

Public Document Pack

Minutes of the meeting of the City Council

held at the Council House, Old Market Square

on 9 May 2022 from 2.00 pm - 4.45 pm

Attendances:

✓ Councillor Dave Trimble (Lord Mayor until Agenda Item 3)	
✓ Councillor Wendy Smith (Lord Mayor from Agenda Item 4)	
✓ Councillor Hassan Ahmed	✓ Councillor Pavlos Kotsonis
✓ Councillor Leslie Ayoola	✓ Councillor Rebecca Langton
✓ Councillor Cheryl Barnard	✓ Councillor Jane Lakey
✓ Councillor Steve Battlemuch	Councillor Dave Liversidge
✓ Councillor Merlita Bryan	✓ Councillor Sally Longford
✓ Councillor Eunice Campbell-Clark	✓ Councillor AJ Matsiko
Councillor Graham Chapman	✓ Councillor Carole McCulloch
Councillor Azad Choudhry	✓ Councillor David Mellen
✓ Councillor Kevin Clarke	✓ Councillor Sajid Mohammed
✓ Councillor Audrey Dinnall	Councillor Salma Mumtaz
✓ Councillor Michael Edwards	✓ Councillor Toby Neal
✓ Councillor Samuel Gardiner	✓ Councillor Nayab Patel
✓ Councillor Jay Hayes	✓ Councillor Anne Peach
✓ Councillor Rosemary Healy	✓ Councillor Georgia Power
✓ Councillor Nicola Heaton	✓ Councillor Shuguftah Quddoos
✓ Councillor Patience Uloma Ifediora	✓ Councillor Ethan Radford
✓ Councillor Phil Jackson	✓ Councillor Nick Raine
✓ Councillor Corall Jenkins	✓ Councillor Angharad Roberts
✓ Councillor Maria Joannou	✓ Councillor Andrew Rule
✓ Councillor Sue Johnson	Councillor Mohammed Saghir
✓ Councillor Kirsty Jones	✓ Councillor Roger Steel
✓ Councillor Angela Kandola	✓ Councillor Maria Watson
✓ Councillor Jawaid Khalil	Councillor Sam Webster
✓ Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan	✓ Councillor Adele Williams
✓ Councillor Neghat Khan	✓ Councillor Linda Woodings
✓ Councillor Zafran Nawaz Khan	Councillor Cate Woodward
	Councillor Audra Wynter

✓ Indicates present at meeting

1 Apologies for absence

Councillor Graham Chapman – leave
Councillor Azad Choudhry - personal
Councillor Dave Liversidge – personal
Councillor Salma Mumtaz – personal
Councillor Mohammed Saghir – unwell
Councillor Sam Webster – leave

Councillor Cate Woodward – personal
Councillor Audra Wynter - leave

2 Declarations of Interests

None

3 To elect a Lord Mayor and appoint a Sheriff

Resolved to:

- (1) elect Councillor Wendy Smith as the Lord Mayor until the next annual meeting of Council, as nominated by Councillor Rebecca Langton and seconded by Councillor David Mellen; and**
- (2) appoint Councillor Nicola Heaton as the Sheriff until the next annual meeting of Council, as nominated by Councillor Michael Edwards and seconded by Councillor Linda Woodings.**

4 To note the appointment of the Lord Mayor's Chaplain

The appointment of Rev. Peter Shaw as the Lord Mayor's Chaplain for 2022/23 was noted.

5 Questions from citizens

Emergency Planning

BC asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Energy, Environment and Waste Services:

The threat of a nuclear war is greater than ever because of the Russian invasion of Ukraine and potential for NATO countries, including the UK to become involved. President Putin has threatened to use nuclear weapons in which case NATO would almost certainly strike back. Weapons much more powerful than those used in Hiroshima and Nagasaki would be involved resulting in immediate death, injury and destruction of buildings including hospitals. The after-effects include radiation poisoning, burns and cancers. Public services like water, power and sewerage would be destroyed and transport impossible. What emergency plans does Nottingham City Council have in preparation for a nuclear warhead explosion in the vicinity of Nottingham?

Councillor Sally Longford replied as follows:

Can I thank the citizen for this timely question and say that I do share their concerns about heightened tensions in the world, we are in troubled times. I've been responsible for emergency planning for last three years and can tell you that Nottingham City Council has responsibility to prepare for civil emergencies, not those related to war or nuclear attack. The Council takes its responsibilities for dealing with civil emergencies seriously and has a team that works with partners to write, train and exercise plans to cover those civil emergencies contained in the National Risk Register. As citizens would expect, they have been working very closely with a variety of agencies in recent years to help to keep people safe during the pandemic. I'd like to pay tribute to their hard work and dedication over this period of time. Whilst

the National Risk Register includes references to chemical, biological, radiological and nuclear incidents, an attack on Nottingham by nuclear weapons is outside of the scope of the Risk Register and of the civil contingency duties on the Council. The Council has not been asked, or is required to have plans for such an incident. The plans we have are based the likely level of risk and impact. The Government could take powers under Part 2 of the Civil Contingencies Act 2004 which would allow it to make special temporary legislation to deal with the most serious of emergencies. If 'Part 2' powers were implemented, Government would appoint a Regional Coordinator who would act as the focal point for co-ordination of response efforts. The Council, through the Local Resilience Forum, has many generic and specific plans, which would be used to address any response to the human and environmental issues caused by exposure to nuclear material but does not have plans for a nuclear strike on Nottingham. Central Government is responsible for such planning, rather than local authorities, and can I suggest that the citizen puts his/ her question to their local MP who will be able to seek answers from the Government. Thank you.

Libraries

DC asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture and Schools:

Following the recent announcement to consult on the closure of three historic community branch libraries, I, as a Nottingham citizen and member of the Save Nottingham Libraries campaign, am asking for additional information and transparency regarding the decision making stage including:

- What are the next steps in the decision-making process?
- What are the approximate timescales involved for each stage in the process.
- Specifically, how long is the data analysis of the 2000+ survey responses going to take?
- Do the slight amendments to the original consultation survey influence the data results?
- In the spirit of transparency, will the Council publish a full report and Executive Summary outlining the total number of survey returns received during the consultation period, highlighting the main option preferences favoured by respondents?
- How will the final decision regarding the library review be made and publicised?

Councillor Eunice Campbell-Clark replied as follows:

Many thanks Lord Mayor. Could I thank the citizen for their question, which is quite detailed so I will go through each of the points. I have broken the information down under headings as some points being raised appear to be sub-questions under the same theme.

