

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council Chamber - at the Council House

on 9 March 2015 from 14.00 - 17.32

ATTENDANCES:

✓ Councillor Ian Malcolm (Lord Mayor)	
---------------------------------------	--

✓ Councillor Liaqat Ali	✓ Councillor Dave Liversidge
✓ Councillor Cat Arnold	✓ Councillor Sally Longford
✓ Councillor Mohammad Aslam	✓ Councillor Carole McCulloch
✓ Councillor Alex Ball	✓ Councillor Nick McDonald
✓ Councillor Steve Battlemuch	✓ Councillor David Mellen
✓ Councillor Merlita Bryan	✓ Councillor Thulani Molife
✓ Councillor Eunice Campbell	✓ Councillor Eileen Morley
✓ Councillor Graham Chapman	✓ Councillor Jackie Morris
✓ Councillor Azad Choudhry	✓ Councillor Toby Neal
✓ Councillor Alan Clark	✓ Councillor Alex Norris
✓ Councillor Jon Collins	✓ Councillor Bill Ottewell
✓ Councillor Georgina Culley	Councillor Jeannie Packer
✓ Councillor Emma Dewinton	✓ Councillor Brian Parbutt
✓ Councillor Michael Edwards	✓ Councillor Anne Peach
✓ Councillor Pat Ferguson	Councillor Sarah Piper
✓ Councillor Chris Gibson	✓ Councillor Mohammed Saghir
✓ Councillor Brian Grocock	✓ Councillor David Smith
✓ Councillor John Hartshorne	✓ Councillor Wendy Smith
✓ Councillor Rosemary Healy	✓ Councillor Timothy Spencer
✓ Councillor Nicola Heaton	✓ Councillor Roger Steel
✓ Councillor Mohammed Ibrahim	✓ Councillor Dave Trimble
✓ Councillor Glyn Jenkins	Councillor Leon Unczur
Councillor Sue Johnson	✓ Councillor Jane Urquhart
✓ Councillor Carole-Ann Jones	✓ Councillor Marcia Watson
✓ Councillor Gul Nawaz Khan	✓ Councillor Sam Webster
✓ Councillor Neghat Nawaz Khan	✓ Councillor Michael Wildgust
✓ Councillor Ginny Klein	✓ Councillor Malcolm Wood

✓ Indicates present at meeting

87 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Nick McDonald – Other Council Business

Councillor Leon Unczur – Personal Reasons

88 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None

89 QUESTIONS

a QUESTIONS FROM CITIZENS;

No questions from citizens were received.

b PETITIONS FROM COUNCILLORS ON BEHALF OF CITIZENS.

No petitions were presented by Councillors on behalf of citizens.

90 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 26 JANUARY 2015

The minutes of the meeting held on 26 January 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

91 TO RECEIVE OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL AND/OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

The Chief Executive reported the following:

Nottingham City Museums and Galleries' Lace collection

The city's Museums and Galleries' lace collection has been awarded Designated Collection status by the Arts Council England, it therefore joins a list of 140 nationally important collections. This is a mark of distinction awarded to the finest cultural collections across England.

The Lace Machinery and Lace Collections tell the distinctive story of the city's industrial and textile past and explain how a domestic craft became an important mass market commodity.

Democratic Services Officer of the Year

Kim Pocock, Governance Manager the Democratic Services, has recently won a national award from the Association of Democratic Services Officers. Kim was named as Democratic Services Officer of the Year for her exemplary performance in the championing and delivery of professional, innovative and forward thinking democratic services. As part of her prize, Kim will be attending the International Institute of Municipal Clerks' Conference in Hartford, Connecticut USA.

Councillors standing down

6 Councillors have confirmed they will not standing for re-election in May's local elections:

- Our Lord Mayor Councillor Ian Malcolm, who was first elected in the Wilford ward on 4 May 1995,
- Councillor Thulani Molife, who was first elected in the Mapperley ward on 5 May 2011,
- Councillor Mohammad Aslam, who was first elected in the Wilford ward on 4 May 1995,
- Councillor Leon Unczur, who was first elected in the Aspley ward on 1 May 1997,
- Councillor Eileen Morley, who was first elected in the Wollaton West ward on 7 August 2008,
- and Councillor Tim Spencer, who was first elected in the Wilford ward on 4 May 2000.

Councillor Jon Collins spoke in tribute to Councillors Ian Malcolm, Thulani Molife, Mohammad Aslam and Leon Unczur. Councillor Georgina Culley spoke in tribute to Councillors Eileen Morley and Tim Spencer. Councillor Chris Gibson spoke in tribute to Councillor Ian Malcolm.

92 QUESTIONS

Educational Attainment

Councillor Eileen Morley asked the following question of the Leader:

Could the leader of the Council explain how, if elected, he intends to deliver on the pledge to ensure that every child in Nottingham is taught in a school judged either good or outstanding by OFSTED, given the atrocious record this authority has had on educational attainment in the past, and the fact that the majority of our schools are now academies which are independently run?

