

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council Chamber - at the Council House

on 9 May 2016 from 14.00 - 16.47

### ATTENDANCES:

---

✓ Councillor Mohammed Saghir (Lord Mayor)

---

✓ Councillor Liaqat Ali	✓ Councillor Carole-Ann Jones
✓ Councillor Jim Armstrong	✓ Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan
✓ Councillor Cat Arnold	✓ Councillor Neghat Nawaz Khan
✓ Councillor Leslie Ayoola	✓ Councillor Ginny Klein
✓ Councillor Ilyas Aziz	✓ Councillor Dave Liversidge
✓ Councillor Alex Ball	✓ Councillor Sally Longford
✓ Councillor Steve Battlemuch	✓ Councillor Carole McCulloch
✓ Councillor Merlita Bryan	✓ Councillor Nick McDonald
✓ Councillor Eunice Campbell	✓ Councillor David Mellen
✓ Councillor Graham Chapman	✓ Councillor Jackie Morris
✓ Councillor Azad Choudhry	✓ Councillor Toby Neal
✓ Councillor Alan Clark	✓ Councillor Alex Norris
✓ Councillor Jon Collins	✓ Councillor Brian Parbutt
✓ Councillor Josh Cook	✓ Councillor Anne Peach
✓ Councillor Georgina Culley	✓ Councillor Sarah Piper
✓ Councillor Michael Edwards	✓ Councillor Andrew Rule
✓ Councillor Pat Ferguson	✓ Councillor David Smith
✓ Councillor Chris Gibson	✓ Councillor Wendy Smith
✓ Councillor Brian Grocock	✓ Councillor Chris Tansley
✓ Councillor John Hartshorne	✓ Councillor Dave Trimble
✓ Councillor Rosemary Healy	✓ Councillor Jane Urquhart
✓ Councillor Nicola Heaton	✓ Councillor Marcia Watson
✓ Councillor Mohammed Ibrahim	✓ Councillor Sam Webster
✓ Councillor Patience Uloma Ifediora	✓ Councillor Michael Wildgust
✓ Councillor Corall Jenkins	✓ Councillor Malcolm Wood
✓ Councillor Glyn Jenkins	✓ Councillor Linda Woodings
✓ Councillor Sue Johnson	✓ Councillor Steve Young

---

✓ Indicates present at meeting

## **1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Liaqat Ali – annual leave  
Rosemary Healy  
Toby Neal – unwell  
Jane Urquhart  
Marcia Watson  
Michael Wildgust - unwell

## **2 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

None.

## **3 TO ELECT THE LORD MAYOR AND APPOINT THE SHERIFF**

**RESOLVED to:**

- 1) elect Councillor Mohammed Saghir as the Lord Mayor of the City of Nottingham until the next annual meeting of the City Council, as nominated by Councillor Mohammed Ibrahim and seconded by Councillor Brian Grocock.**
- 2) appoint Councillor Jackie Morris as Sheriff of the City of Nottingham until the next annual meeting of the City Council, as nominated by Councillor Linda Woodings and seconded by Councillor Alex Norris.**

## **4 TO APPOINT THE LORD MAYOR'S CHAPLAIN**

The Lord Mayor informed Council of the appointment of the Reverend of St. Mary's Church (Christopher Harrison) and the Imam at the Nottingham Islamic Centre (Hafiz Abdul Rehman), as the Lord Mayor's Chaplains.

## **5 QUESTIONS FROM CITIZENS**

None.

## **6 PETITIONS FROM COUNCILLORS ON BEHALF OF CITIZENS**

None.

## **7 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 7 MARCH 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

## **8 TO RECEIVE OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND/OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE**

The Chief Executive reported the following official communications:

Paddy Tipping has been re-elected as the Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner. Following the election, Mr Tipping gained 80,926 of the first round votes, following the second round of voting, he ended up with 89,749 votes. The turnout was 21.8%. Mr Tipping is the incumbent Police and Crime Commissioner, and will therefore continue his work in this role. Nottingham City Council extends its congratulations to him in the post.

