

## Responses to questions from Councillors requiring a written response

CQ1

### **Question to be asked by Councillor Kevin Clarke of the Portfolio Holder for Highways, Transport and Parks at the meeting of the City Council to be held on 31 October 2022**

---

Can the Portfolio Holder address why, despite this being the hottest summer on record, the residents of our City had no paddling pool on Victoria Embankment to take their children to?

Councillor Audra Wynter replied as follows:

Thank you and I would like to thank Councillor Clarke for his question about the paddling pool. As you will remember from my response to Councillor Jones's question about the closure of the paddling pool at Council in July, we fully recognise that the facility was a well-loved visitor attraction and also understand the concerns about its closure particularly during this summer's periods of extreme hot weather. We are fully aware of the public's support to bring back the paddling pool but significant investment is now required to fix the damaged filtration system. As the facility was no longer fit or capable of operating there was no choice but to keep the paddling pool closed this summer but we are committed sourcing the funding to bring back a new facility serving families of all abilities.

Recognising that access to safe open air water play would be in high demand this summer the parks team did put in extra effort to ensure that Bulwell Bogs water park remained open throughout the summer and whilst I appreciate that the Bulwell facility is located in the North of the City it is fully accessible via the Tram network. As outlined at Council in July, the Parks team have now carried out and recently completed a community engagement survey. The survey was originally scheduled to conclude at the end of July but, following feedback, it was felt that a further month during the summer holidays would help capture additional opinions and ensure that all the local community groups had time to engage with the survey. The survey has been carried out in order to help provide evidence of support for a replacement facility and to prioritise the type of facility that the community would prefer to see developed. Over 2,100 people have engaged with the online survey or have returned paper surveys. The Parks Team also visited 4 local primary schools to get the opinions direct from local children. The survey has resulted in an overwhelming support for a new facility and one that includes a mixture of both traditional open water and a splash pad. In addition, the school survey has also confirmed a strong interest in providing some form of water play facility.

Now that the survey is completed, the Parks Team are now starting to explore funding opportunities which will include a mixture of funding bids to external funding organisations alongside the use of new section 106 funding from local developments. In addition, the Parks Team are also working with the Nottingham Open Space Forum to deliver a Just Giving type of campaign. It is hoped that this will start in the next few weeks.

It is hoped that the funding package will be confirmed before Christmas and plans can then be put in place to implement a new water park facility later in 2023.

CQ3

**Question to be asked by Councillor Kevin Clarke of the Portfolio Holder for Strategic Regeneration and Communications at the meeting of the City Council to be held on 31 October 2022**

---

As the Council claims it supports community activity, does it consider that increasing the rent of the Place Community Centre in Sherwood by 120,000% will achieve this?

Councillor David Mellen replied as follows:

The 'Place' is a building in Sherwood which belongs to the City Council. It houses many community activities but it is not one of the Council's community centres. The organisation that runs the Place has leased the premises from the Council and pay a nominal rent. Their lease has now expired and the organisation has requested a renewal.

One of the actions of the 'Together for Nottingham' improvement programme is to carry out a review to ensure robust agreements are in place for all of our leases. The Place is part of that review. Many existing agreements leave the Council receiving only small rents while retaining significant repairing liabilities which is not sustainable. The current agreement for the Place leaves the Council with external repairing responsibility.

Our starting point for all property transactions has to be market rent in line with our adopted Disposals Policy and emerging Community Asset Policy. We can only consider offering rent reductions for organisations that are not for profit and properly constituted and where they deliver community outputs which meet the Council's priorities, and which have to be monitored for delivery.

As the Portfolio Holder for Property, I have met with the organisation together with officers and the local ward members for Sherwood, who I commend for taking the issues raised by the Place Management Committee forward, and we have indicated that if they can demonstrate that they are a not-for-profit organisation and properly constituted they can submit a proposal for a reduced amount of rent offset by quantifiable community outputs for consideration by the Council. It is important to note that this 'social value' will have to be in line with the Council's priorities and appropriate Council officers will be asked to advise in that respect.

WQ1

**Question to be asked by Councillor Andrew Rule of the Portfolio Holder for Housing and HR at the meeting of the City Council to be held on 31 October 2022 requesting a written response**

---

Could the Portfolio Holder provide a breakdown by service line of the current number of advertised vacancies in the Council, split out by grade of staff?

Councillor Toby Neal replied as follows:

The below table shows the number of 'live' advertised vacancies on 2 November 2022.

<b>Directorate</b>	<b>Grade</b>	<b>Total</b>	
People	Grade C	3	
	Grade D	8	
	Grade E	4	
	Grade F	4	
	Grade H	1	
	Grade I	1	
	<b>People Total</b>		<b>21</b>
Resident Services	Grade A	3	
	Grade B	1	
	Grade D	5	
	Grade E	2	
	Grade F	1	
	Grade G	2	
	Grade I	1	
	Grade K	1	
	<b>Resident Services Total</b>		<b>16</b>
	Growth & City Development	Grade E	1
Grade F		1	
Grade G		3	
<b>Growth &amp; City Development Total</b>		<b>5</b>	
Finance & Resources	Grade E	1	
	Grade F	2	
	Grade G	1	
	Grade H	2	
<b>Finance &amp; Resources Total</b>		<b>6</b>	
<b>NCC Total</b>		<b>48</b>	