

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council House, Old Market Square

on 13 July 2015 from 14.00 - 17.29

ATTENDANCES:

✓ Councillor Jackie Morris (Lord Mayor)

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

✓ Indicates present at meeting

17 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor Alex Ball – other business
Councillor Corall Jenkins – illness
Councillor Linda Woodings – annual leave
Councillor Marcia Watson – personal reasons
Councillor Rosemary Healy – personal reasons
Councillor Sally Longford – annual leave

18 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS

None.

19 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS FROM CITIZENS

Questions from citizens

Mr S H asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Jobs, Growth and Transport, to receive a written response:

Can you please explain the process of consultation as it does not appear as democratic as first seen. I refer for example to the proposal to make Station Street pedestrian only. It would appear from press reports that the funding was signed off before the consultation even began. How can you sign off a project when the residents have not had a chance to give their approval, and, given that you do not know what amendments to the proposal would be, what the budget required is anyway? Exactly how does the council view the consultation process, is it part of an approval process? Can it be used to stop ideas being taken forward? Can I also request that in examples such as the above, it is made perfectly clear when requesting opinions that "funding has already been signed off, it is going ahead"?

Councillor Nick McDonald responded, in writing, as follows:

The Station Street project was included in the City Council's refreshed capital programme approved at the February 2015 Executive Board meeting. Following further development of the proposals to confirm funding and likely costs a delegated Leader decision was approved on the 12th May 2015. This agreed to commence transport infrastructure improvement works for a new high quality public space on Station Street adjacent to the Station and re-arrange traffic management, to approve funding from:

- Creative Quarter Public Realm schemes funded by the City Deal
- European Regional Development Fund grant
- Contributions from the Nottingham Station Hub scheme highway improvement allocation
- Local Growth Fund Turning Point South / Broadmarsh allocation (subject to D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership confirmation)
- Approval to use the Councils in house contractors to undertake works

The approval therefore fulfils the City Councils approval procedures for implementing Capital funded schemes.

The detail design of the scheme and traffic orders are subject to consultation which is currently being undertaken in accordance with statutory procedures for the Traffic Regulation Orders proposed and will continue with the development of the detail design / layout for the works.

It would be unusual to undertake consultation, detailed design and make changes to traffic regulation orders in advance of approvals for the project to commence and for the necessary funding required. I hope this clarifies the process and confirms the current status of the consultation process for the Station Street proposals.

Petitions from councillors on behalf of citizens

Three petitions were presented to Council. Councillor Steve Battlemuch presented a petition from the residents of Chalcote Drive in Wollaton, requesting effective resurfacing of road and pavements to ensure safety to all, and a petition from the residents of Ringwood Crescent in Wollaton, requesting a residents parking scheme for the street. Councillor Jon Collins presented a petition from residents of the Victoria Centre flats, requesting increased security, such as fob entry, at the entrance to the Victoria Centre flats from Clinton Street.

20 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 18 MAY 2015

Subject to the inclusion of Conservative Councillors objections to the reduction in the number of Council meetings to be held this municipal year, the minutes of the meeting held on 18 May 2015 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Lord Mayor.

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

The Deputy Chief Executive reported the recent death of Brian Loughbrough, who passed away on 13 May 2015, after a long illness. Brian worked for the City Council from 1972 to 1992 when he retired as the City Council's Arts Director. Before his appointment with Nottingham, notable achievements included his establishment of the Museum of Lincolnshire Life and initiating the refurbishment of Papplewick Pumping Station. He carried these interests, and achievements, into his new role by improving the City Council's museums' service, gaining it recognition at regional and national level, whilst also developing a vibrant arts programme for the City. Following his retirement, and until his illness, he remained involved with museums at a national level, in an advisory capacity, but still found time for engagement in local activities with the Thoroton Society and Beeston and District Civic Society.

A minute's silence was held.

22 COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS

Student Maintenance Grants

Councillor Josh Cook asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Schools:

As a ward councillor representing a large campus of Nottingham Trent university I was extremely disappointed to see the chancellor scrap grants for those students from poorer families in favour of a loan based system. It also seems that the chancellor gave the green light for further tuition fee rises in years to come. Does the portfolio holder agree with me that this step will not promote aspiration and in fact places a further debt burden on people who attend universities; for most of their working life?