Councillor Jon Collins replied as follows:

Can I thank Councillor Morley for her question, although I wonder whether at her last meeting here, Councillor Morley is aware of quite how contradictory her question is? She firstly accuses the Council of being responsible for an atrocious record of educational attainment, before implying that there's nothing the Council could do about school performance because "the majority of our schools are now academies which are independently run". Fortunately, all of her assumptions are wrong. The Council doesn't have an atrocious record on educational attainment, the majority of our schools are not yet academies, and despite her government stripping the Council of its powers of funding to support and intervene when schools fail, there are things we can do to help schools improve the standard of education in the city.

But first: the Council's record on driving up school standards. When Nottingham became a unitary authority in 1998, just 26% of our school leavers were getting 5 or more A-C grades at GCSE. On the same measure, last year 77% of school leavers achieved that level. We closed failing schools, and took a pragmatic approach to expanding successful schools and opening new schools, and when inspected by

Ofsted were recognised as having made good progress in closing the gap in local and national GCSE performance. Indeed, between 2002 and 2009, that gap closed from 20.2% to just 2.9%, and Nottingham improved from 145th to 109th of 152 Local Education Authorities nationally. Indeed, during that period, only Tower Hamlets achieved a faster rate of improvement in GCSE results. Only by 2010 did the rate of improvement start to drop off.

Regrettably since that time performance has, at best, stagnated, and comparatively gone backwards. So what's happened? Well, in the last 5 years the Council has lost its responsibility for school improvement, lost the ability to intervene until after schools have failed, lost the funding necessary to support a team of advisors, and all but 2 of our secondary schools have become academies. We've also seen academies increasingly compete with each other for funding, for good pupils, for good staff, and for the best ways to avoid taking difficult children. Secondary schools have largely stopped cooperating with each other; stopped learning from each other, and in some cases developed a greater allegiance to their academy chains than to Nottingham.

Of course, all this, and the drop-off of performance, might just be a coincidence. But if that were the case, you'd expect to see a similar drop-off in performance in primary schools, even though the majority are yet to convert to academies. However, the opposite is true. In primary schools, performance continues to improve, and at a faster rate than nationally, so the gap between Nottingham schools and the national average continues to close. Indeed, the performance of our primary schools in 2009 placed us 144th of 152 Local Education Authorities, last year we were 119th, moving from 7% to just 3% short of the national average performance. Indeed, the most recent performance data from Ofsted shows the progress made by Nottingham primary pupils in the previous 4 years was ranked in the top 1/3 of all Local Education Authorities nationally.

Finally, while in the middle years of the last decade Nottingham and Tower Hamlets GCSE performance improved at the same rate, Tower Hamlets has continued to improve and to close the gap with the national average, while the performance in Nottingham schools has not. Coincidentally, only 1 of Tower Hamlets schools is an academy, with the rest operating as community schools supported by the Local Education Authority, the opposite of the position in Nottingham.

Lord Mayor, in a recent Select Committee report, MPs concluded that the move to academies had no positive impact on school performance. I would suggest our experience is that a monopoly of secondary academies would appear to have a negative effect.

So it's in this context, that to have the Conservatives and the rather-less-than-impressive Nicky Morgan, Secretary of State for Education, tell the Nottingham Post that academisation was the way to tackle poor GCSE performance, bizarrely ignores the evidence and the fact that all but 2 of our secondary schools are already academies.

But we are where we are. And we either wash our hands of the problem, because we have no direct responsibility or influence over our secondary schools and in

increasing number of primary schools, or we do what we can to help schools turn things around, and that's what we'll do.

It is realistic to pledge that every child in Nottingham will be taught in a school that is judged good or excellent by OFSTED, and that's because it's been done before. Indeed between September 2008 and November 2009 there were no Nottingham schools in an OFSTED category, so effectively, the measure our manifesto has committed to achieving was achieved.

But specifically, what now can we do? Well, we've already established a School Improvement Board, chaired by the Vice Chancellor of Nottingham University, Sir David Greenaway, to bring together key figures within education in Nottingham to develop a programme of interventions, policy changes, and activities to support schools in our city. The Council's recent attendance campaign has helped coordinate efforts to highlight the importance of pupils being in lessons, and contributed to improvements during the autumn term and over recent months. We're establishing a governors' academy to provide accredited training for all Council nominated governors, and any other school governors interested in developing the skills necessary to hold school management more effectively to account for probity and performance, issues now the Council no longer has a role in. We are working with secondary schools to develop a new behaviour strategy, and appropriate arrangements for pupils attending alternative education options outside of school. We have plans to help schools recruit to fill vacancies in shortage subjects, by working with the universities to retain graduate teachers, and with schools to promote Nottingham as a city to move to. Individually, the steps schools can take to attract teachers are limited, but as the local authority, we can help with finding accommodation, school places, jobs and jobs with partners by running recruitment fairs in high cost parts of the country. We're improving the way we deliver services to schools, so they're easier for head teachers to access and manage. We're developing a programme of extra-curricular activities to under the title Opportunities Notts, so that all city children can have a range of experiences that evidence suggests builds commitment to schooling and self-confidence in their ability to learn. Perhaps most importantly, we're looking at ways of funding a network of advisors who will be available to offer support and advice to schools facing challenges.