Theme 1: What are the next steps and timescales in the decision-making process? We have received in total 2,807 completed individual consultation submissions which included 396 responses to the adapted easy to read version survey introduced (13% of the total) and 132 completed school children submissions which equates to 4.5% of the total. In addition, 220 people took part in our on-line and in-person public

consultation sessions, where key points and raised issues were also captured for consultation. In terms of the next steps we are now going through all the responses received to ensure we have a clear understanding of the numerous points being raised. This is expected to take six weeks with the aim being that a report and the detail of the consultation will be produced and where alternative proposals have been made, that these can be initially explored. It is proposed that we will submit this completed report to the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committee to review. Following that review and any considerations that might arise from the process, an Executive Board report will be produced that will make recommendations for the final decision. This is not expected to take place until the autumn.

Theme 2: Do the slight amendments to the original consultation survey influence the data results?

You will see I have given the percentage of the results received via the amended surveys. Those surveys were introduced as a response to a few concerns that were raised about the accessibility of the main consultation form. I believe that being as responsive as we were was positive, and the amended forms have helped increase engagement and capture wider views, without detracting from the findings of the original main consultation survey.

Theme 3: In the spirit of transparency, will the Council publish a full report and Executive Summary outlining the total number of survey returns received during the consultation period, highlighting the main option preferences favoured by the respondents?

Yes. Throughout the process we have been very transparent. All reports and even transcripts from public meetings held have been published on the Council's website ensuring that people can read what has been said. This process will continue.

Theme 4: How will the final decision regarding the library review be made and publicised?

As stated earlier, there will be two key points where reports will be taken to public committees for councillors to scrutinise and finally agree a set of recommendations around future library delivery. Overview and Scrutiny Committee will firstly look at the consultation process, the results and the validity of options that emerge from the consultation. This will then be followed by a report to the Executive Board which will seek to finally agree recommendations for the future delivery network and transformation for the library service.

Libraries

DC asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Leisure, Culture and Schools:

The Government, via the 'Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities' has recently announced that it is opening the bidding process for the next round of its Levelling Up funding, which is being made available to all Local Authorities across England. The £4.8 billion fund will support town centre and high street regeneration, local transport projects, and most importantly here, cultural and heritage assets. The government prospectus states the following in relation to the cultural investment strand: "maintaining, regenerating, or creatively repurposing existing cultural, creative, heritage and sporting assets ... including theatres, museums, galleries, production facilities, libraries, visitor attractions ... heritage buildings and sites, and assets that support the visitor economy." I, as a Nottingham Citizen and member of

the Save Nottingham Libraries campaign, would ask whether Nottingham City Council could provide a rationale for why it would or would not make a bid for these funds to help save the three historic branch libraries currently earmarked for closure.

Councillor Eunice Campbell-Clark replied as follows:

Thank you again Lord Mayor. The Levelling Up Fund is designed to invest in infrastructure that improves everyday life across the UK. The £4.8 billion fund will support town centres and high street regeneration, local transport projects, and cultural and heritage assets. In Nottingham City we are eligible to submit up to three bids up to £20 million each, but these must be spread equally across parliamentary constituencies (MP support is required) and bids have to meet local strategic priorities. Bids submitted will be rigorously assessed on characteristics of place, strategic fit, economic benefit, and deliverability. Investment proposals submitted must focus on supporting high priority and high impact schemes. This funding is not available to support ongoing 'day to day running costs', such as libraries, but is designed for one off capital development schemes that will help bring longer term economic regeneration benefits for local areas.

This is the second round of Levelling Up funding offered. In the first round Nottingham City submitted three bids and was only successful with one of those - £18million towards improvements to our streets and roads. We are currently developing options, building on the lessons learnt from our first round of submissions to determine our bidding strategy for the second round of Levelling Up funding. It is important that the City secures future funding and chooses appropriately scaled and deliverable projects that can meet all the objectives laid out from the strands of funding. We are currently developing options for which schemes will make the strongest case to Government for this funding.

Nottingham City Homes

JK asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Planning and Heritage:

How does the Council police its agents Nottingham City Homes with regard to the health and safety of residents? In one building alone containing 14 flats Nottingham City Homes failed to respond to several incidents which could impact the health and safety of residents in a timely manner. An example is detailed below, there are others, all of which are factually accurate, residents have documentary and pictorial evidence. Nottingham City Homes have issued a charter to all residents stating "Safety is our top priority" and they will "Prioritise any contact that may have a building safety implication". It appears that Nottingham City Homes put safety of the residents a very poor second to its propaganda.

The example is: Dangerously damaged manhole covers in a common access area in constant use – It was not prioritised and not deal with for over 3 months.

You as the Landlord maybe held liable if a resident or visitor was injured.

Councillor Linda Woodings replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. I also want to thank the citizen for their question in relation to repairs at a specific apartment block. Nottingham City Homes (NCH) is the management agent for the Council's housing stock and, as such, responsibility for management and maintenance is delegated to Nottingham City Homes to deal with. One of the repairs referred to by the citizen was escalated to me and I sought an urgent report on that repair. However complaints of this nature would, in the first

instance, usually be referred to Nottingham City Homes and dealt with via their complaints procedures.

As a more general response, the Council engages with NCH's performance in a number of ways. Within NCH the ALMO Board is tenant led, but also has two councillor appointees on the Board as well. A major part of this Board's role is to monitor the services received by tenants, including repairs performance. It receives reports on general repairs performance, complaints handling, emergency repairs, on the gas and electricity check and compliance, on fire safety checks and management. Performance is benchmarked against the Housemark industry standard. Repairs satisfaction has dipped due to significant staffing and supply issues caused by Covid, however NCH still benchmarks in the upper median compared to other housing organisations.

Within the Council there is a joint Building Safety Group between Nottingham City Council and Nottingham City Homes officers which looks at policy and risk in relation to building safety matters and also logs serious incidents such as fires and their investigations. NCH's performance in general, including in relation to repairs, complaints and safety, is monitored by a range of performance indicators that are reported to the Partnership Forum, which I currently Chair but as from tomorrow my colleague Councillor Toby Neal will Chair. Any incidents or particular concerns can be raised by the Council for a response from NCH through any of these channels. NCH is pro-active in relation to building safety and has been working for a considerable period of time on preparation for the additional responsibilities of the Social Housing Bill.