A service was held on 8 May 2016 at St. Mary's Church to commemorate the victims at the 75<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the World War II bombings of Nottingham. A total of 159 people lost their lives in this dramatic event that affected the lives of many people in the city.

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

None.

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

Historic Child Abuse in Nottingham Children's Care Homes

Councillor Georgina Culley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Early Intervention and Early Years:

Following on from recent emails sent to all Nottingham City councillors, will the Leader of the Council issue an apology to "the friends, victims and survivors" of child abuse who were in the care of Nottingham children's care homes?

Councillor David Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, can I add my congratulations to your appointment, and I wish you and the Sheriff all the best in the year to come, and thank you Councillor Culley for your question. I would like to reassure all members of Council, and most importantly, anyone who has suffered child abuse, whether current or historical, that this is something that the City Council takes extremely seriously, and are committed to tackling effectively wherever and whenever it arises.

Since the current police investigation was launched in 2010, we've been doing all we can to support it, with a view to bringing any past perpetrators to justice. In line with the local Safeguarding Children's Board agreed procedures, we have established a cross-authority strategic management group to take an overview of these matters, with partner organisations, and we will ensure that no stone is unturned in pursuit of answers, closure, and wherever possible, criminal justice for survivors, as well as learning any lessons about how to best deal with allegations of this nature.

We welcomed Lord Justice Goddard's inquiry decision, looking into local cases of historical child abuse, which will bring the independent scrutiny that we know is

important to survivors and their representatives. We, along with local partner organisations, are committed to engaging fully with this inquiry.

Members may be aware that most of the cases being looked at by the police relate to a time before the latest local government reorganisation, when the County Council was responsible for children's homes in Nottingham, and that they recently apologised after a former member of their staff was successfully prosecuted for historical abuse. However, at this time no former or current City Council employees have been charged or prosecuted for historical abuse as part of ongoing police investigations, and so we are not in the same position. This does not mean that we are not sympathetic to anyone who has suffered abuse in the past, far from it.

This is an abhorrent crime, which has a devastating effect on the lives of victims, and is particularly terrible when perpetrated by someone in a position of trust. We can assure anyone who has suffered, in the past or now, that they will be listened to, taken seriously, helped to access appropriate support, and that action will be taken wherever possible. We would encourage anyone aware of or affected by abuse, current or historical, to come forward and speak confidentially to us or to the police, as well as taking the forthcoming opportunity to provide evidence to the Goddard inquiry.

It is also important to remember that children's homes in Nottingham are unrecognisable today to those that are at the centre of current investigations. All of the homes in Nottingham, which I have visited, are rated Good or Outstanding by Ofsted. They are heavily regulated; the safety, quality of care, and outcomes for individual children are now closely monitored and reviewed by the local safeguarding boards. The safety and wellbeing of children in our care today remains our highest priority. Thank you.

---

#### Suspension from the Labour Party of a Nottingham City Councillor

Councillor Georgina Culley asked the following question of the Leader:

Would the Leader confirm that a councillor on Nottingham City Council is among the recent suspensions of members of the Labour Party? What action will he be taking in the circumstances?

Councillor Jon Collins replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I take this opportunity to congratulate you and the Sheriff on your appointments for the forthcoming year. Councillor Aziz has been suspended from the Labour Party pending an investigation, and in consequence he has also been suspended by the Labour Group, and has had the Whip withdrawn.

---

#### City Division of Nottinghamshire Police

Councillor Michael Edwards asked the following question of the Leader:

Would the City division of Nottinghamshire Police remaining be in the best interests of residents and Policing in Nottingham City?

Councillor Jon Collins replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. The simple answer to that question is yes. As Councillors will be aware, under the structure proposed by Nottinghamshire Police, the City division would cease to exist, and the most senior officer in the city would be at the rank of Superintendent. It is the view of the City Council that this would have clear implications for future policing capacity in the city, and undermine public confidence in policing in Nottingham.

