

Public Document Pack

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council Chamber - at the Council House

on 11 July 2016 from 14.00 - 16.14

ATTENDANCES:

✓ Councillor Mohammed Saghir (Lord Mayor)

✓ Councillor Merlita Bryan	✓ Councillor Carole-Ann Jones
✓ Councillor Liaqat Ali	✓ Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan
✓ Councillor Jim Armstrong	✓ Councillor Neghat Nawaz Khan
✓ Councillor Cat Arnold	✓ Councillor Ginny Klein
✓ Councillor Leslie Ayoola	Councillor Dave Liversidge
Councillor Ilyas Aziz	✓ Councillor Sally Longford
Councillor Alex Ball	✓ Councillor Carole McCulloch
✓ Councillor Steve Battlemuch	✓ 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

18 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Sue Johnson – other Council business

Councillor Dave Liversidge – personal

Councillor Alex Norris – annual leave

Councillor Andrew Rule – personal

Councillor Mick Wildgust – unwell

19 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None.

20 QUESTIONS FROM CITIZENS

None.

21 PETITIONS FROM COUNCILLORS ON BEHALF OF CITIZENS

Councillor Rosemary Healy presented a petition on behalf of residents of Blythe Street, Staples Street and Querneby Street, requesting the enforcement of 20 mile per hour speed limits, which are not being adhered to, and the erection of bollards on Blythe Street and Staples Street to prevent vehicles travelling at high speeds and using the area as a cut-through.

22 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 9 MAY 2016

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 May 2016 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chair.

23 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:

Alison Challenger has been appointed to the role of Director of Public Health, following an external recruitment process.

The results of a national passenger survey, undertaken by Passenger Focus in Autumn 2015, have now been released. The tramways satisfaction survey was carried out in six cities, with NET achieving the highest overall satisfaction scores in the UK of 98%, an increase from 96% in 2014. The average satisfaction score for all networks was 92%.

The Nottingham City Council Heritage Strategy has won the Excellence in Planning for Built Heritage Award at the National Royal Town Planning Institute Awards Ceremony in May 2016. The judges commented that The Nottingham Heritage Strategy is a good practical exemplar with wider application potential. It shows that Heritage can be at the heart of place making and can combine with economic growth principles.

The death was reported of County Councillor, former City Councillor, and Honorary Alderman Martin Suthers, OBE. Councillor Suthers died on Saturday 21 May 2016 from an inoperable tumour on his lung after a short six week illness. He had represented the Bingham ward on the County Council since 2000, and was also deputy leader of the Conservative Group at the County Council. Councillor Suthers was a Nottingham City Councillor from 1967-69 and again from 1976-95, and was Lord Mayor of Nottingham in 1988-89.

Councillors Chris Gibson and Georgina Culley spoke in tribute to Martin Suthers, and a minute's silence was held.

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

None.

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

Process for appointment of Honorary Aldermen

Councillor Georgina Culley asked the Leader:

Could the Leader of the Council explain to me why the procedure and qualifying criteria for nominating Honorary Aldermen has changed for this municipal year?

Councillor Jon Collins replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. It hasn't.

Strike action by teachers

Councillor Jim Armstrong asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Education, Employment and Skills:

Does the Portfolio Holder for Education support the recent strike action by teachers in Nottingham, action which has stolen a day's education from the children of this city?

Councillor Sam Webster replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and I'm grateful to Councillor Armstrong for his question. There was strike action by the National Union of Teachers nationwide, last Tuesday 5 July. The strike had an impact in Nottingham schools and on Nottingham children, and this is regrettable. It's a shame to see that the relationship between education professionals and the government has broken down to such an extent that 92% of NUT members who voted in the strike ballot voted in favour of strike action. It's a

worrying trend that we have increasing levels of dispute between the government, trade unions, and professional bodies; including junior doctors and teachers.

However, to give an idea of the impact in Nottingham of this particular strike, I can report that only 10% of schools were completely closed, and a large majority of schools were open to all pupils. I fully recognise that loss of learning, even for one day, isn't what any of us would want, and the disruption caused to parents and carers is also regrettable. My view is that strike action that impacts on children's education should only be used as a last resort. However, it's important for us to understand why exactly teachers up and down the country chose this course of action. And with a 92% vote in favour of a strike, it would be foolish to dismiss out of hand the genuine concerns of some teachers.