This is a shortened version of the question originally submitted which raised four specific repairs and I asked for reports on each and every one of these. For context, at the time the manhole covers in the courtyard were reported in February 2021 there was a nationwide Covid lockdown, schools were still closed, infection rates were very high, and councils, including our ALMO, had significant numbers of staff isolating or actually off with Covid and the vaccine had only just been made available to those aged 70 and over. So NCH prioritised emergency appointments with the staff that they had available. Another repair in July 2021 regarding a fire door was checked to ensure safety the day after it was reported but not repaired until 14 days later. The door was boarded up within 24 hours, the glass was ordered immediately and fitted as soon as it became available, but at that time in July 2021 glass was not as readily available and lead-in times were slightly longer due to Covid-19. A different repair to a fire door was escalated to me 2 months ago, March 2022. It was checked the same day as it was reported and it was deemed not to compromise the fire safety of that door. The glass was ordered immediately the following day and fitted as soon as received 27 days later. Another repair referenced in November 2021 was repaired the day after it was reported. Health and safety issues which pose an immediate risk are treated as emergency works, whereby Nottingham City Homes aims to attend within 4 hours and make safe within 24 hours. If it is deemed that by making safe the repair there is no immediate risk to tenants, residents, visitors and the general public a full repair will normally be undertaken within 30 days. With regards to fire doors generally, where glass is cracked it poses little or no impact on the integrity of the fire door, nevertheless, as a first port of call where it is established that replacement glass is required, measurements are taken and the replacement glass is ordered from the supplier within 24 hours of the first attendance and, depending on the glass

and the supplier, the process is to fit the glass as soon as it becomes available which is usually, in normal times, within 5 to 10 working days. Where glass is broken the same process applies, however the door is boarded up whilst the glass is manufactured.

Thank you.

6 Petitions from councillors on behalf of citizens

Councillor Jay Hayes presented a petition on behalf of residents living on Beckhampton Road about problems with parking, especially during school times. The residents in the area have collectively agreed to meet the costs of creating shared access to enable their vehicles to be parked directly outside their properties and were asking the Council to confirm that it is happy for them to appoint and pay a separate contractor and outline in detail stages of legal elements of the process.

7 To confirm the Minutes of the last meeting of Council held on 7 March 2022

The minutes of the meeting held on 7 March 2022 were confirmed as an accurate 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:

We look forward as a City to celebrating and marking the Queen's Platinum Jubilee this June. The City and its partners are planning a number of special events and installations to mark this unique and special occasion, which will include:

- four of our neighbourhoods staging community-led beacon lighting events
- the opportunity to reminisce and discover the times over the past 70 years that the Queen has visited our City
- enabling our residents to shut neighbourhood streets for street parties and make use of our parks and public open spaces for Jubilee events
- enhanced city centre dressing and floral displays to ensure that the City looks its best; and
- a number of other events and festivals happening around the City, with the chance for residents and visitors to enjoy and celebrate the City in style over the 4-day bank holiday weekend.

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

Libraries

Councillor Kevin Clarke asked the following question of the Leader of the Council:

Will the Leader of the Council join me in congratulating the “Save the Libraries” campaign who, over the past few months, have worked tirelessly to bring to attention the necessity of retaining Nottingham’s local libraries?

Councillor David Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. Can I thank Councillor Clarke for his question. I would be happy to pay tribute to those involved in the “Save the Libraries” campaign as well as to thank all those who expressed their view on the proposals put forward by the Council as part of our consultation, brought about by the necessary duty to balance our Council budgets. Their efforts helped contribute towards achieving one of the largest consultation responses the Council has received to date on proposals for the transformation of our City’s library service and, in particular, discussion around three potential library closures. This work complemented the work that the Library Service undertook in partnership with the Research, Engagement and Consultation Team to ensure we received a wide range of engagement from our citizens and key stakeholders. This work included:

- creating a dedicated web page on the library for the consultation, that saw over 5,500 visits;
- undertaking Facebook and Twitter posts about the consultation, which had a reach of 18,709 people;
- including the consultation in the Libraries ‘Stay Connected News’ emails, that went to over 28,000 subscribers;
- writing to all schools in the City and holding discussion with youth groups;
- leaflet drops in local areas where library closures are being proposed; and
- printing out and having papers copies of the survey and background documents at every library.

The consultation on the proposals for the libraries closed on 24 April. We received, as Councillor Campbell-Clark has already reported to Council, 2,887 individual submissions, plus responses from five public engagement sessions that saw 220 attend, plus a number of letters from key stakeholders such as Arts Council England, National Save Libraries Campaign and others. We are now carefully looking at the responses received, and analysing proposals made, prior to bringing a report back to Council later this year before any final decision around changes or closure of any sites will be made. It is important when we are looking to make key strategic decisions that we do listen and hear a wide range of views and opinions. This type of engagement is essential for the City and helps us all make better decisions on what is important and prioritise the way we use our public funds and resources to deliver the services that the city needs. Thank you.

Fly-tipping

Councillor Maria Watson asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Highways, Transport and Cleansing Services:

With the introduction of the charge for bulky waste having come into effect at the end of April, we are aware of the fears within the City of a knock-on impact on fly-tipping. Can the Portfolio Holder provide any information about the number of reports of fly-tipping since the charge was introduced and whether the Council is prepared to commit increased resources to combat fly-tipping if these numbers increase?

In Councillor Healy’s absence, Councillor Sally Longford replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and thank you Councillor Watson for your question. I was responsible as part of my Portfolio duties covering waste for bring forward the plan under the budget to introduce a £20 charge for up to 6 items of bulky waste. As I have said on numerous occasions, charging for bulky waste is the norm across most of the country and we have reluctantly introduced a charge due to the Conservative Government's huge level of cuts to our annual budget. However, residents in receipt of Council Tax Support will continue to be eligible for one free bulky waste collection per year, which will hopefully help to alleviate some of the problems. Data across the country shows no apparent pattern between levels of fly tipping and charges for bulky waste and we believe that our citizens will continue to do their best to keep their neighbourhood looking clean and tidy and try to manage their waste responsibly. Indeed, we know that many of our citizens care passionately about tackling mess on their street because our Clean Champions now number 6,000 amazing volunteers. The changes were introduced on 25 April so it is too early to assess the full impact of their introduction. However, officers have benchmarked the City's fly tipping from the start of this paid service compared to previous years and will be reporting to me regularly from now on. We have been through unusual times, when household waste statistics fluctuated greatly during the pandemic, so comparisons are quite difficult. In the week commencing 25 April compared to last year I can tell you there was a remarkable 30% reduction in reported fly tipping in Nottingham. It is not statistically valid to compare the data between this year and two years before in 2020 because we were in lockdown, so if we go back to compare the week commencing 25 April with the same time in 2019, i.e. before the pandemic which is probably the most valid comparison, it's interesting to note that there was a 2% increase in reported fly tips. Officers meet regularly to review the fly tipping data and will reallocate capacity within the city where this is required. I will be monitoring both the number of bulky waste collections and the fly tipping data to ensure that we do not suffer increased problems on our streets. I have also asked to be updated on the data by ward and neighbourhood so that we can identify emerging issues at an early stage. I am glad to report that since the introduction of the paid service the bulky waste provision continues to be very popular with residents who are now paying for this service. When people are booking bulky waste collections, we are also encouraging alternative options for people to use including free collections by charities such as the British Heart Foundation and Haven Housing Trust, as well as suggesting Freecycle which is a really good place to pass on useable items to other people for reuse. When I was clearing my mother's home some years ago there were a lot of items which I certainly didn't want or need but when I put them on Freecycle there were lots of takers and it is a very efficient way of passing on stuff to people who want it and this is obviously important from a carbon reduction point of view because it is less waste and more of a circular economy. I'd like, finally, to take the chance to thank all the Clean Champions in the city who do a fantastic job picking up waste, sometimes in groups, sometimes individually, and make a huge contribution to keeping our streets tidy, and I hope that we can continue to build on that relationship and that partnership with them in the next few years. Thank you.