Nottingham has made significant progress in reducing crime in the last decade or so; a reduction from around 75,000 crimes per year in May 2003 to a little over 30,000 crimes annually at the end of this financial year. While there are cities with significantly worse crime figures than Nottingham, there can be no room for complacency, and there is much more to do.

In this context, the decision by the Chief Constable to turn the clock back to the 1990s and introduce a policing structure that ignores the needs of the city is bizarre and inexplicable. Surely, since the current crime reductions follow from the decision to create a City division in 2002, it makes no sense to do away with that structure now? As the saying goes: if it ain't broke, why fix it? And if the current move towards a single County division with generic responsibilities is such a good idea, why is it that no other Core City adopts this model of policing? Why is it that every other Core City has its own police division, headed by a senior police officer, with the rank of Chief Superintendent or above?

Lord Mayor, in a recent conversation with the Mayor of Leicester, I have to say we managed to grab a few words while he wasn't out celebrating the amazing and deserved success of Leicester City Football Club in winning the Premiership, he told me how Leicester had been stripped of its city policing division without any consultation, and about the many problems this had caused in continuing with effective partnership working. If these proposals go ahead, there will be a similar result in Nottingham: poorer partnership working, less accountability, and increased crime as a result.

Following a decision at the last meeting of the Executive Board, the City Council's position is that of opposing these proposals, and seeking to collaborate with Nottinghamshire Police in order to find a mutually agreeable way forward. In particular, the council is calling for Nottinghamshire Police to adopt a geographical model, in consultation with Nottingham City Council, that clearly reflects Nottingham's status as a Core City. We are also calling for the City division to be retained, and to be led by a Chief Superintendent responsible for the same areas of policing as under the current model.

Finally Lord Mayor, can I finish with saying this: today, Paddy Tipping, our re-elected Police and Crime Commissioner, has announced that the Chief Constable has decided to retire in 6 weeks' time. Lord Mayor, I believe Chris Eyre has been a very good Chief Constable for Nottinghamshire, and he can be proud of the way he has turned the force around, and delivered steady and sustained reductions in crime, both within the City and County. Furthermore, he has overseen increasingly close working between the City Council and the police through Project Aurora, which has helped deliver a more integrated and effective service to local people in our

communities. However, in light of his imminent departure, he must surely recognise that to press ahead with this ill-judged reorganisation in the knowledge that he can never be held to account for its failure, would be totally wrong.

Strong personal accountability is the key to decision making in the public sector, and to be making such a critical decision in this way undermines that principal. In the circumstances, I would hope and expect, even at this late stage, that both the current Chief Constable and the newly elected Police and Crime Commissioner will put the matter on hold until a new Chief Constable can be appointed, review the proposals, and then make a decision that he or she will then be happy to be accountable for. This decision is too important to be made in haste, without public consultation, without the support of partner organisations, and by a Chief Constable who is due to retire in 6 weeks' time.

---

### Local Government Funding Distribution

Councillor Corall Jenkins asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Could the Deputy Leader comment on the difference in Local Government funding settlements that have seen Rutland lose far less per household than the people of Nottingham?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Can I thank you for the question, and also add my congratulations to you Lord Mayor. In 2016/17, Nottingham households each lost £71 of spending power, via reduced government grant. Nottingham is the 21<sup>st</sup> most deprived council area in England. Rutland is the 321<sup>st</sup> most deprived area, but actually it is a silly term to use; it is indeed one of the richest areas, just below Tunbridge Wells in terms of income per household. Yet in Rutland, each household gained, yes gained, £44. So let's just get this in our heads; Nottingham households lost £71, Rutland households gained £44.

This is part of a trend, over the last 5 years Nottingham households have lost £426 per household in government settlement by spending power. Rutland households have actually gained £54. Now we have been told that part of this is to reflect the fact that the Labour government gave more to deprived areas at the expense of the better off areas. In my view, that was right, and it was right because that additional settlement that the Labour government gave reflected additional needs. We for example have got far more demand for child protection services, and we have far more demand for elderly care. In Rutland, many of the elderly are well off enough to pay for themselves, we have to finance elderly care. We have more transport responsibilities, and we also have more community protection responsibilities.