Councillor Sam Webster replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Cook for his question, and welcome his first contribution in this chamber since his deserved Labour gain in Clifton North, Wilford and Silverdale. Who can blame voters in Clifton North for the choice they made, with Tory policies like this one? A policy that will hit hard our young people in Nottingham from families without the financial means to be able to fund a university education. A policy that targets young people with lower paid parents. A policy that discriminates on the grounds of wealth.

So what do the changes to student finance announced by the Chancellor in the so-called Summer Budget last week actually mean? Well, from September 2016, the student maintenance grant that did not need to be paid back will be scrapped. A young person from a lower earning family living at home was entitled to a grant of around £4,500 per year. However, this will no longer be available, there will be no additional financial support for students from lower earning families, other than additional loans, loans that need to be paid back.

To set the context further, graduates are currently leaving University with an average of £44,000 worth of debt. The debt is accrued to pay tuition fees of £9,000 per year, and to support living costs for the duration of the degree course. This was just one of many measures in the Chancellor's budget that targets lower earning families. It is part of a con-trick that fails to tackle inequality, in fact it embeds inequality. The scrapping of student maintenance grants is a bad policy. It creates a perverse disincentive to young people from poorer backgrounds.

It doesn't equalise student funding, it says to young people "if you're from a low earning family, you'll have to borrow more money to fund your education. You'll have a bigger debt than other students when you graduate, and you'll pay what is effectively a 9% graduate tax for the first 30 years of your working life. You'll therefore have less money in your pocket during your working life than a graduate with the same income who was in part subsidised by their parents". A clear message to young people then, from George Osborne, if you start out poor and you want a University education, you'll be punished financially.

Although it's true to say that everyone pays back at the same rate, the fact is that poorer students will now be forced to borrow more, and therefore most will have no chance of clearing their debt. Student loans also attract interest of up to 3% on top of inflation. A student without financial support from their family might be borrowing over £60,000. A student with financial support from their family might have no borrowing, or if they're covering tuition fees only; a £27,000 debt might be owed. So it's effectively a graduate tax, but as I've said, it's also a tax that embeds inequality. If you started out poor, you'll owe more, and you'll pay more back over a longer period.

Only the Tories could bring in a policy that sees the poorest students subsidising education costs for the wealthy. We've heard again this morning from the Confederation of British Industry about a skills crisis, especially relating to higher skills. For cities like Nottingham, where we have lower rates of young people choosing to study at degree level, this policy is not likely to attract more new entrants from poorer families. In fact, it will deter them. Councillor Cook also rightly points out in his question that the end of the maintenance grant is part of a double whammy, with student fees due to rise in line with inflation from the current £9,000 per year.

The overall level of student debt is concerning. As a society, we're making life very difficult for young people, and this government is continuing its attack on the young. Graduates trying to meet housing, transport, and other living costs, as well as the costs associated with raising their own families in time, will bear an additional tax burden for up to 30 years. The policy flies in the face of the so-called low tax economy the Tories say they seek. If you want a university education, that will be a 9% income tax hike, thank you very much.

So to be clear, I deplore any measures which restrict university access to students from poorer families: both raising debt levels and dampening aspiration do this. I therefore agree with my colleague, and I strongly urge the government to reconsider.

Midland Mainline Electrification

Councillor Michael Edwards asked the following question of the Leader:

How quickly can the Midland Mainline be electrified given the announcement by the government?

Councillor Jon Collins replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Edwards for his question. The speech given by the Secretary of State on the 25 of June stated that the electrification of the Great Western line is a top priority, and that as a result the electrification of the Midland Mainline route, together with a number of other rail schemes, would be paused. While other improvements to the line delivering incremental reductions in journey times will still be implemented, the news that the electrification was being paused was very unwelcome, and certainly not received well by Councils and business across the region.

Interestingly, while a number of rail schemes in the North and Midlands have been put on hold to pay for the Great Western line overspend, projects in and around London look set to continue as planned. Once again, and despite the Secretary of State for Transport being an East Midlands MP, anywhere north of London appears to have lost out in the competition for priority in funding.