Victoria Market

Councillor Kirsty Jones asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Skills, Growth and Economic Development:

I'm sure I speak for many here when I say how sad I feel reading the recent reports of the Council weighing up the decision to exit from the lease for the Victoria Market.

Can the Portfolio Holder inform us what plans are being put in place so, were the Victoria Market to close, the traders would not be left out of pocket and alternative trading sites could be provided for them?

As Councillor Rebecca Langton was on maternity leave, Councillor Linda Woodings had been leading on this area of work and replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and thank you Councillor Jones for your question. As you see I have been covering some of the duties of our colleague on maternity leave. The consultation on Victoria Market is still ongoing at the moment and so any representation received during that consultation will be given material consideration by the Council in coming to a final decision. As you are aware that consultation commenced on Monday 25 April. We circulated a briefing to all councillors, including yourselves, at the launch of that consultation explaining that the Council leases the market space in the Victoria Centre but has had to provide a significant annual subsidy to keep it afloat since the service charge was increased in 2015 by the former owners INTU. The Conservative Government's programme of austerity over the last ten years has meant that Nottingham City has lost £100million per year in government grant, and the subsidy we pay, which is just shy of £500,000 per year, is no longer a viable option for this Council. As you say, it's very sad because the Victoria Market has been operating from that site since 1971 and, as reported previously to this Council, despite our investment in recent years it hasn't been performing well and it is now less than half occupied. The service charges were increased to the same level as other retail units in the Victoria Centre and that has created this financial difficulty. To add to this the market was badly affected, as was the whole of the retail sector, by the Covid pandemic and the loss of footfall generally despite the support provided to traders both from the Council and from Government grants as well.

Any proposed change to the current arrangement does require the cooperation of traders, in addition to the owners of the shopping centre which is now a company called Global Mutual who are an asset management company. Any final decision on the future of the market is, as I say, subject to consideration of all of the views and options that might be put forward as part of the six week consultation process. So if a decision is made at the end to exit from that operation the Council will offer traders a fair financial compensation package. We'll provide them support to identify alternative vacant units in the city, or we'll provide them support to wind up their businesses early if, *if*, that is their preferred option. We are very conscious that this is these people's livelihoods and we understand all change is extremely difficult in these circumstances because indoor markets are a very different type of operation to outdoor markets, so we need to put traders at the heart of this decision we are making. Thank you.

Financial management

Councillor Kevin Clarke asked the following question of the Leader of the Council: Does the Leader of the Council agree with the Nottingham Post that intervention is necessary to prevent more of the extraordinary financial mismanagement from this authority and that, in light of yet further revelations of unlawfully spent money, historical Portfolio Holders should be offering their resignation?

Councillor David Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Clarke for his question. Let me make it clear to this Council that we, as Nottingham City Council, are already subject

to the intervention of a Government appointed Improvement and Assurance Board. A Board which challenges us, which holds us to account and which regularly reports to Government on our journey of improvement. That is in the public arena and people can read those reports. It is disappointing that the local paper does not recognise this. It's also disappointing that, while sister papers in the north regularly fight for their cities to receive a fair share of resources, the Nottingham Post seems to delight in talking down our great city. The money that has been identified in recent reports as being misallocated has been spent on things that are of value to our citizens, things like street lighting and cleaning the public realm, which benefits everyone. However, the ring-fence of the Housing Revenue Account means that this money can only be spent on Nottingham City Homes tenants and the properties in which they live. We've taken action to ensure that in the future the money generated from Council house rents is properly segregated from other Council funds once more and is only used for the benefit of Council tenants. We will put a stop to historical practices, which resulted in some of these funds being allocated to non-council housing spending. We commissioned these recent reports. We identified the misallocated funds and we will repay the Housing Revenue Account so that these funds can be used on the homes occupied by our tenants.

Since 2019, the Council has been determined to tackle difficulties, to improve governance and culture and to do this in a transparent way to the public. It is because of the changes that we have made that these issues are being brought to light and being put right. Repeatedly, we have taken decisive action to sort these issues out and, following a recent CIPFA review, we acted to begin the process of bringing Nottingham City Homes back under direct control of the Council. As a Labour-led administration, it has been our mission to bring about the needed change to the organisation, strengthening the Council with a new leadership team, setting recently a balanced four year budget and reducing the Council's debt levels by almost £250million. Rooting out bad practice and bringing out into the public domain historical issues doesn't always lead to positive news headlines, I understand that. However, we are determined to do what is needed and to do what is right. Despite our challenges, the ambition of Nottingham Labour for our great city remains undimmed. We have agreed ambitious plans to deliver over £600million worth of capital projects, including over £200 million on building hundreds of new Council houses that the Nottingham people desperately need. We'll keep fighting for Nottingham, for services commissioned and delivered here, for democratic oversight and for local accountability. Even if the Post has doesn't always stand up for Nottingham, we always will.

Health and Wellbeing Strategy

Councillor Angela Kandola asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health:

What impact will the Health and Wellbeing Strategy for Nottingham have in improving the health and wellbeing and reducing health inequalities in Nottingham?

Councillor Adele Williams replied as follows:

Thanks Councillor Kandola for your question. As Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health and Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, I was really pleased that the Board approved the new Joint Strategy for Health and Wellbeing in Nottingham at its March meeting. The Strategy sets out its vision and the approach and the priorities for action over the next three years to improve health and wellbeing and reduce health inequalities across the City. We know that health of people in Nottingham is

generally worse than the England average at present and this can be plainly seen when you look at life expectancy in our city. A female baby born in Nottingham today has a healthy life expectancy on average of 55.6 years, which is the 2nd lowest of any local authority area in England. This means that they are likely to live approximately one third of their life in poor health or disability. We also know that health inequalities exist within Nottingham. There are avoidable and unfair differences in health and wellbeing between different groups, and this Strategy sets out a clear intention to improve outcomes for people experiencing the worst health outcomes faster, to try and close this gap and this means sometimes we will have to do things very differently. Different things for different people and in different areas and in different circumstances, because equality isn't just opening a door and saying anyone can come in. Equality is doing things differently to make sure that people are able to have the best outcomes regardless of their circumstances, regardless of where they are from and this Council is absolutely committed to that.

The Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy has been developed with the intention of making a real and tangible impact on these outcomes. In order to make the change that we really need in the city it has been necessary to just hone it down to a small group of priorities. All of the normal work will continue, but we will focus very hard on those four lead priorities. Looking at the available data, our local and national strategic priorities and, really critically, the views of our community representatives, they represent the areas where we think that with renewed collaborative efforts, we can make the biggest positive difference. They are:

- 1) Smoking and tobacco control - we know that smoking is the single largest cause of preventable death and disease in the city and obviously a key driver of health inequalities. It links as well into priority four, which I will come to.
- 2) Eating and moving for good health – recognising how broad and how complex the contributing factors are to that and again, this links to priority four.
- 3) Severe multiple deprivation - looking at how we can work together as a health and care system to get much better outcomes and experiences for people who are experiencing a combination of challenges, such as homelessness, substance abuse and mental health issues.

And the fourth one, which is not just the elephant in the room, it is the room. When you talk about health and wellbeing to people if they are hard up, if they can't fill their cupboards, if they can't fill their tank with petrol to get to get to work, it is so difficult for them to make progress. As a Council we have been conscious of that and the approach of Nottingham Labour is to recognise the struggles that people have because we live in our communities, we work with our communities and we understand how things are in reality not on paper. So it is absolutely critical that we use all of our partnerships to move this one forward. That's thinking about the Nottingham pound - we've got a great record in Nottingham City on procuring locally, but we will spread that with our partners. We will look at ways we can support our small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) in order to make sure that they can employ local people, thinking of things like job carving. We've got levels of unemployment partly because people are struggling to access those jobs, because of the way those jobs are set up. What can we do as a system to think about the way that people advertise their jobs and frame their jobs; and make sure that everything we do, every pound we spend in the city works hard for Nottingham. These are big challenges and I was really keen that we had this as a plank in the Strategy because

I think it is so foundational. When we took it round to talk to community groups and the third sector, it really resonated with people because it just represents the reality that people live in. So it is going to be quite a job of work to get this one motoring but we are absolutely committed to it with our sustained and collective efforts. No one bit of the system can deliver this alone and in recognition of this, the Strategy will be delivered through the Nottingham City Place-Based Partnership, which brings together all of the core providers and links in with the voluntary sector as well. This needs to be a team effort. And as I say, a big part of the team will be people out there, it will be our communities, because what we've got here, are a set of priorities and the actual delivery of this will need to be shaped with our communities. We are all experts in our own lives, we are all experts in how things feel where we are, so we need to get that and make the change situated in that understanding that comes from people with lived experience themselves.

So I will be working very hard, still as Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board and in partnership with people across the system, to ensure that those conversations are real and that we act on them. I'm really excited about the new Strategy, really excited to hear everyone's thoughts, and particularly doing that engagement with communities. I would encourage everyone to take a look at it, which you can find at www.healthynottingham.co.uk. There will be lots of opportunities for people to feed in the way that this is delivered and obviously you, as councillors, have all got lots of views on that and understanding of how things are for people. In answer to your question directly, I think we will see a difference and the reason for that will be that it's really grounded in the reality of people's lives and I think we are all committed to making sure that continues as we develop our plans. Thank you for the question.

Adult Social Care Funding

Councillor Nick Raine asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health:

Research carried out by the Institute for Fiscal Studies has found that the changes to the way care is to be funded from October 2023 will leave little protection against catastrophic care costs. What impact will this have on people in Nottingham?

Councillor Adele Williams replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and thank you for your question Councillor Raine. It is a really interesting one and worth caveating with its relatively new so we don't yet fully understand statistically the impact on Nottingham, however we understand it broadly and I am afraid it is the same old story. In September 2021, 10 years after the Dilnot Commission recommended a cap on care costs, the Government finally announced with a great hurrah that it would implement a cap from October 2023. However, just two months later the Government proposed to amend the Care Act so that an individual reached the social care cost cap when the amount they spent themselves, only themselves, reached £86,000. This would stop any care that has been funded through the means test counting towards the cap. I would argue that this was made with some sleight of hand, because it was introduced giving MPs just five days to scrutinise and challenge the proposals ahead of a vote with no impact assessment published at the time. The Government, of course, claim that this change is fair because it means that everyone pays the same amount from their own pocket. The Kings Fund says that this is not a definition of fairness that many people would recognise. Then I thought, actually I do recognise that, because it sounds a bit like the Poll Tax, doesn't it - we all pay the same no matter how much you've got in your pocket. I think it is interesting, that it's an echo from the past. In Nottingham we know

what fairness looks like to this Government: look at the Towns Fund and the Community Renewal Fund - £3.6billion granted with no published criteria for selection, in which the Ministers took a really close interest and remarkably, out of the 45 towns that got funding 40 have got Tory MPs. Cheadle just north of Manchester fulfils nobody's idea of deprivation, but was on the list so I am sure the people of Cheadle are really pleased, as is the local Tory MP who won the seat with a majority of just over 2,000. Richmondshire in North Yorkshire is the 256th most deprived local authority and got money through the grant; yet Hull, the 4th most deprived place in the country, did not. So of course, it is just a coincidence that Richmondshire happens to be Chancellor Rishi Sunak's constituency. So this is what fairness looks like, same old story.

Analysis from the Institute of Fiscal Studies, that Councillor Raine refers to, shows that people with the same level of need for care, but different levels of wealth, will reach the cap at different points. So one example – a really wealthy person will reach the cap after three years and four months, but someone with less wealth will take almost twice as long to do so, almost double the need for care before getting the same financial support as the wealthy person. So, for many people the latest proposals are considerably less generous than the Care Act would have been, as many people could face losing more than 70% of their assets to pay for care. Those people are not getting any protection from the catastrophic costs and still face the prospect of losing almost everything including the value of their home to pay for care. Just last week the Alzheimers Society said that the Government has squandered a huge opportunity to protect the poorest from paying catastrophic fees for their care, and just 1 in 5 people living with dementia will reach the cap. This will save money, but we know where the savings are coming from. They are coming from up here. In reality, the savings come from poorer, older people living in the North East, Yorkshire Humber and the Midlands, and working aged adults who will now be required to pay more than they would have done than under the original proposals that were floated back then. All of our surrounding Conservative MPs voted for this I think, presumably without knowing, or bothering to find out about the impact it would have on their constituents. The Lords made an amendment that was really positive but unfortunately the local Conservative MPs did nothing to defend their local constituents from these catastrophic care costs. In 2019, the Government made a cast iron guarantee, that no one needing care would have to sell their home to pay for it. However, we know that promises from this Government are worthless. The change they proposed to their original plans just a couple of months later will lead to catastrophic care costs actually landing up here, and yet another Tory attack on those who can't afford it and significantly reducing the benefits to working age adults. My personal view is that if we could build the NHS out of the rubble of the Second World War and spectacular national levels of debt, then we can, to use Boris' phrase, take 'a moon shot' at supporting people to live in dignity as a society rather than it landing catastrophically landing on family. Come on, can't we do that? Thank you Lord Mayor.