But this year is quite significant, and it is significant because it is the first year that a household in Rutland gets more government support than a household in Nottingham. It has actually crossed over, despite all of those additional responsibilities we have in Nottingham.

But to add insult to injury, it was not just Rutland who benefitted; there are many other authorities who benefitted from a late windfall that the Conservative government gave to a number of authorities. And they are, to give you some

examples: Surrey received an extra £24,000,000, Hampshire received an extra £19,000,000, Oxfordshire (the county where David Cameron has his constituency) received £9,000,000, Richmond-on-Thames, that focal point of poverty, received a £3,000,000 bonus. Leicester received nothing, Derby received nothing, and Nottingham received nothing.

Yet I knew there were a number of Council leaders scurrying down to London, and I knew, having talked to them, they were going to get something, and I'll talk about them in a second. I know that Derby went down and absolutely got nothing. It's very interesting why. If you ask yourself, "what have the authorities who got extra money got in common?" you've got to ask yourself these things. I'll tell you what they are: all are well off, all have a high tax base, most of them are southern, most of them have lost far less than the average over the last 5 years in previous settlements (they've lost less, not more), most of them, 80%, are Conservative. The leaders that went down lobbying were all Conservative leaders, and I spoke to them and they were very convinced they were going to get something out of the government, unlike the leaders from Derby. Most contain seats of Cabinet Ministers. Those are the things in common when you're looking at the distribution of that additional £300,000,000.

However, that is not the technical reason for it; it couldn't possibly be, because we have got an unimpeachable civil service that would have to find a technical reason for it, so I decided I was going to put in a Freedom of Information enquiry to find out how they could possibly justify what one member of the media said to me was "financial gerrymandering". So I was quite interested to see what the technicalities were. So I put an FOI in, and what I got back was "sorry, we can't respond yet, because we're not sure it is in the public interest to let you know". Now this is no joke, it is not necessarily in the public interest that you should know what criteria we used, so can we have another 23 days please? And the 23 days came up, and expired, and I got no reply. I informed the MPs, I informed the BBC who showed interest, and only at that point did we get a response, and that response was not adequate. It gave a description of the formula, it did not give the information on the spreadsheet that gave us the ability to analyse properly how they had distributed.

Moreover, and by the way, we get all that information from the grant system normally, it is normal to give us the full information, so I wasn't asking for anything untoward. Moreover, part of the response to the BBC was "well actually, the reserves that Leicester have are quite high" with the implication that you should be able to spend your reserves. Now we all know that if you start spending your reserves, you start moving down the primrose path to the everlasting bonfire of bankruptcy, which is what's happening to Northamptonshire, who are Tory controlled by the way. They also told me that Derby had reserves, and they gave the Nottingham reserves of £141,000,000. I did point out to the BBC that actually, the reserves of Essex, who got £14,000,000, are actually £400,000,000! So what they've done is dished out money to the authority with £400,000,000 of reserves. I don't accept the reserves argument, but that shows the absurdity and the desperation of somebody down in the Department for Local Government, trying to divert attention away from what they are in fact doing.

For me, it is a serious matter, it is not just fairness, but it is beginning to feel a bit like corruption of the system. The failure to give us the real reasons for it reinforces that view, and I want to know why they will not release the details of the spreadsheet, and

why it might not be in the public interest. I'm also interested to know where the money came from: where all of a sudden do you find £300,000,000? I'd be interested to know whether it comes from another local government pot. So we'll find out, because I'm going to pursue it. I'm also interested in why there's no transitional support for somewhere like Moseley, where in the poorest place in the country I think each household over the last 5 years has lost more. The poorest place in this country has lost more than any other area in the UK. That's a condemnation of this government. I'm also interested to know why we only started getting answers when the BBC got involved. So those are questions that I will be pursuing doggedly, very very doggedly, because I smell rats, and I've got to say, I smell Tory rats. Thank you.