So I'll try to give some context to Councillor Armstrong's question. In a letter written to Nicky Morgan on 28 June, the NUT highlighted reasons for striking, stating that the note was a last appeal before action was taken. Kevin Courtney, the Acting General Secretary of the NUT, warned that the funding situation in schools would get progressively worse unless government changed course. He argued that the funding cuts could have negative implications, including an increase in class sizes, fewer subject choices for children, and cuts in support and teaching staff, all of which could affect standards overall.

The strike took place due to concerns about funding. Funding to ensure the profession attracts and retains the best teachers, funding that ensures class sizes remain static and do not rise, funding to ensure that schools are properly equipped and resourced, funding to ensure that valuable aspects of children's education such as the arts and music are retained, funding to ensure redundancies in schools are avoided.

For those of us interested in education funding, breadth of curriculum, and quality of teaching, it's sensible to listen to the concerns of the profession. In fact, we should all be extremely concerned about government education policies and continued Tory austerity measures. We should all be aware, and we should make sure that parents are aware, of the funding cuts that our schools now face. The Institute for Fiscal Studies indicates that per pupil funding will fall by 8% between 2014/15 and 2019/20. Post 16 funding has fallen by 14% over the last parliament, and will not in future be protected in real terms.

The proposed cut to the Education Services Grant of £600,000,000 announced in last year's spending review is yet another financial pressure which will, in the coming months and years, have huge implications for schools directly and indirectly. This cut will have a major effect on education services currently provided to schools by local authorities. So I'm concerned that the government is freezing funding per pupil, whilst at the same time imposing higher national insurance and pension costs on schools. Additionally, I'm worried that the proposed national funding formula could take money away from around half of all schools, and this has to be seen in the context of DfE data which predicts 900,000 extra pupils at England's schools over the next decade, which will clearly increase costs as well as create additional recruitment and retention pressures.

So, at the heart of this dispute are our expectations as a society and for us here in Nottingham as a city about the importance of adequate funding to schools, about our commitment to the highest possible standards for every child, and whether we are serious about ensuring all children are given the fullest opportunity to realise and make the most of their potential. We shouldn't take adequate education funding for granted.

I'm proud to belong to a party that, when last in government, significantly increased spending on educating children in this country and in this city. Under Labour, spending by schools per pupil rose by about 5% per year in real terms between 1997 and 2010, and we saw the result of that in much improved outcomes for young people over that period. Yet, under Conservative governments, we've seen and continue to see falling spend per child in real terms, and reductions as a percentage of national income. These are the biggest falls in education spending since the 1950s. So it's imperative that we note the NUT's concern, and it's imperative that once again, education becomes a central plank of Labour's campaigns and Labour's policies. The failed economic plan of the Conservative government must not be allowed to fail the next generation.

I do urge Councillor Armstrong to join me in calling for a reversal in cuts to school budgets. A government that stops seeing spending on education as anything other than an investment in the future really has lost its way. Thank you.

Early intervention support for children with English as an additional language

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

The council is providing support through training to teachers in schools where a significant proportion of children do not have English as their first language, but could the Portfolio Holder explain what the council is doing to support those children before they enter into the education system, so they are not at a significant disadvantage from their first day in primary school?

Councillor Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Culley for her question, I am grateful to her for this opportunity to share with Council today the valuable work that's being done with under 5s across the city, both those with English as their first language, and those whose first language is something other than English. Of course, many children attend school nurseries or other nursery provision in the city before the reach statutory school age. This vital provision helps all children to develop their language and communication skills, as well as learning many other early skills; preparing children for full time school. The fact is, this Labour council has extended nursery provision by enlarging many nurseries, including introducing one at Fernwood School in your ward Councillor Culley, where we've recently opened a nursery that is benefitting the families in Wollaton.