Police Resourcing

Councillor Michael Edwards asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods, Safety and Inclusion:

In the run up to the Police and Crime Commissioner elections last year, Caroline Henry pledged to divert resources away from the City to areas around the county.

Can the Portfolio Holder comment on what impact this is now having in Nottingham?

Councillor Neghat Khan replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Edwards for his question. This month marks a year since Caroline Henry was elected to the post of Police and Crime Commissioner, having signalled her intent on redistributing resources away from the Nottingham and the City. She said, and I quote: “for years, our forgotten Nottinghamshire towns have been let down when it comes to policing decisions. While crime rises and drugs spiral out of control, money continues to pour in to Nottingham.” I am not sure on what metric the Commissioner is working to, but money pouring into Nottingham are not words often used when referring to funding and the Conservatives. History has shown us the opposite, with the Government’s continued politically driven agenda of austerity right across the Midlands, so you can imagine our apprehension when Commissioner Henry took office. Then again, the Commissioner also pledged to crack down on speeding offences, and take a zero tolerance approach to crime prevention. Perhaps she will need reminding of that now in the light of her inability to stick to her words.

Over the past couple of years, Covid has swept across the world and brought with it unprecedented challenges, both in terms of the health impacts of the virus, but also the social economic consequences required to contain it, some of which will last for many years. Despite these new challenges, partners across the City are committed to delivering successful outcomes for citizens in Nottingham. We are extremely proud that people of different backgrounds get on so well together in Nottingham and this is something we should all be proud of. We see first-hand the importance of our neighbourhoods, their cultural identities and the people who live and work within them.

Nottingham has achieved great success over the past decade in reducing crime, antisocial behaviour and the issues that underline them, such as the misuse of drugs and alcohol. Tackling long-term issues for the City saw crime fall by more than half between 2006 and 2015. Volumes of crime and acquisitive crime have risen again after a long period of decline while the nature of drug use and supply has seen profound changes, particularly with the increase of use of psychoactive substances. Coordinated and proactive partnership working is the best way to deliver successful outcomes for citizens to ensure Nottingham is as safe, clean and healthy as it can be. It is clear that challenges remain across the City, and it is my firm belief that real and sustainable improvements for citizens can only be made by addressing problems locally and by tackling the root causes of crime and antisocial behaviour. The Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner has historically invested funds into City Council commissioned domestic abuse and criminal justice substance misuse services. This funding has been maintained for 2022/23 and as of yet there are no indications that this will be reduced in the coming years. Likewise, the commitment to projects in the City commissioned in whole or in part by the Violence Reduction Unit remains unchanged. This is welcome and a much needed resource that makes significant impact right across Nottingham. Notwithstanding that, there have been changes to the support provided to the multiagency organisation that’s function it is to reduce crime in Nottingham. The Crime and Drug Partnership has had vital elements of its funding reviewed and withdrawn, particularly around the commissioning of services. Although other elements are being considered and reviewed by the Commissioner, we must do what we can to preserve the integrity and effectiveness of the Crime and Drug Partnership, after all it was established on the understanding that the causes of crime are complex and no single agency holds the key to reducing crime and its impact on society, thus crime reduction and prevention is not the sole responsibility of the police and the key to achieving long term and sustainable

reduction of offending is through multiagency working that addresses not only enforcement but prevention as well. Thank you.

Energy Efficiency

Councillor Jay Hayes asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Energy, Environment and Waste Services:

Could the Portfolio Holder explain what is being done to improve energy efficiency in the City to help reduce residents' energy bills? With households seeing a 54% hike in energy costs, what does the Portfolio Holder think of the Chancellor's comments that it would be 'silly' to provide more support to tackle rising energy bills now?

Councillor Sally Longford replied as follows:

The comment made by the super-rich Chancellor Sunak on Mumsnet that it would be silly to provide more funding to support people with their energy bills is frankly insulting to people who are realising how severely the rising cost of energy is going to hit them in their pockets and are having to make really hard choices about how they will manage their budgets. But then how would he understand their anxiety? This Conservative Government is completely out of touch with the day to day experience of our citizens, as demonstrated by the suggestion that buying own brand supermarket products or cancelling annual MOTs could make significant difference. Contrast our situation with that of France, where they maintained state ownership of the energy sector and have enforced a 4% energy cap, and Spain where they have imposed a windfall tax on energy producers to subsidise lower energy bills. We're all paying the price for Thatcher's privatisation of the energy market. With BP and Shell enjoying record profits and no action by the Chancellor to control the situation we will all go on suffering the consequences.

Here in Nottingham meanwhile, we are continuing to invest in energy efficiency and energy production. We are supporting citizens across the City to control their demand for energy and helping them to cut their bills. We know that this is the only sustainable long term solution to the energy crisis and will support us to be the first carbon neutral city in the country. The Council's Carbon Reduction and Energy Services Team is currently delivering a variety of grant funded programmes to improve the energy efficiency of social, private rented and owner occupied housing across the city and we are very fortunate to have these nationally recognised experts delivering for our city and citizens in the city. There are a wide variety of measures such as deep retrofit, solid wall insulation and solar photo-voltaic installations which reduce energy consumption or generate energy to use in the home and so help to protect residents from rising energy bills in the future. 243 social homes and 531 private homes are due to receive these improvements throughout ongoing programmes this year. We've also recently been awarded grant funding to deliver improvements to a further 298 homes through the Social Housing Decarbonisation Fund Wave 1. So that is many more than 1000 households supported with these practical energy saving measures. We will continue to explore the opportunities to bid for grant funding to enable further energy efficiency improvements to be made in the future. There is information about how to keep your bills down and manage outgoings on the AskLion website and I suggest councillors direct constituents to that site. However, to be honest this is all a drop in the ocean. Cash strapped local councils can't save the energy crisis, it is the Government's duty to protect people from the situation. We need decisive action now, a windfall tax on energy producers, redistributed to subsidise energy bills. For the longer term we must protect people from the future impacts of climate change and to stop this chaos by investing in a

massive programme of installation, putting solar panels on every south facing roof. We need to stop the short-term grant bidding process and provide a long term pipeline of works to give confidence to supply chains which were found seriously wanting through the dismal Green Homes Grant Scheme. But that would take a Government that has vision and understanding and we are unfortunately a hell of a long way from that.