---

### Voting in the European Union Referendum

Councillor Linda Woodings asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Can the Deputy Leader tell us why it is important that Nottingham Citizens both register, and vote, in the forthcoming referendum on whether the United Kingdom should remain in the European Union?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. Irrespective of which way people vote, it is important that they register and take part in what is going to be a decision which historically is more important than a general election. A general election is for 5 years, this decision is likely to be for life. I was originally sceptical about the risk of this referendum, and I still am. I still think it is high risk, and I still think the city is suffering somewhat because there's been a downturn in the markets, but also a downturn in inward investment interest.

Nevertheless, I am pleasantly surprised by the number of people who really want to understand the issues, and people who want to get involved. I'm constantly being asked by constituents about the issues, in a way which doesn't occur normally, and I am very optimistic that there will be a good turnout, provided people are registered. I just hope that we get a good debate, and I also hope that some of the media, especially some of the more virulent elements owned by non-EU residents, and you can guess who they are, treat the readers with the respect they deserve and the respect that they want on this issue, so that we can have a proper informed debate, and people can vote on the basis of fact not prejudice. In my view, if they do base their vote on fact and not prejudice, they will probably come down on the side that it is far better to stay within Europe.

I will put the City's point of view, which is a unanimous view within the Labour Group, and it may or may not be the case from the Conservatives.

So the first thing is trade. Nottingham's businesses benefit from the EU single market of £500,000,000 and it is worth £11,000,000,000,000 per year in terms of trade. Around 45% of exports from Nottingham's businesses go not to India, not to China, but to the EU. It's our main market. The harmonised rules of a single market simplify, despite what is said, trade and investment decisions. It is a myth that somehow leaving the EU will reduce bureaucracy. Any firm wishing to import, or in particular



export, will have to comply with regulations which are likely to be far greater if you're coming from the outside than from the inside. There will be more bureaucracy.

In terms of jobs: 1 in 8 jobs are associated directly or indirectly in this city with EU trade. Funding from the European Social Fund has supported training and employment of local people. We have just secured a £7,000,000 EU-funded programme to support our young people into work over the coming years, and this is substituting for the loss of funding from central government.

In terms of grants: the city benefits from access to the EU Regional Development Funds. Since 2000 we've received £190,000,000, and this is an important figure, to fund projects such as the Market Square, Nottingham Contemporary, the Creative Quarter, Southglade Food Park, Sneinton Market, and many other schemes. Our universities benefit from access to research funding estimated at £40,000,000 through the current Horizon programme. Our universities are genuinely worried about exit, because they will lose a major stream for research and development.

Moreover, whilst the government is disproportionately reducing funding for this city, EU funds are distributed on the basis of need, so it is fairer. And whilst the government is taking short term approaches, for example reducing funding on capital investment, reducing funding on training (particularly in further education), reducing the incentives for long-term research and development, these are the very areas which the EU is targeting. So EU funding is actually far more intelligent than our own government's funding, and is also far more consistently distributed to areas of need.

So two final points. First, it is true that as a nation we contribute more than we get back in terms of money transfer. We do, it would be foolish not to accept that, but so does Germany. However, when the benefits of trade and GDP are taken into account, as with Germany, the benefits far outweigh the immediate costs. Moreover, the idea that Michael Gove and Boris Johnson would encourage any monetary savings to be spent either on the health service or to compensate Nottingham for EU grants it loses is, to put it politely, implausible. I'd like to put it less politely, but I won't, because it's Full Council.

Second, a decision to leave the EU is a step into the unknown. Businesses and government leaders such as the CBI and the Treasury, are clear that economic growth will be slowed down if we take that step. And I just think it's so obvious that that will be the case, because it will create massive uncertainty. It's not necessarily what might happen; it's more the period in which things are not happening that's going to cause a problem. The markets respond to uncertainty, and they go down if there's uncertainty, and there will be massive amounts of uncertainty. The Leaders and mayors of all the UK's core cities are united in their belief that leaving the EU would only harm their city's economies and future prospects.

We therefore believe, it is not only important that all citizens in Nottingham register to vote and exercise that vote, but that in so doing they consider the benefits that our EU membership brings, and the significant risk and damage to the city in the long term should there be an exit. Thank you.