But early learning does not just start when children are at nursery. It starts at birth; in fact, arguably before, and the Health Visitors service which is now commissioned by the council, do much valuable work with all babies and their mums on early development progress, attachment between mother and child, as well as all the necessary medical checks. Then many different professionals involved in working with young children and their parents across the city; despite government cutbacks, we retain 18 children's Sure Start children's centres across the city. These centres offer universal services to all children, and in areas where there are high levels of children with English as a second language, such as Hyson Green and Forest Fields, the children's centre provides and facilitates family law advice sessions and translation services in many languages to initially engage the parents in the children's centre services, and then allow family support workers to assess the needs of the children and engage in open access and targeted provision to support their communication and language.

Children's centres have trained 26 colleagues across the city in the PEEP programme (Parents as Early Educational Practitioners). This is an initiative delivered by the children's centres for parents and their children. It is delivered in age bands, and provides parents with tools and resources to support their child's development. These are delivered in all the 18 children's centres across the city, and where English is a second language parents are encouraged to attend the specific groups to develop the children's communication skills and spoken English.

Joint working is undertaken between the Family Information Service and the children's centres to promote the early learning programme for 2 year olds, and engage children on this programme. This includes a systematic approach of calling all parents whose children are approaching the next cohort of eligibility, and families who have maybe registered on the programme but not yet taken up a place. Those calls are to identify eligibility and the barriers to attending, and support families in overcoming those barriers, so that as many as possible 2 year olds take up the 15 hours of nursery provision that is available.

The City Council's Early Year's team have successfully run the "talking twos" programme, within private and voluntary nursery and childcare settings to support practitioners in their ability to develop speech and communication skills in the early years. This is supplemented by the provision of ongoing training for all early years practitioners by a qualified speech and language therapist, in order to support speech and language development. The needs of children with English as an additional language are addressed through the programme and training of the parents. The Early Years team are also introducing in the forthcoming academic years a new core strategy for EAL in the early years that specifically addresses the needs of these children. It will focus on providing early years workers to be able to work in partnership with parents and to provide children with English as an additional language with experiences that allow them to develop and enhance their English language acquisition, whilst continuing to build upon and celebrate their own home language and culture. It will be delivered by the local authority's Early Years consultants.

So, much is going on, but despite the resources being systematically reduced in this city by government cuts, we are looking for creative ways to supplement what we already do. So we bid 2 years ago to the Big Lottery Fund, one of 150 authorities

across the country, and we were one of only 5 authorities to gain the £45,000,000 to work with under 4 year olds in 4 wards of our city, in innovative and consistent practice over a 10 year period. They already have developing programmes for parenting, early communication, nutrition, and developing a new workforce of parent-peer mentors, who have already started working in Bulwell and Aspley, and in the autumn, will start working in Arboretum and St Anns. Extra money has been brought to this city by this Labour council, working in partnership with other organisations in the city, despite the cuts from the government.

Equally, we believe that we want to get more books into the hands of young children, so 3 years ago the council got involved in the Dolly Parton Imagination Library scheme, which delivers a good children's book to children from birth to the age of 5, through the letterbox, through the post, for the cost of a cup of coffee really. It only costs £2 to get those books to those children. We haven't got the money for it, so we've been working in partnership with the Rotary Club, with groups like Castle Cavendish, and with sponsorship from individuals and businesses, to be able to now get to the stage where 2,500 of under 5 years olds are getting a book through their letterbox, and then our libraries and children's centres are working with those parents to develop those early skills. There's a lot more to do, and if Councillors are not already involved in that scheme and want to sponsor a child, it's only £2 per month, and I would very happily give you a standing order form!

Finally, I think the last thing to say in my experience as a primary school teacher, is that actually, having English as an additional language, we need to look at that positively; it's an extra skill for children, and children are often much better at languages when they have at a very early age had to communicate in 2 languages. And although they might take a little bit of time when they first get into school, or when they're first mixing with other children, young children learn very very quickly, and they are soon up to scratch with the other children. It's more difficult when children perhaps arrive with English as an additional language when they're 13, 14 or 15, and there is more catching up to do there, but for young children I don't see this as a difficulty, and as a teacher it was never a problem. Thank you.