Of course, this government has made school improvement the responsibility of schools themselves. Nevertheless, there clearly remains a demand from head teachers for advice and support from the Council, and a small number of new appointments means we're increasingly able to offer that.

So, to summarise, there's a lot we can do, there's a lot we're already doing, and it's beginning to make a difference. But in a school system where all but 2 of our secondary schools are now directly funded and directly accountable to the government, surely Councillor Morley should be asking her colleagues in the Department for Education what they intend to do about school performance in the city too? Because isn't it about time that the government took its responsibility for the performance of academies seriously? And as a cheerleader for government education policy, isn't it about time that you, Councillor Morley, took some of that responsibility too? And finally, isn't it time that you explained what you would do differently if your party won the local elections on 7 May? Lord Mayor, I'm happy to take a supplementary on the issue and to ask for a little leniency on your part so that

Councillor Morley can spell all of that out. So let me start you off: “is the portfolio holder aware, that if the Conservatives win the local election on 7 May, we will be able to improve school results in Nottingham by...” Over to you Councillor Morley.

Redeveloping the Broadmarsh Shopping Centre – View of the Castle

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

Does the Portfolio Holder share my views that the draft proposals from Intu for the Broadmarsh Centre are a step in the right direction to enhance the visitor experience to Nottingham? Of particular merit are the reconfigured entrance arrangements and street patterns opposite Carrington Street and Bridlesmith Gate.

Intu have stated that these refurbishments would concentrate on food and leisure, so we the council need to compliment this vision. I have mentioned in this chamber before that the jewel that is Nottingham’s Castle Rock needs to be opened up to views from the Lister Gate and Stamford Street corner to combine this leisure and retail offer with a stunning vista. Demolition and relocation of the current Castle College and Boots premises are now distinct possibilities that could achieve this aim. Does she agree with me that we must not miss this opportunity lest it be lost for a generation?

Furthermore, does she agree with me that if there are still plans to pedestrianise Collin Street, then the current proposals, which essentially maintain the existing vast brick walled frontage, seem to have no ambition to take advantage of any new pedestrianised area?

Councillor Jane Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and thank you Councillor Steel for your question, I’m always glad to hear your views. I may not always agree them, but it’s always interesting to hear your views expressed at some length in this question. What it’s really good to be able to do this afternoon, as a result of this question, is to talk about the huge ambition that we in the Labour group and on the Labour side of the council have for our city, and the ambition that we have shown through the achievements we’ve already made over the past four years. Because, of course, regenerating the southern end of the city has been a priority for us, and I am sure Councillor Steel would want to congratulate us on having achieved such a great regeneration, refurbishment, and restoration of our station - an award-winning project and catalyst for further development south of the city - an award-winning piece of work, paid for of course by the workplace parking levy, and which secured significant levels of employment and contracts for local firms during its construction. So, yes, I'm delighted that the council has now received the proposals from INTU, the operators of Broadmarsh, for the refurbishment of the centre. They have been subject to informal public consultation prior to their submission as a planning application, and there isn't actually a planning application before us as yet, but that's expected in early April.

The proposed scheme is indeed an excellent opportunity to improve the whole of the Broadmarsh area, and I am sure that most residents of Nottingham and the

surrounding areas will be really pleased that positive action at last seems to be being taken by INTU, because I'm sure that many of us who have been in this chamber for some time can recall many previous occasions when we thought that a Broadmarsh scheme was just around the corner, and we've been sadly disappointed that nothing has come to fruition until now.

I am not going to comment on the details of negotiations, nor the proper processes that we have for making planning decisions by having comments in this meeting impacting on that committee's ability to make a good decision. So I'm not going to comment on the detail of designs that may be proposed at this time. They're not final yet, the eventual planning application may well look different. So I don't intend to comment in detail, but what I can say from what I've seen so far, is that they do attempt to address some of the key issues that we have wanted to achieve for some time in the city, like the need to create a better link through from Lister gate to Collin Street and Carrington Street, so that sense of coming through from our fantastically restored station through to the city centre is a much more legible and navigable aspect of our city centre, and that one again, we seek to drive regeneration of the southern part of our city.

And of course, we come to Collin Street. Plans for Collin Street have been long discussed, in fact it's been a feature of previous Broadmarsh applications, that we do indeed plan to create an attractive pedestrian space running between Middle Hill and Maid Marian Way, enhancing views, and the route and views to the castle, because of course, yes we do have other ambitious development plans for the castle too, and on the eastern side for a skills hub. So yes, we know that those things are very important, and we are already working hard to enable them to happen.

So, views of the castle are important, the opportunity to create a great new pedestrian space and to create a clear route, both north-south and east-west in that area, are a part of our ambitious vision. But actually, isn't it more important than either of these, that we have the ability to deliver the project? And to be key on ambitious regenerative projects, which are what we have been delivering as a Labour Council? Projects like the station, projects like the tram, bold decisions like the Workplace Parking Levy, things opposed by the Tories, but things are clearly acting as a catalyst for the wider renewal of our city and are driving its economy.