## **11 EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS, REMITS AND FIRST MEETINGS 2016-17**

The Leader submitted a report on Executive appointments, remits and first meetings 2016/17, as set out on pages 11 to 24 of the agenda, and 3 to 34 of the appointments supplementary agenda.

**RESOLVED to:**

- 1) note the appointment of Councillor Graham Chapman as Deputy Leader;**
- 2) note the appointments of Portfolio Holders, their Executive Assistants, and their remits as below and in appendix 1 to the report, and their responsibilities and remits as detailed in appendix 2 to the report;**

<b>PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME</b>	<b>PORTFOLIO</b>
<b>Jon Collins</b>	<b>Strategic Regeneration</b>
<b>Graham Chapman</b>	<b>Resources and Neighbourhood Regeneration</b>
<b>Alan Clark</b>	<b>Energy and Sustainability</b>
<b>Nicola Heaton</b>	<b>Community Services</b>
<b>Nick McDonald</b>	<b>Business, Growth and Transport</b>
<b>David Mellen</b>	<b>Early Intervention and Early Years</b>
<b>Alex Norris</b>	<b>Adults and Health</b>
<b>David Trimble</b>	<b>Leisure and Culture</b>
<b>Jane Urquhart</b>	<b>Planning and Housing</b>
<b>Sam Webster</b>	<b>Education, Employment and Skills</b>

<b>EXECUTIVE ASSISTANT NAME</b>	<b>REMIT</b>
<b>Alex Ball</b>	<b>Housing</b>
<b>Rosemary Healy</b>	<b>Policy Team Development</b>
<b>Corall Jenkins</b>	<b>Transport</b>
<b>Toby Neal</b>	<b>Equalities, Customer Focus, IT and Technology</b>
<b>Marcia Watson</b>	<b>Skills</b>

- 3) note the appointments, including substitutions where applicable, and first meeting dates of Executive meetings, as detailed in appendix 3 to the report;**
- 4) note the terms of reference for Executive committees and agree the related changes to the Constitution, as detailed in appendix 4 to the report.**

## **12 APPOINTMENTS AND FIRST MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES AND JOINT BODIES 2016-17**

The Leader submitted a report on appointments and first meetings of committees and joint bodies 2016/17, as set out on pages 25 to 74 of the agenda, and 35 to 94 of the appointments supplementary agenda.

**RESOLVED to:**

- 1) agree the first meeting dates of Council bodies and Joint bodies, as set out in appendix 1 to the report;
- 2) agree the terms of reference of Council bodies and Joint bodies, and any related changes to the Constitution, as set out in appendix 2 to the report;
- 3) agree the membership of Council bodies and the City Council membership of Joint bodies, as set out in appendix 3 to the report;
- 4) agree that Councillor Hartshorne will fill the vacancy to the City Centre Forum of a member who is also a member of the Trusts and Charities Committee, as reported at the meeting by Councillor Sally Longford;
- 5) agree substitutes, where applicable, as set out in appendix 3 to the report.

**13 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES**

The Leader submitted a report on decisions taken under urgency procedures, as set out on pages 75 to 82 of the agenda.

**RESOLVED to note the urgent decisions taken, as follows:**

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

<u>Ref no</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2367	04/03/16	Bioscience – Alternative Funding Proposal	Exempt	The need to proceed quickly in order to take advantage of this year's investment window with likely backers.
2371	10/03/16	Security Functions	Exempt	The impact on affected staff needs to take place immediately.
2389	21/03/16	Extension of Edge of Care Hub Service	£720,000	Staff contracts are due to expire imminently therefore it is essential that the decision is implemented immediately.