Statement on public finances

Councillor Michael Edwards asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Can the Deputy Leader advise on the impact on Nottingham of recent statements on public finances by the government?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Yes thank you Lord Mayor, and I thank Councillor Edwards for his question. The most recent government statements, and by government I include the Bank of England, have not, surprisingly, been in response to Brexit. They have, I think, 4 major statements. First, the announcement that balancing the government current account will be extended as a target for a further 2 years. This is something I will remind people that was promised in the last government to balance the books, it then promised again the budget to balance the books, and it's now extended for another 2

years. Second, the expectation from the Bank of England that there will be a further 3% reduction in GDP as a result of Brexit. Then thirdly, there is an announcement of the possible reduction in Corporation Tax. And then, fourth, an announcement that the Bank of England is ready to release £250,000,000,000, although I did also read in the Financial Times it was £150,000,000,000, but what's £100,000,000,000 between friends? So this was released into the economy, so those 4 things.

Let's take the first one, which is balancing the books. George Osborne was never going to balance the books in the timescale that he gave. The original announcement was full of bluster, I identified that at the time, and Brexit is now being used as cover for a U-turn he would have had to make anyway. It is not Brexit that is causing that U-turn, and I'm someone that voted for staying in Europe, and we need to be honest about it. For Nottingham, this means that the additional, and I stress 'additional', pressure on our already-impossible budget may well be relieved for a couple of years. It will be small comfort, because the budget is under enormous pressure, but there may well be some relief, and that is good news. It may, on the other hand, be the beginning of an admission of what we in this group and this party have known all along, that the degree of austerity we've been undergoing is neither necessary, nor is it working. And that would be better news still for the city.

Second, the expectation of a 3% drop in GDP as a result of Brexit. If the Bank of England is right, then the loss of tax take will be double the net amount we make on saving on our contributions, which will wipe out any hope of contributions to the NHS, making up for the money we lose from Europe which is £50,000,000 in this city, and anything else that the Brexiters promised. It will be double, the loss will be double what they promised. This will severely affect public finances; it will put more pressure on the NHS, on social care and other services, unless there are substantial tax rises. As a city with a number of vulnerable people, and a net consumer of services, the prospects do not look good. On top of the cuts the council is already going to have to make. It is therefore up to us as a council to do our utmost to mitigate what damage we can. But it will be impossible to mitigate all damage, but that is a discussion for another day. Brexit also requires the government to have an economic plan, and at the moment that is totally absent.

Third, a further reduction in Corporation Tax. This, in my view, is a panicked proposal, and I have no idea what the Chancellor wants to achieve. The organisations most hit by Brexit in the short term are the banks. The banks are not making profits; therefore they are not paying corporation tax. So it's not necessarily going to help the banks. One advantage of Brexit is the effect of the fall of the pound on export goods, and making them more competitive. But if you were wanting to take long term advantage for, say manufacturing, you should not be reducing corporation tax, which affects all companies; you should be increasing capital allowances, which encourages long term investment. The effect on Nottingham would be to reduce further the tax take, and put pressure on public services. Not a good use of public money, not part of a strategy, it is a silly thing to do.

Fourth, the announcement that £150,000,000,000, or I don't know, £250,000,000,000 could well be released through quantitative easing. This could be an enormous opportunity, if the money is used not like it was last time to shore up the banks, because that will be a wasted opportunity. It should be converted into bonds to release capital into the economy, and this capital should be geared towards long term

investment, which should improve our national productivity. We are told our economy is bouncing along, but what bounce there is, is on the basis of consumption and not production. It is on the basis of high imports; we have a really serious balance of trade problem that nobody seems to be addressing, and it is critical that it is addressed. Also, our growth has been on the basis of population growth. It has certainly not been on the basis of productivity. We've got 2 economic problems in this country, 1 is the balance of trade, and the other is productivity. We have increased production because the population is increasing; we have not increased unit productivity, which makes us uncompetitive. Nottingham has a really serious problem. The productivity in the city is one of the weakest of the core cities. So it is absolutely critical that this quantitative easing is put into longer term investment, but my worry is that will not happen, it will go as usual back into bank balances, and it will filter its way into the consumption economy, pushing up house prices. That is my worry.