I do hope that Councillor Steel has made his views known to INTU through the consultation they've been running. He may of course have an opportunity through the statutory consultation, and perhaps through a Planning Committee decision, to take part in the decision making. But of course, he may or may not be a member of the Planning Committee by then, as I suspect the decision will be made after May. And perhaps it's with that in mind that he sought to so thoroughly make Council aware of his views now.

Redeveloping the Broadmarsh Shopping Centre – View of the Caves

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

In their proposals for Broadmarsh, Intu recognises the potential of our vast network of caves to be a crucial visitor attraction. With this in mind, does the portfolio holder

agree with me that the entrance could be placed to better effect, possibly adjacent the Nottingham Contemporary steps.

Similarly, would she agree with me that the ancient remnants of Drury Hill, still exposed in the bowels of the Broadmarsh centre, would be an interesting welcome for inquisitive visitors and local residents in the proposed pocket square on the relocated Drury Walk, and might she suggest a glass viewing panel be incorporated into Intu's plans?

Councillor Jane Urquhart replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and thanks again Councillor Steel, 2 opportunities, during what could be the last council meeting before the election, to give me a chance to talk about our pride in our city's heritage and our group's ambition for our future, and our delivery of infrastructure projects: thank you very much Councillor Steel indeed.

So, some of the comments in my earlier answer are relevant, so I'm not going to go into a great deal of detail, but of course, yes I am very pleased that Intu have caught up with our long-held view that the caves are a crucial part of what we offer as a city. And that is why, of course, they feature in our lottery bid for the castle: that bid making the most of our bold and rebellious past, using modern techniques to enable visitors to experience both our rich history and our unique geology.

So we have already acted positively to achieve improvements, and to achieve a vision and a sense of ambition and use of our caves. And of course, we're actually starting some work towards this ambitious castle plan, by starting some work on the castle approaches and the roads around there later this year, in order to show that we as a council, once again, are prepared to deliver in order to get the wider benefit of the bids that we're making for funding for the castle project.

So in terms of the caves at Broadmarsh, of course they too are important, and discussions are ongoing with Intu about this. We will continue to work with them, and the operators of the current caves attraction to seek the best solution for them within the redevelopment plans for the Broadmarsh, but I'm not going to describe what that solution might be in this council meeting, particularly, as I said before, ahead of any formal planning application, and whilst detailed negotiations are ongoing.

I'm really pleased that Intu realise, just as we do, how important our heritage and our history is, and again, I wish Councillor Steel every luck in putting forward his views on the Broadmarsh scheme through the informal consultation and potentially through formal processes at some point later on.

Council Tax Freeze Grant

Councillor Georgina Culley asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

If the Labour group had taken the Government's offer of Council Tax Freeze Grants in every year of this parliament, residents would be paying 8.7% less in Council Tax. That's £85 less per year for those living in a Band A property and £127 less per year for those living in a Band D property.

Does the Deputy Leader of the Council believe this is a choice Nottingham's citizens would have made if they had been given the choice and, if so, why has he carefully avoided triggering a local referendum on the subject every year since 2012 by raising Council Tax by the very maximum he is allowed to without seeking the consent of the Nottingham public?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. I do believe people would have chosen to pay the Council Tax, and it's partly because all of the increases have been perfectly reasonable and in line with inflation. But also, I think there are other reasons, which I will go on to. But first I want to make an observation. What is interesting about this question is what it actually reveals about Conservative party thinking. The question is stimulated by a view amongst Conservatives, not just our Conservatives but all Conservatives, that people are so short-sighted, and are so mercenary, and are only interested in money, and for that reason they would never have agreed to an increase in Council Tax. Well we take a more optimistic view of the world. And fortunately what has happened is that people fit more in with our appreciation of them than with yours. Certainly that's been the case in Nottingham. And there is actually empirical evidence that they take our side, the more optimistic side, and it is called the electorate. Were it the case that they sided with you on this, then you would be sitting here, and we would be isolated, there'd be 4 or 5 of us sitting over there. And the people have had that opportunity year after year after year, to make their views known, and they have chosen to put 49 of us back, when there's a very clear dividing line, and 4 of you back. So that is, if you want, the ultimate referendum.

But the reason people have not responded in the way you would have expected them to, is partly because they are much nicer, and they have a broader view of the world than you give them credit for. They also see the other side of a balance sheet. The other side of the balance sheet of not increasing Council Tax is another £12.6 million of cuts. And some of them may not actually want their parents stuck in a hospital bed, unable to get home because of lack of care. They may not want to see children in care not receiving their due protection. They may not want to see children's centres closed, or libraries closed to the extent that's been seen in other councils. They may want to see CPOs on the street, and they may actually want a council which is solvent, which this council is.

And finally, on the referendum, I'd point out that 49 of the 101 councils that are increasing their Council Tax and have not taken the freeze grant this year are Conservative councils. That is almost 50%. They are doing so, because they recognise as well that you cannot go on not putting your Council Tax up at the same time as having government grant cuts. So they have been very sensible, but also I'd point out that not one of them is having a referendum. And there are very good reasons why 49 Conservative councils have decided not to have a referendum: it's because referendums are extremely costly. They create massive uncertainty: it is very difficult to budget around the outcome of a referendum. There is also a recognition that people are elected to take decisions on behalf of the electorate, and the time for judging our decisions is at the ballot box. Again, people seem to accept this, and again, there is no better evidence than the empirical evidence in this chamber that we are 49 and you are 4. We have been increasing our majority

through this period of Council Tax increases, whilst you have been diminishing in number and size.