Covid Testing

Councillor Georgia Power asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health:

Could the Portfolio Holder comment on the High Court ruling that the Government acted unlawfully when it sent patients into care homes without Covid testing?

Councillor Adele Williams replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and thank you Councillor Power for your question. So, just so people are aware the Judgement opens with this: "About 20,000 residents of care homes in England died of Covid-19 during the first wave of the pandemic in 2020. 2 of them were Michael Gibson, father of the first claimant, and Donald Percival Maynard Harris, father of the second claimant. Mr Gibson died in a care home in Oxfordshire on 3 April 2020, Mr Harris on the 1 May 2020." The High Court ruling found specifically that the common law claim succeeded against the Secretary of State and Public Health England in respect of both the March Discharge Policy and April's Admissions Guidance to this extent: "The Policy set out in each document was irrational in failing to advise where an asymptomatic patient other than one who had tested negative was admitted to a care home he or she should as far as practicable be kept apart from other residents for 14 days." This High Court ruling process was not an inquest into the tragic deaths of the two claimants' fathers but it does appear that lives were put at risk as a result of policy and guidance for which the Secretary of State is responsible. No one would expect that in a rapidly changing understanding of the virus that everything would be optimal from day one but the High Court judgement finds that even in these early weeks there was clear evidence that asymptomatic transmission could happen. So they state that during the three weeks from 25 February to 17 March the scientific picture was rapidly changing. At a meeting on 6 March Professor Ferguson was pointing to evidence that infectiousness could be detected just before, as well as just after the onset of symptoms and on 8 March 2020 three academic papers were published and they all pointed to the very real possibility of pre-symptomatic transmission of the virus. On 12 March the European Centre for Disease Control and Prevention published a paper confirming the fact that asymptomatic people could be infectious. Matt Hancock said in a press conference in May 2020: "Right from the start we have tried to throw a protective ring around our care homes. We set out the first advice in February and as the virus grew, we strengthened it throughout. We've made sure that care homes have the resources they need to control the spread of infection." Bereaved families have given their own verdict of how truthful they think that is. I am not going to make a lot of political points because I think this is just really sad. The underfunding of the health and social care system means that all of us are vulnerable in future waves of future pandemics. I know that the bereaved families are very keen that the Howlett Inquiry results in lessons learned and actions taken that will prevent more people suffering as they have in future waves or future pandemics. I'll leave my answer there, it's just really saddening. Thank you.

Housing Revenue Account

Councillor Andrew Rule asked the following question of the Leader of the Council: The Leader of the Council will recall at the last Executive Board meeting I recommended that following the decision to bring Nottingham City Homes in-house that, in relation to transactions involving the Housing Revenue Account, records should be retained in electronic and hard copy form for a period of six years; and for the foreseeable future the Section 151 Officer should authorise any Housing Revenue Account transactions to ensure proper management oversight. Can he confirm these recommendations will be implemented?

Councillor David Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Rule for his question. All Housing Revenue Account (HRA) transactions are reviewed by the Council's Senior HRA Accountant who has significant experience in this area. Any concerns are escalated to the Section 151 Officer. In addition, any new proposals for spending against HRA budgets need the prior approval of the three statutory officers before they can progress to ensure that they meet the strict criteria applied to HRA matters.

Libraries

Councillor Andrew Rule asked the following question of the Leader of the Council: Can the Leader of the Council provide an undertaking that when the fit out of the Central Library building is eventually completed, it will not be used as an excuse for further reducing neighbourhood libraries following the recent budget proposals to close three neighbourhood libraries in the City?

Councillor David Mellen replied as follows:

Thank you, Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Rule for his question. Firstly, I want to reiterate that the delivery of a new Central Library in Nottingham remains a key priority for the Council and its development remains a key part of the City Council's Capital Programme. To this end, I am pleased to announce that I will be bringing a report to Executive Board later this month, following the market testing of construction prices for this scheme to propose the starting of this work to fit out the library building that was recently completed on the corner of Colin Street and Carrington Street. As I outlined in my response to the Leader of the Opposition in both July 2021 and January of this year, I am committed to the role and work of libraries and it is important to us to ensure that this project is completed. Provision has already been made within the Council's Medium Term Financial Plan for its cost and it is not anticipated that this will raise any further additional financial pressures for the Library Service.

Councillor Rule will be aware that we have just completed a comprehensive consultation about our future library provision as has been mentioned in three questions already this afternoon. The submissions from which are now being reviewed and carefully considered. A further report will be brought back to the Council's Executive Board later in the year for decision on any changes that may or may not need to be undertaken on our neighbourhood provision. I recognise the importance of needing to maintain a strong network of excellent neighbourhood libraries alongside the replacement Central Library and we will be working to ensure that this network remains. Labour councillors have put forward closure proposals as part of our need to balance our budgets. Sadly, the proposals for libraries accompany savings to be made amongst our Children's Centres, our Youth Service and with us charging for services which have previously been free. Councillor Rule

you use the word 'excuse', and I believe that is neither appropriate nor fair. No councillor on this side of the Chamber wants to close libraries or Children's Centres or to reduce the youth provision, but having to balance a budget is our legal duty, it's our responsibility as we take on the leadership of the City. I wonder, Councillor Rule, if you would describe the closing of more than 800 libraries across the country over the last few years by councils run by parties all colours as a result of excuses or rather whether you would admit that cuts in public services are as a result of systematic underfunding of local government by this Conservative Central Government. This is the reason why decisions are having to be made. We are having to consult on closures because your Government, Councillor Rule, has not funded services in Nottingham properly. We will do our bit, we will listen to the consultation responses and seek any alternative ways to make the necessary savings that come forward, but our duty to set the budget remains. Perhaps Councillor Rule, you might make representations to your Government on behalf of this City to properly fund services for the people of Nottingham.

I remain proud of the commitment we have been able to make over the last decade to improve library provision in Nottingham, with new libraries on Sneinton Dale and Strelley Road, a new library being built in Sherwood and now the start of the final stage of the new Central Library. Our commitment and ambition for libraries remains.

11 Appointments, remits and first meetings of committees and joint bodies 2022/23

The Lord Mayor and Chair of Council, Councillor Wendy Smith, presented the report setting out proposed terms of reference, first meeting dates and memberships of Council committees and joint bodies for 2022/23. The report was seconded by Councillor Nicola Heaton.