But in the end, none of this adds up to a strategy, or even a coherent set of tactics. This country is at the moment economically rudderless. There is no one on the bridge and the waters are turbulent. So it is up to us as a city to do what we can in our leadership of this city, which is why I welcome the strategy we are developing for outer areas, which I've got a question on some of that later, but also the partnership we are forging with Derby through the Metro strategy. That has a coherent approach, which if we can get the government to be equally coherent, we can start dealing with some of the damage which has been roped by government policy and Brexit. Thank you.

Electric buses announcement

Councillor Anne Peach asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Business, Growth and Transport:

Would the Portfolio Holder please inform the chamber on how the recent announcement regarding electric buses in Nottingham will help improve the air quality of our City?

Councillor Nick McDonald replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and thank you Councillor Peach for your question. There are a number of UK cities that are under scrutiny in terms of their air quality, and rightly so, I think air quality is something that we should care about in urban areas, and we do in Nottingham. As Councillor Peach's question rightly highlights, actually our transport strategy in particular is entirely consistent with a desire to see air quality improve in the city, and some of the things that we're doing are things that I think will make a major difference. One of these is the introduction of larger numbers of electric buses in the city. Zero emission electric buses will soon be replacing the current diesel buses operating for the council tendered park and ride routes to the city centre, and a planned Eco-expressway will now give these vehicles priority on their journey into the city centre. These council-owned zero emission vehicles will contribute to the council ambitions to provide zero emission transport interchanges throughout the city, they will improve air quality, and they will also contribute to sustainability targets to

reduce CO2 emissions by 26%, to 2005 levels, by 2020. We will be replacing vehicles of Euro 3 and Euro 4 engine emission standards. It is therefore estimated that CO2 emissions will be reduced by 300 tonnes per annum when compared with the buses that are already operating these routes, whilst nitrogen oxide emission reductions will be in the order of 6 tonnes per annum. Levels of PM10: particles of 10 microns and below, and I won't pretend to know what that means, but I think we all know that it's something that we don't want to see in the air in the city, will reduce by 25 kilograms per annum.

So I think we should be proud of what we're doing in Nottingham, in terms of our sustainable transport strategy. We all talk about the tram and the way in which the city is being progressive and forward-thinking, not just in terms of creating mass public transport, but also in creating green transport. What we're doing with electric buses, is also something that I think is quite bold. We're ahead of other cities in the UK, and it's testament to the clarity of the strategy that we've had for many years in this city that we're making that kind of progress. Thank you.

Support for Nottingham towns

Councillor Corall Jenkins asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood Regeneration

Will the Portfolio Holder please tell us what the City Council is doing to support the towns in Nottingham such as Bulwell and Clifton?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Yes, thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Jenkins for her question. Clifton and Bulwell are to receive £1,000,000 from the City Council, to help make them better places to shop, work, and just to be. A budget of £500,000 per area has been set aside for the improvements. These include practical local ideas for improving shopping facilities, improving the outdoor markets, which are operated in both places by the council, and are key to both centres.

Plans for Clifton will complement improvements undertaken as part of the developing tram network, and will include better pavements in the shopping area, better street furniture, better signage, and better shop fronts. They also include investing in options for developing a range of shopping and leisure facilities in the area.

Unlike Clifton, which is a post-war development, Bulwell is a traditional market town. Bulwell has a distinctive identity, with buildings of character and architectural history. We are working with local representatives and businesses, and we aim to make the most of this heritage; there is strength in what Bulwell already has to offer. The funding will provide a boost to what is a very popular market as I've said, and the funding will also help improve pavements in Bulwell, landscaping, street furniture, and play equipment. In addition, the council will use some of the investment to regenerate Bulwell's nearby industrial sites and some of the outlying areas.

This funding, in the scheme of things, is small. Let's not exaggerate, £500,000 per area is not an enormous amount, but we are in hard times. However, the philosophy behind it is to use the money as an incentive for greater private sector investment, and to cash in on the benefits of the tram. For example, we are working on getting the New Crown Vauxhall garage site in Bulwell, which has been derelict for years, and there is now a potential developer in Lidl. In Clifton, we have been involved in the possible redevelopment of the Fairham House site, which we intend to go for retail and housing, to reinforce the retail offer of the area.