Private Tenants

Councillor Michael Edwards asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety, Housing and the Voluntary Sector:

What problems are Nottingham tenants of private landlords now suffering that require action a national level?

Councillor Dave Liversidge replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. In the past decade in Nottingham we've experienced an above average increase in the size of the private rented sector. At the 2001 census, it was 14% of the city's housing; in 2011 it was 23%. Private sector is clearly becoming more important as a provider of homes for our citizens. Given the increasing role of the private sector, it's crucial that accommodation provided is safe, is decent quality, is reasonable and affordable, and provides a secure home; particularly for families with children.

As the sector has increased in size and importance, so have the Council's efforts to raise standards. We've created a rogue landlord campaign to find and drive out the worst landlords from the sector, and we've received around 1,300 requests for help within the rented accommodation sector during 2014, up by 250 on 2013. We're making effective use of our enforcement powers to make poor landlords improve their properties, and prosecuting those who fail to comply. There have been 5 prosecutions so far this financial year. The use of 2 accreditation schemes; Unipol and the Decent and Safe Homes, helps landlords to improve and to show that they are good landlords, and that they meet the overall Nottingham standard for their properties and the management of them. In January 2014 we introduced a scheme of additional licensing for Houses in Multiple Occupation in certain parts of the city. In February we also launched the Tenants Toolkit, which advises tenants of their rights and responsibilities. With all of these things we are helping to make private renting easier and a better experience for our citizens.

However, there are a number of areas that we believe should be actioned at a national level to improve the situation. Firstly, the length of tenure should be longer than the current minimum offer of 6 months. The norm should be at least 3 years; we need to give private renters more security of tenure, as they have in council houses. If you have school aged children, a 6 month tenure brings enormous uncertainty and potential disruption. Children need stability in their lives, and if we are to see more children living in the private rented sector, we need to make sure that there is a minimum tenancy much longer than 6 months. We know that this is a particular issue in Nottingham from the number of people going to our housing advice service for help. The biggest cause of homelessness is assured shorthold tenancies coming to an end. 31 households were made homeless in this way in the first quarter of 2014, and in quarter 3 it's 40. So there's a general spread of people leaving 6 months tenures to become homeless.

Another area is the practice of letting agents. According to our colleagues at Notts Housing Advice, complaints about letting agents are frequent. Clients find fees prohibitive, particularly those on benefits. Housing benefits and discretionary payments cannot be used for agents' fees. Fees are often not justifiable, particular examples include a non-refundable fee if a client fails a credit check. There are fees for renewing fixed term agreements, when there is actually very little work required in re-issuing agreements, but clients are often charged £150 for renewal. Nationally, the Property Ombudsman has confirmed that 2/3 of upheld complaints made to them by both landlords and tenants are against lettings agents. Some clearer rules on what agents can and can't do are needed, so that people needing occupation quickly are not exploited.

Whilst we are making the best use of powers to improve standards, things could be vastly improved by a national licensing scheme, requiring landlords to register addresses of private rented properties, and to apply for a license to ensure properties meet at least minimum standards of safety, condition and management. This would mean landlords having to meet a minimum set of standards before letting out the house, such as smoke alarms, providing details of who is in control of the property and who to report problems and disrepair to. So, overall, whilst the Council has made considerable progress to make private renting in Nottingham, we believe that action is needed at the national level. And if we start with these 3 things, we may even get to decent homes standard in the private sector also.

93 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE LEADER ON DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER THE URGENCY PROCEDURES

The Leader submitted a report on decisions taken under the urgency procedures, as set out on pages 23 to 26 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to note the urgent decisions taken, as follows:

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

<u>Ref</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
1826	26/01/2015	Licences to occupy areas within Loxley House	Exempt	The licensees needed to complete their agreements as soon as possible
1828	23/01/2015	Approval of the costs of an Adults Care Package	Exempt	To allow for a timely implementation of the decision
1835	30/01/2015	Strategic Land Acquisition	Exempt	No reason given
1838	05/02/2015	Rejuvenation of the Sandbase Pitch at Southglade Leisure Centre	£16,150	Work needs to be completed immediately to avoid having to close the facility, which would then affect income to the Council

1841	06/02/2015	Approval of the costs of an Adults Care Package	Exempt	To allow for a timely implementation of the decision
1856	18/02/2015	Voter Registration Initiative - Engagement of Bite the Ballot	£30,000	Any delay in appointing a secondee for engagement purposes seriously impacts on already limited time available to address voter registration before the deadline of 20 April 2015

(2) key decisions (special urgency procedure)

<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Decision Taker</u>	<u>Reasons for special urgency</u>
24/02/2015	Medium Term Financial Plan	Nil	Executive Board	Due to the complexity of the report, the additional work required to be undertaken in response to the Local Government Financial settlement and to allow for the appropriate consultation on both phase 1 and 2 proposals, the MTFP report was not available for circulation with the agenda, so further 5 days notice could not be given