<b><u>Ref no</u></b>	<b><u>Date of decision</u></b>	<b><u>Subject</u></b>	<b><u>Value of decision</u></b>	<b><u>Reasons for urgency</u></b>
2390	22/03/16	Priority Families Partnerships Accredited Practitioners	£656,000	This decision affects staff contracts which were due to expire at the end of March. Immediate consultation with affected staff is required.
2395	30/03/16	Nottingham Works - Youth Engagement Initiative Funded Programme	£6,875,340	In order to sign the funding agreement.
2398	31/03/16	Marketing Nottingham & Nottinghamshire	£740,110	Any delay in implementing this decision would lead to a gap in place marketing activity which would undermine the city's approach to attracting investment and creating jobs for local citizens.
2406	06/04/16	Derby City Council - Transport Services for Older People and People With Learning Disabilities	£440,510	Derby City Council's incumbent supplier is pulling out of the passenger transport service market in Derby and the Council have been unable to appoint an alternative provider through the tender process. Nottingham City Council is required to take over this service on the 3 May 2016 to provide continuity of service which is vital as the customers are vulnerable and disabled adults.

<u>Ref no</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2410	04/04/16	Repairs and Maintenance to Council Properties	£468,000	The contract end date impacts upon the delivery of statutory inspections for Council buildings. Engagement with contractors is required immediately to ensure the Authority is not put at risk.
2411	07/04/16	Advocacy Provision	£92,351	Immediate implementation of the decision provides notice of the availability of funding in line with the agreed timetable.
2412	08/04/16	Approval for Catering Facilities	£99,428	To allow for immediate consultation with affected staff.
2417	07/04/16	Sale of the Freehold interest in the former Springwood Day Centre site, Ransom Drive, Nottingham NG3 5LR	Exempt	Any delay would adversely affect the sale.
2428	18/04/2016	Response to invitation to tender for energy management support for Djanogly Learning Trust	Exempt	In order to meet the tender submission deadline of 18 April 2016.
2442	21/04/2016	Transfer of external homecare provision to internal provision	Exempt	Any delay would result in citizens being put at risk of losing their homecare services.

2) **key decisions (taken under special urgency procedures)**

<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Decision Taker</u>	<u>Reasons for special urgency</u>
30/03/16	Nottingham Works - Youth Engagement Initiative Funded Programme - Key Decision	£6,875,340	Leader of the Council	The decision is urgent and the business cannot be deferred in order to sign the funding agreement and arrange funding for 1 April 2016.
10/03/16	Security Functions	Exempt	Leader of the Council	Contract negotiations need to start as soon as possible to ensure that preparations for the new arrangements (including staff consultation) are in place by 1 April 2016 following the end of the current contract on 31 March 2016.
20/04/16	Permission for Procurement Tender for Nottingham City Council (NCC) Transport services	£10,760,000	Leader of the Council	The decision is urgent as the current transport contract for Nottingham City Council has now expired and a new framework needs to be established.

**14 APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY CITY ORGANIST**

The Leader submitted a report on the appointment of the Honorary City Organist, as set out on pages 83 to 84 of the agenda.

**RESOLVED to appoint John Keys as the Honorary City Organist for Nottingham.**

**15 ADOPTION OF THE BUSINESS CHARTER**

The Portfolio Holder for Business, Growth and Transport submitted a report on the adoption of the Business Charter, as set out on pages 85 to 91 of the agenda.

**RESOLVED to approve and note the Business Charter.**

## **16 MOTION**

Moved by Councillor Sam Webster, seconded by Councillor David Mellen:

"This Council opposes the Government policy of forced academisation of 'good' and 'outstanding' community schools.

This Council opposes the Government's proposal to remove the requirement on schools to appoint parent governors.

This Council calls on Government to return to Local Authorities the powers to build new maintained schools to ensure that good school places are available for all children.

The Council also notes that the Conservative, Labour, Liberal Democrat and Independent groups via the Local Government Association have set out their opposition to forced academisations to the Secretary of State for Education."

**RESOLVED to carry the motion.**

## **17 TO AGREE FUTURE MEETING DATES**

**RESOLVED to:**

- 1) hold meeting of Council at 2pm on the following dates:**
  - 11 July 2016
  - 12 September 2016
  - 14 November 2016
  - 16 January 2017
  - 6 March 2017
  
- 2) hold meetings of Extraordinary Council after the meeting of Council on the following dates:**
  - 11 July 2016