This initiative is also a way of recognising that although the city centre in Nottingham is important, so are our neighbourhoods. We will, for example, soon be announcing further, albeit modest, investment in other out-of-town city shopping areas, to build on some of the investment we've already made. So what we are doing in Clifton and Bulwell will be complemented in other areas, but in addition we have also announced allocation of £50,000 to Alfreton Road, again, this is pump priming in order to improve, and I fully expect the Councillors to use that money wisely, and they have promised they will do.

Finally, I would actually like to say something about Clifton in particular. I've always felt that Clifton is under-developed as a shopping area. When you go there, and you look at the potential of Clifton, and then you look at the quality of the shops, there's a dislocation and a dysfunction. Clifton should, looking at the demography, be having better shops than it has.

Moreover, there will be a new development of 3,000 houses in Rushcliffe, on the fringe of Clifton. We have an agreement with Rushcliffe Council to help capture some of the jobs from the development for Clifton residents, and that should increase the incomes and turnover, and that is a very good thing. But there is a risk to this development and the risk is this, that where it is located does not link directly to Clifton centre. The link is mainly through the A453, which bypasses that centre. And so from my point of view, there are 3 absolutely essential things for Clifton. First, we do upgrade the shopping offer, to make it attractive for people from that development to want to go to Clifton and not elsewhere. Second, we rather hope that we're not going to get a shopping development within those 3,000 homes. There will have to be some shops, but not major shops, and that is something that we're going to have to keep an eye on as a council. And thirdly, we really need to link the two up.

Now we have looked at the degree to which we can link this new development to the centre, and actually if you look at Clifton there's almost a wall of housing in between, so without destroying a large number of houses, you can't actually run a road through, and even then the cost of running that road would be rebarbative. So what we need to be doing is looking to see the degree to which we can encourage a further spur of the tram, and in the plans for the new development, there will be a corridor which will allow a new tram development. And I am looking at you Councillor McDonald, and I'm asking you to try and sort an extra spur of the tram out for Clifton, that is your duty, alright?

So these are our plans. We do have long term vision for the areas which are these town centres outside, in addition to our own city centre. Thank you.

Transitional grant arrangements

Councillor Toby Neal asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Would the Deputy Leader please comment on the seeming unfairness of the transitional grant arrangements in light of the Government refusing to answer his Freedom of Information request on how the £300 million came to be distributed?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Can I thank the Councillor for the question, particularly this Councillor, because he's got a history with this question. It is very complicated, so I will try to put it as clearly as possible. If you can just follow the first couple of sentences, I know you all fall asleep after that, but if you can just try to follow it for that long. For the 2016/17 settlement, almost, and I stress almost, every council received a cut. Every council received a cut. However, the councils which have received most cuts since 2011, once again had the highest cuts. However, those with the lowest cuts since 2011 received compensation. Those with the highest cuts protested, and received no compensation, those with the lowest cuts protested, and received compensation. That is how fair the system is!

The result was, that those councils which had received the lowest cuts, which have also received the lowest cuts since 2011, and even then had done better in the first place, got compensation, and those councils were overwhelmingly from better off areas, and overwhelmingly Conservative. Conversely, those receiving the highest cuts, which had also received the highest cuts since 2011, and even then though they'd done worse in the first place, got no compensation. So all the better off places got compensation, all the worse off places got no compensation. Needless to say, the ones that got no compensation were also Labour, so the ones that got compensation were mainly Tory, the ones that got no compensation were mainly Labour.

I'll read out the list of the winners: Surrey – one of the lowest cuts, Hampshire, Hertfordshire, Essex, West Sussex, Kent, Buckinghamshire, Oxfordshire, Leicestershire. Political control of those Councils? I'll go down the list: Conservative, Conservative, Conservative, Conservative, Conservative, Conservative, Conservative, no overall control but the biggest party is Conservative in Oxfordshire, and Leicestershire is Conservative.

So the ones with the biggest cuts: Sunderland, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Bolton, Rochdale, Birmingham, Durham, Kingston-on-Hull, Stoke-on-Trent, Northeast Lincolnshire – which is basically Grimsby, Blackpool. Labour, Labour, Labour, Labour, Labour, Labour, Labour, no overall control but Labour is the largest party, no overall control but Labour is the largest party, and Labour.