94 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE LEADER ON CONSTITUTIONAL UPDATES

The Leader submitted a report on Constitutional amendments, as set out on pages 27 to 42 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to:

- 1) note the changes previously agreed by the Leader to the terms of reference for the Executive Board Commissioning Sub Committee, and its new name, Commissioning and Procurement Sub-Committee, following inclusion of procurement decision making in the remit of the sub-committee, as detailed in appendix 1;**
- 2) note the change to the terms of reference for the Appointments and Conditions of Service Committee to reflect changes to pension**

arrangements agreed by the Monitoring Officer, as detailed in appendix 2;

- 3) note the delegation previously agreed by the Leader to enable colleagues to apply the Advanced Payment Code of the Highways Act 1980, as detailed in paragraph 5.4 and appendix 3;
- 4) note the delegation previously agreed by the Leader in relation to flood management, as detailed in paragraph 5.5 and appendix 3;
- 5) approve an addition to the terms of reference of the Trusts and Charities Committee to enable urgent decisions to be made between scheduled meetings, as detailed in paragraph 5.6;
- 6) approve the proposed changes to the membership and voting arrangements for the Health and Wellbeing Board, as detailed in paragraph 5.7;
- 7) approve an amendment to the Council's petition scheme to require petitions triggering a formal debate to clearly and primarily relate to the City Council's functions and its administrative area, as detailed in paragraph 5.8;
- 8) adopt a policy to require an enhanced Disclosure and Barring Service check of all city councillors immediately after their election, to be maintained throughout their term of office on the grounds that all councillors have the potential to serve or be substitutes on a committee discharging education or social care functions or may become members of the Executive, and to disbar any councillor who does not undertake the Disclosure and Barring Service checks as set out above, or whose check discloses matters which, in the opinion of the Corporate Director for Children and Adults and the Monitoring Officer, may present a risk to children and vulnerable adults, from all offices and membership of committees, sub committees, panels or outside bodies, appointments to which are made by the Leader, Council or other body of the Council, as detailed in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.13;
- 9) adopt the revised Code of Conduct for Members and Co-opted Members set out in appendix 4 and the revised terms of reference for the Standards Committee set out in Appendix 5.

95 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE DEPUTY LEADER ON ELECTORAL SERVICES: REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS AND PLACES 2014/15

The Deputy Leader submitted a report on the review of polling districts and places, as set out on pages 43 to 50 of the agenda, and pages 3 to 176 on the supplementary agenda.

RESOLVED to amend the current scheme of polling districts and places as set out in the appendix to the report.

96 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE DEPUTY LEADER ON THE TREASURY MANAGEMENT 2015/16 STRATEGY

The Deputy Leader submitted a report on the 2015/16 Treasury Management Strategy, as set out on pages 51 to 84 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to

- 1) approve the 2015/16 Treasury Management Strategy document, including the strategy for debt repayment and the investment strategy, as detailed in appendix 1;
- 2) approve the Prudential Indicators and limits from 2014/15 to 2017/18, as detailed in appendix 3.

97 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE DEPUTY LEADER ON THE BUDGET 2015/16

The Deputy Leader submitted a report on the 2015/16 Budget, as set out on pages 85 to 90 of the agenda, and pages 177 to 334 of the supplementary agenda.

Councillor Culley presented a proposed amendment to the Budget, as follows:

In recommendation 2.1 (1) add after “the revenue budget for 2015/16”

Subject to the following:-

	Net 2015/16 £
<p>The proposed budgets for the Marketing & Communications and Internal Communications service areas are reduced by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the removal of the corporate, internal and one-off funding budgets delivering a part year saving of £209,683 (full year saving of £394,548) • a reduction of 2.5% in the departmental communications and marketing budget delivering a part year saving of £15,786 (full year saving of £21,048) 	-225,469
The cessation of payments for Trade Unions delivering a part year saving of £175,087 (full year saving of £350,174)	-175,087
The number of Portfolio Holders is reduced by 2 delivering a full year saving of £37,059	-37,059
Following the recalling of the Independent Remuneration Panel to consider the proposal, the removal of the Special Responsibility Allowance for Executive Assistants delivering a part year saving of £24,905 (full year saving of £29,886)	-24,905
That a sum of £217,138 of the General Fund Balance be released to support revenue spending in 2015/16 (to be repaid in 2016/17 from full year savings)	-217,138

Proposing a 0% council tax increase and accepting the Government's offer of a council tax freeze grant equivalent to a 1.0% increase for 2015/16	-1,107,654
That a six month trial of free parking at Wollaton Park is implemented at a one-off cost of £86,000	86,000
TOTAL NET FINANCIAL IMPACT	-1,701,312

And amend the following recommendations as indicated:

- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (a) substitute £948,102,159 for £948,597,199;
- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (b) substitute £860,695,065 for £859,488,793;
- In recommendation 2.1 (3) (c) substitute £87,407,094 for £89,108,406;
- In recommendation 2.1 (4) substitute £1,431.80 for £1,459.67
- In recommendation 2.1 (6) amend Members' Allowance Scheme for 2015/16 by removing the Special Responsibility Allowance for Executive Assistants