Resolved to

- (1) agree the terms of reference for Council committees and joint bodies for 2022/23, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;**
- (2) agree the first meeting dates for Council committees and joint bodies for 2022/23, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report;**
- (3) agree the membership and substitutes, where applicable, for Council committees and the City Council membership and substitutes, where applicable, for joint bodies for 2022/23, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report;**
- (4) appoint the committee chairs and vice chairs for 2022/23 for committees that Council is responsible for appointing to, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report; and**
- (5) amend the Constitution to reflect the agreed terms of reference of Council committees and joint bodies for 2022/23.**

12 Executive appointments, responsibilities and remits and first meetings 2022/23

Councillor David Mellen, Leader of the Council, presented the report setting out his appointment of Portfolio Holders and Executive Assistants and establishment of Executive committees for 2022/23. The report was seconded by Councillor Sally Longford.

Resolved to

- (1) note the appointment of Portfolio Holders and their areas of responsibility, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report;**
- (2) note the appointment of Executive Assistants and the remits of those roles, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report;**
- (3) note the terms of reference and first meeting dates of Executive committees, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report;**
- (4) note the appointments (including substitutes where applicable) to and chairing arrangements for Executive committees, as set out in Appendix 4 to the report;**
- (5) note that the Constitution will be amended to reflect these appointments, delegations of responsibility and roles; and**
- (6) note that all other Executive delegations, as set out in the Executive Scheme of Delegation in the Constitution, are confirmed.**

13 Decisions taken under Urgency Procedures

Councillor David Mellen, Leader of the Council, presented the report detailing urgent decisions that the Council is required to note, which have been taken under provisions within the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules and Access to Information Rules. The report was seconded by Councillor Adele Williams.

Resolved to note

- (1) the following decisions taken under the Call-in and Urgency provisions of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules:**

Decision reference	Subject	Decision taker	Reason for urgency
Minute Ref: 126	Highways Delivery Options	Executive Board	Exempt
DD4582	Procurement of Mailroom Inbound Services	Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources	The current contract expired on 31 March 2022.
DD4607	Supporting Families Programme Staffing	Leader of the Council	The grant had to be accepted by 22 April 2022.

(2) the following Key Decision taken under the Special Urgency provisions of the Access to Information Procedure Rules:

Decision reference	Subject	Decision taker	Reason for special urgency
Minute ref: 130	External review of housing financial management and Council response	Executive Board	The report outlined significant issues that had been identified relating to the management of the Housing Revenue Account that require urgent and decisive action. The report outlined the proposed actions and controls that need to be put in place to address the issues that had been identified. There was a need to provide timely assurance to all stakeholders including members, tenants, taxpayers, the Improvement and Assurance Board and Government that the issues that had been identified are accepted by the Council and that appropriate action is being taken to urgently address them. Delay would undermine that assurance.

14 Motion in the name of Councillor Leslie Ayoola

Councillor Leslie Ayoola proposed the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Eunice Campbell-Clark:

The Home Office's failure to keep detailed records of the arrivals in the UK created an issue for the 'Windrush Generation' who were unable to evidence their lawful status when facing immigration checks to continue working, access services or even to remain in the UK.

This Council notes:

- The enormous contribution of members of the Windrush Generation to British society following the Second World War.

- That the many thousands of members of the Windrush Generation who made their homes in this country to build a better life and contribute to our society were granted indefinite leave to remain in 1971.
- That members of the Windrush Generation residing in Nottingham may have suffered loss and unfair treatment with regard to their immigration status, including threat of deportation due to the failure of the Home Office to maintain records of their lawful right to remain in the UK.
- The ongoing implications of this treatment for many people and their families.
- That the Council holds an annual civic event to commemorate the Windrush Generation on 22 June.

This Council therefore resolves:

- To continue to mark Windrush Day on 22 June in the City of Nottingham annually as a civic celebration to recognise and honour the enormous contribution of those who arrived between 1948 and 1973.
- To call upon the Government to support advice agencies in their work to achieve support, advocacy and justice for all Nottingham residents affected by the Windrush scandal; not to cap compensation amounts payable to victims under its compensation scheme or to apply confidentially agreements, time limits or other arbitrary restrictions; and waive fees for naturalisation for all who have been affected and provide legal aid for those who have been affected.
- To offer support to those affected by the scandal who may be seeking help, including to third sector organisations which provide support, advice and advocacy.
- To promote the Windrush Generation Scheme to help ensure that all Nottingham residents who may be eligible for compensation are aware of it.

Resolved to carry the motion.

15 Future meeting dates

Resolved to meet at 2pm on the following Mondays:

- **11 July 2022**
- **12 September 2022**
- **14 November 2022**
- **9 January 2023**
- **6 March 2023**

The Meeting concluded at 4.45 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

Responses to questions requesting a written response

WQ1

Written question to be asked by Councillor Kirsty Jones of the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Resources at the meeting of the City Council to be held on 9 May 2022

Can the Portfolio Holder outline exactly how much Nottingham City Council is currently spending per month on management contractors, and how much it has spent in total in the previous two years?

Councillor Sam Webster replied as follows:

In April 2022, the most recent month for which we hold data when this written question was submitted, the Council spent £133,000 on specialist contractors and executive interim agency workers engaged with the Council at the senior leadership level.

This figure represents around 0.88% of the monthly pay bill.

Nottingham City Council is currently investing in a Transformation Programme following the adoption of the 'Together For Nottingham Plan.' Details of the plan can be found via this link: <https://www.nottinghamcity.gov.uk/media/3374138/together-for-nottingham-plan.pdf>

This investment is informed by a number of detailed business cases which demonstrate short, medium and longer term financial savings as well as service improvements. The upfront investment does mean that there is a short term increase in spending on external specialists and contractors.

WQ2

Written question to be asked by Councillor Andrew Rule of the Portfolio Holder for Skills, Growth and Economic Development at the meeting of the City Council to be held on 9 May 2022

Could the Portfolio Holder provide a monthly breakdown of how many applications for new stalls at the Victoria Centre have been approved and rejected since May 2021?

Councillor Linda Woodings replied as follows:

As requested, please find attached information regarding traders' allocations for new stalls at the Victoria Centre Indoor Market.

May 2021

3 applications accepted - 2 still trading

1 left.

June 2021

1 application accepted - still trading

2 cancelled by the applicant prior to starting

1 rejected – background check

July 2021

1 accepted but now left

1 rejected – background check

August 2021

None

September 2021

None

October 2021

None

November 2021

1 accepted – still trading

2 cancelled by the applicant prior to starting

2 rejected – as on hold trader was preferred

2 on hold – due to COVID

December 2021

None

January 2022

None – accepting new traders paused.

This page is intentionally left blank