This is not abstract money. It actually affects people and services. There are implications per household. For example, Buckinghamshire households lost £8 per year. In Rutland the households gained £41 per year. Birmingham, they lost £98 per year. And in Nottingham? £71 – every one of our households lost £71 per year. On this basis, I put in a freedom of information request for the formula, and for the model. The first response was "there is a delay", and they said they needed to work out

whether the release of information was in the public interest. I then had to wait, and they eventually released the formula. Now the formula was an abstraction, because I'd also asked for the workings, but they refused to release the workings. So I put in a second request for the workings, and I also asked for any correspondence as to why they had refused, as I was interested to know whether Ministers had been involved in the refusal. The response I got was "it is not in the public interest to disclose this information at this time". Well I would ask at what time is it going to be appropriate?

The DCLG also stated that the public interest served by disclosure of the information would be minimal beyond a small number of interested parties. Given the number of households in areas which did not receive compensation, I think we are talking about 30,000,000 people. So this is a small number of interested parties, 30,000,000? Only the Chinese government could possibly make a claim that 30,000,000 people was a small interested party. So what I've done again, is I've appealed. I've appealed because I believe that this is a political fix, I believe that it is an overt abuse of the system, and it is not only Nottingham that has picked up on this, but so, fortunately, have the Audit Commission.

But I'll leave you with one point. Irrespective of the technicalities, irrespective of the lack of transparency and the apparent subterfuge, there is a moral obscenity about a system which has resulted in Nottingham citizens losing £71 per household, when Nottingham is currently the 8th poorest out of 152 councils, whereas Rutland, the 4th richest council in the country, has received an increase of £41 for every household. Not only that, but for the first time ever, households in Rutland are funded to a higher degree by the government than households in Nottingham. The subsidy to Rutland per household has overtaken the subsidy to Nottingham. Nottingham with all our problems, of the elderly, of child protection, of our roads that we've got to maintain, the influx of people coming in to work, all the costs of maintaining a major city, and we are getting less per household than Rutland. My view is that this is verging on the corrupt, and I'm going to pursue it, and I'm going to pursue it, and I'm going to pursue it, until I find out what was the justification for this allocation of funding. Thank you.

26 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES

The Leader submitted a report on decisions taken under urgency procedures, as set out on pages 21 to 24 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to note the urgent decisions (exempt from call-in) taken:

<u>Ref no</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2461	12/05/16	Procurement of Provider for Health and Employment Support Service	£147,000	The contract for the current service expires in August, hence the need to go out to tender as soon as possible to allow for TUPE arrangements and set up time.
2472	18/05/16	6 & 6A Knights Close	Exempt	The purchase of the property must complete by Thursday 19 May 2016.

<u>Ref no</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2486	20/05/16	Approval of procurement of electricity supply for Nottingham City Council	£24,000,000	To enable an immediate tender to be placed.
2490	02/06/16	Improvements to Ridge Adventure Playground	£300,000	Due to timeline for placing work order.
2492	06/06/16	Meals at Home food supply contract	£800,000	To meet tight timescales.

27 CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Leader submitted a report on changes to the constitution, as set out on pages 25 to 26 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to:

- 1) **approve the proposed changes to the membership and voting arrangements for the Health and Wellbeing Board as outlined in paragraph 5.2 of the report, subject to agreement by the Health and Wellbeing Board at its meeting on 27 July 2016, and the resulting changes to the Constitution;**
- 2) **approve the changes to Health Scrutiny terms of reference to reflect the new membership number of 10.**

28 APPOINTMENT OF HONORARY RECORDER

The Leader submitted a report on the appointment of the Honorary Recorder, as set out on pages 27 to 28 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to appoint His Honour Judge Dickinson QC as Honorary Recorder for the City of Nottingham under the powers in the Courts Act 1971, with the appointment starting from 8 August 2016.

29 THE CRIME AND DRUGS PARTNERSHIP PLAN 2015 TO 2020 (2016/17 REFRESH)

The Portfolio Holder for Community Services submitted a report on the Crime and Drugs Partnership Plan refresh, as set out on pages 29 to 42 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to approve the Partnership Plan 2015 to 2020 (2016/17 refresh), as set out in appendix 1 of the report.