And amend the following sections as indicated:

- In section 5.2 substitute £87,407,094 for £89,108,406 and £1,431.80 for £1,459.67
- In section 5.3 and 5.6 substitute the following basic amounts of council tax for the ones shown in the report:

Band	Basic Amount of Council Tax
A	£954.53
B	£1,113.62
C	£1,272.71
D	£1,431.80
E	£1,749.98
F	£2,068.16
G	£2,386.33
H	£2,863.60

- In section 5.6 substitute the following aggregate council taxes for those shown in the report:

Band	Aggregate
A	£1,120.42
B	£1,307.16
C	£1,493.90
D	£1,680.64
E	£2,054.12
F	£2,427.60
G	£2,801.06
H	£3,361.28

Councillors voted as follows on the proposed amendment:

Councillor	In favour of the budget amendment	Against the budget amendment	Abstained
Liaqat Ali		✓	
Cat Arnold		✓	
Mohammed Aslam		✓	
Alex Ball		✓	
Steve Battlemuch		✓	
Merlita Bryan		✓	
Eunice Campbell		✓	
Graham Chapman		✓	
Azad Choudhry		✓	
Alan Clark		✓	
Jon Collins		✓	
Georgina Culley	✓		
Emma Dewinton		✓	
Michael Edwards		✓	
Chris Gibson		✓	
Brian Grocock		✓	
John Hartshorne		✓	
Rosemary Healy		✓	
Nicola Heaton		✓	
Mohammed Ibrahim		✓	
Glyn Jenkins		✓	
Carole Jones		✓	
Gul Nawaz Khan		✓	
Neghat Nawaz Khan		✓	
Ginny Klein		✓	
Dave Liversidge		✓	
Sally Longford		✓	
Ian Malcolm		✓	
Carole McCulloch		✓	
David Mellen		✓	
Thulani Molife		✓	
Eileen Morley	✓		
Jackie Morris		✓	
Toby Neal		✓	
Alex Norris		✓	
Bill Ottewell		✓	
Brian Parbutt		✓	
Ann Peach		✓	
Mohammed Saghir		✓	
David Smith		✓	
Wendy Smith		✓	
Timothy Spencer	✓		
Roger Steel	✓		
Dave Trimble		✓	
Jane Urquhart		✓	
Marcia Watson		✓	
Sam Webster		✓	
Michael Wildgust		✓	
Malcolm Wood		✓	

RESOLVED to reject the proposed budget amendment.

Councillors voted as follows on the recommendations in the budget report:

Councillor	In favour of the budget report	Against the budget report	Abstained
Liaqat Ali	✓		
Cat Arnold	✓		
Mohammed Aslam	✓		
Alex Ball	✓		
Steve Battlemuch	✓		
Merlita Bryan	✓		
Eunice Campbell	✓		
Graham Chapman	✓		
Azad Choudhry	✓		
Alan Clark	✓		
Jon Collins	✓		
Georgina Culley		✓	
Emma Dewinton			✓
Michael Edwards	✓		
Chris Gibson	✓		
Brian Grocock	✓		
John Hartshorne	✓		
Rosemary Healy	✓		
Nicola Heaton	✓		
Mohammed Ibrahim	✓		
Glyn Jenkins	✓		
Carole Jones	✓		
Gul Nawaz Khan	✓		
Neghat Nawaz Khan	✓		
Ginny Klein	✓		
Dave Liversidge	✓		
Sally Longford	✓		
Ian Malcolm	✓		
Carole McCulloch	✓		
David Mellen	✓		
Thulani Molife	✓		
Eileen Morley		✓	
Jackie Morris	✓		
Toby Neal	✓		
Alex Norris	✓		
Bill Ottewell	✓		
Brian Parbutt	✓		
Ann Peach	✓		
Mohammed Saghir	✓		
David Smith	✓		
Wendy Smith	✓		
Timothy Spencer		✓	
Roger Steel		✓	
Dave Trimble	✓		
Jane Urquhart	✓		
Marcia Watson	✓		
Sam Webster	✓		
Michael Wildgust	✓		
Malcolm Wood	✓		

RESOLVED to

- 1) approve the revenue budget for 2015/16, including;
 - a) the recommendations of the Chief Finance Officer in respect of the robustness of the estimates made for the purpose of the budget calculations and the adequacy of reserves;
 - b) the delegation of authority to the Acting Corporate Director for Resources in consultation with the Deputy Leader to finalise the MTFP for publication;
 - c) the delegation of authority to the appropriate Directors to implement saving proposals after undertaking the appropriate consultation;
- 2) approve the capital programme for 2014/15–2019/20;
- 3) approve a council tax requirement of £89,108,406, including the calculations required by Sections 30 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 (“the Act”), as set out below:
 - a) £948,597,199 being the aggregate of the expenditure, allowances, reserves and amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) (a) to (f) of the Act;
 - b) £859,488,793 being the aggregate of the income and amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) (a) to (d) of the Act;
 - c) £89,108,406 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2.1(3)(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2.1(3)(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act, as its council tax requirement for the year;
- 4) approve a City Council Band D basic amount of council tax for 2015/16 of £1,459.67 being the amount at 2.1(3)(c) divided by the amount at 2.2(3) below, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its council tax for the year (as set out in section 5 of this report);
- 5) approve the setting of the amounts of council tax for 2015/16 as below:

Band	City Council (£)	Police & Crime Commissioner (£)	Fire & Rescue Authority (£)	Aggregate Council Tax (£)
A	£973.11	£117.60	£48.29	£1,139.00
B	£1,135.30	£137.20	£56.34	£1,328.84
C	£1,297.48	£156.80	£64.39	£1,518.67
D	£1,459.67	£176.40	£72.44	£1,708.51
E	£1,784.04	£215.60	£88.54	£2,088.18
F	£2,108.41	£254.80	£104.64	£2,467.85
G	£2,432.78	£294.00	£120.73	£2,847.51
H	£2,919.34	£352.80	£144.88	£3,417.02

- 6) **approve the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2015/16 in the terms of the previously adopted and amended Scheme, save for adjustments to mirror nationally determined rates for pay awards and travel and subsistence (as applicable to officers) and for carers allowances;**
- 7) **note a Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Fire and Rescue Authority precept at Band D for 2015/16 of £72.44.**
- 8) **note a Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner precept at Band D for 2015/16 of £176.40.**
- 9) **note that in January 2015, the City Council calculated the amount of 61,047 as its council tax base for the year 2015/16 in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) (England) Regulations 2012.**

98 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION ON THE NOTTINGHAM LOCAL FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STRATEGY

The Portfolio Holder for Planning and Transportation submitted a report on the Nottingham Local Flood Risk Management Strategy, as set out on pages 91 to 148 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to

- 1) **approve the Nottingham Local Flood Risk Management Strategy as a formal City Council document;**
- 2) **authorise the Director for Planning and Transport to maintain the Nottingham Local Flood Risk Management Strategy as an up-to-date document.**

99 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR JOBS AND GROWTH ON THE NOTTINGHAM BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) RENEWAL

The Portfolio Holder for Jobs and Growth submitted a report on the Nottingham Business Improvement District renewal, as set out on pages 149 to 154 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to

- 1) **authorise the Deputy Chief Executive/Corporate Director of Development and Growth, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Jobs and Growth to:**
 - a) **receive the renewal proposals from Nottingham BID Company on behalf of the City Council;**

- b) **consider the renewal proposals, ensuring that they do not conflict with adopted policy;**
 - c) **enter into an Operating Agreement under which the Council will collect the levies due on behalf of the Nottingham BID**
- 2) **nominate the Portfolio Holder for Jobs and Growth to hold the proxy vote on behalf of the Council as an eligible levy payer in the BID ballot.**

100 TO CONSIDER A MOTION IN THE NAME OF THE LEADER:

Moved by Councillor Jon Collins, seconded by Councillor Sam Webster:

“This Council recognises that cities are the engines of growth in the British economy. It believes that cities could do more for local communities and economies if freed from central control.

The ten Core Cities outside London deliver 28% of the combined economic output of England, Wales and Scotland. Yet UK cities have far fewer freedoms, powers and resources than our international competitors. Independent forecasts show that with additional devolved powers the eight English Core Cities alone could generate an extra £222 billion and 1.16 million jobs for the country by 2030.

This council resolves to support the call for greater devolution to cities, as set out in the Modern Charter for Local Freedom, to address the urgent challenges of driving prosperity, increasing equality and strengthening democracy.

As a Core City, this Council therefore commits to make the case to government for greater devolution of both budgets and decision making in order to:

- Improve the skill base of the city;
- Encourage investment in jobs and economic growth;
- Improve housing provision;
- Empower communities to do more for themselves;
- Make public services more sustainable.

Only in this way do we believe we can prepare the city for the challenges of the next decades in order to improve the life of Nottingham people.

We encourage citizens, businesses, partners and relevant organisations in the city to add their name to the Modern Charter for Local Freedom.”

RESOLVED to carry the motion.

101 TO CONSIDER CANCELLING THE CITY COUNCIL MEETING SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY 13 APRIL 2015

RESOLVED to cancel the City Council meeting scheduled for Monday 13 April 2015.

102 TO CONSIDER CHANGING THE DATE OF THE AGM CITY COUNCIL MEETING FROM TUESDAY 26 MAY 2015 TO MONDAY 18 MAY 2015

RESOLVED to change the date of the AGM City Council meeting from Tuesday 26 May 2015 to Monday 18 May 2015.

103 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

RESOLVED to note the following changes to membership of Joint City and County Health Scrutiny Committee:

- a) Councillor Mohammed Aslam replaced by Councillor Toby Neal;
- b) Councillor Azad Choudhry replaced by Councillor Anne Peach.

104 EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

RESOLVED to exclude the public from the meeting during consideration of the remaining item in accordance with section 100a(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 on the basis that, having regard to all the circumstances, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighed the public interest in disclosing the information.

105 REPORT OF THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR JOBS AND GROWTH ON THE NOTTINGHAM BUSINESS IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (BID) RENEWAL - EXEMPT APPENDIX

As per minute 99, above.