30 MOTION

Moved by Councillor Nicola Heaton, seconded by Councillor Linda Woodings:

“This City Council is proud of the work it did to introduce a City Police Division in August 2003. Following the introduction of the City Police Division, crime in the City has fallen by half, anti-social behaviour has reduced and Nottingham people feel safer.

This City Council believes that the removal of the City Police Division, announced by the Chief Constable, following inadequate consultation with both partners and the public, will damage policing in Nottingham.

The City Council therefore calls for:

- the City Division to be reinstated based on the current city boundaries
- the appointment of a Divisional Commander
- the appointment of a Chief Constable committed to delivering these changes”

RESOLVED to carry the motion.

31 MOTION

Moved by Councillor Glyn Jenkins, seconded by Councillor Brian Grocock:

“This City Council believes that we all owe a debt to those who serve or have served in the Armed Forces.

It is concerned that local authorities, national government, charities and other service providers are not yet fully able to meet the needs of our Armed Forces community as accurate information about this group just isn't currently available. We don't actually know exactly how many veterans, reservists and dependents there are in the United Kingdom - let alone our local community - or what their needs might be.

The only way that comprehensive information of this kind could be achieved would be through the inclusion of questions about the Armed Forces community in the next national census. This Council therefore supports the Royal British Legion's call for the UK, Scottish and Northern Ireland governments to commit to this modest addition to the census.

The Office for National Statistics, National Records Scotland and the Northern Ireland Statistics and Research Agency have already begun consulting on the content of the next census. This council supports the inclusion of questions on the Armed Forces community as the next census is trialled and developed in the coming months and years.”

RESOLVED to carry the motion.

32 IN-YEAR MEMBERSHIP CHANGES

RESOLVED to note the following changes to Committee memberships:

Health Scrutiny Committee	Carole Jones and Patience Uloma Ifediora to be added as members
Joint Health Scrutiny Committee	Marcia Watson to be added as a member, Corall Jenkins to be removed as a member
Commissioning and Procurement Sub- Committee	Nick McDonald to be removed as a member
Corporate Parenting Board	Patience Uloma Ifediora to be added as a substitute member

Written questions to Council, 11 July 2016, appended to the minutes.

Greater devolution for Nottingham

Councillor Andrew Rule submitted the following written question to the Leader:

Could the Leader of the Council please provide an update on current discussions and the parties involved in those discussions in respect of greater devolution for Nottingham?

Councillor Jon Collins replied as follows:

There aren't any.

Families with young children leaving Nottingham

Councillor Jim Armstrong submitted the following written question to the Portfolio Holder for Early Intervention and Early Years:

Could the Portfolio Holder please explain why so many families with young children are moving out of Nottingham every year?

Councillor Mellen replied as follows:

Nottingham continues to see large increases of children coming into the city, mainly due to international migration and increasing birth rates, and so there is no net loss of children overall. Between 2014 and 2015 the number of 0 to 15s (inclusive) in the city increased by 1000 (and 4,600 people overall). This growth, however, is slightly off-set by a loss of Children to other parts of the UK, through internal migration. In 2015 the city saw 600 children (just over 1% of all children in the city) leave the city for other parts of the UK, a similar figure to 2014 (580). The 2014 data is split according to where internal migrants moved. There was a net loss of 660 children from Nottingham to the surrounding districts (Ashfield, Broxtowe, Gedling and Rushcliffe) and a small net gain of 80 children from other parts of the country.

It is difficult to say for sure why some families choose to leave the city for the surrounding areas but it is likely a reflection of the desire to own their own home or move to a larger house coupled with the ability to afford a more expensive property. The desire for a house with a garden is also a reason to leave some areas of the city where few houses have one. Affordability is also a factor as between 2009 and 2012 internal migration was much smaller and this was during the peak of the recession suggesting that people were less likely to move to bigger more expensive housing when there is uncertainty around jobs and the economy.

Finally, it is thought that the movement in Nottingham is fairly typical of a big city but Nottingham's tight boundary emphasises a standard migration to the suburbs, which would not be as noticeable in those Local Authorities that more closely match the local economic area.

This page is intentionally left blank