Furthermore, there is more than a suspicion that this was an announcement that was made inevitable by the cost overruns from Great Western, but was indeed held over until after the election, allowing local Tory MPs and candidates to boast of infrastructure investment that the Secretary of State knew wouldn't be made.

Ministers and Network Rail have said that electrification will remain part of future plans for the route, but when and where in relation to other paused projects it sits, remains to be seen.

Network Rail has stated that they will develop proposals for re-planning their programme of projects over the next few months. The Secretary of State has appointed Sir Peter Hendy as the new Chairman of Network Rail, who has himself committed to bringing forward proposals by Autumn 2015.

Given that electrification was to be delivered during Control Period 5, it would seem likely that the pause will result in electrification being moved into Control Period 6, so being specific, that means instead of being undertaken between 2017 and 2019, it's likely that construction, if it goes ahead, if it's paused rather than cancelled, won't take place now until between 2019 and 2024.

Independent Living Fund

Councillor Steve Battlemuch asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Adults, Health and Community Sector:

Now that the Nottingham based Independent Living Fund has been closed by the government, much to the disappointment of the service users, can the portfolio holder confirm if the council has received the full amount of funding to cover the cost outlay of benefits and if this has been guaranteed for future years and ring fenced?

Councillor Alex Norris replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and I thank Councillor Battlemuch for his question. Councillor Battlemuch's question is in 3 parts: whether we as a City have received the full amount of money, whether it's been guaranteed for future years, and whether there's a ring-fence that's been put around to safeguard that money. And the answers to those questions when I was working on this reply this morning, were "no, no, and no". But actually, I've had a little bit of information within the last hour, because this is the way things work, that there might be some good news, and I'll share that with you shortly.

Just briefly, it bears explaining what the Independent Living Fund is and what it existed for over the last 30 years. It's a pot of money that people with disabilities and long-term conditions can bid into, so that they didn't need to go into long term residential care to meet their needs, and instead could live at home independently. And that's something that certainly across the political spectrum in this country over 10 years or more has been a consensus point; that we believe that people ought to have choice in how they're looked after. We also believe they should be able to live in their own home if that's what they choose to do. We know that we think that's the right thing, that's what we would all wish under those circumstances. But also, we think that there is an economic case for not putting people into costly placements over very long periods of time, unless that's something that we really have to do. So that's why the fund exists. Regrettably, as we've seen very often from this government, they've closed the fund down and members will recall this across various other different policy strands, and they've given the responsibility to us as a city.

But of course the original indications were that we would not be receiving the full money, instead we'd get 95% of it, they would take a haircut; passport the demand to us, but not give us the money to meet that need. The 5% off the top was due to what they called "attrition" in the fund. Now of course, anyone who has listened to me talk over the last couple of years about the needs of our population, certainly around vulnerable adults, thankfully and very gladly, due to advances in medical sciences, we have a growth in our population of vulnerable adults, because they are living longer. That's a wonderful thing. So as a result, it is impossible, absolutely unthinkable, to project attrition in this fund. So to deduct money from it is a bare-faced pick-pocket of people who really need it.

You've seen just how strong the feeling is for this, you've seen from 30 June, the incredible striking scenes of a demonstration at the House of Commons, just how much this means to people. So I certainly believed that this morning to be a "no", however, and I will share this with the chamber because I think it's important in the interest of full disclosure, we actually received this morning the first payment for the first 6 months of this fund. We're on 13 July, quite what they expected we were doing for the past 2 weeks, I don't know, but we've operated for 2 weeks without knowing how much we might get, despite needing to meet need. But actually the money we've got has been consistent with the full amount. So we're optimistic, but maybe over the second half of the year is where the haircut comes out. But currently, as it stands, it is the same amount of money, so possibly some light at the end of the tunnel. Possibly. And I say this with a slight element of surprise in my voice, because it happens so infrequently! Maybe actually someone listened, and maybe someone took the time to say "that decision we made, clearly people feel very strongly about this, have we got this right?" So, we can only hope, and we will continue to push for that.

With regards to future guarantees: there are none. Instead, and again this is wording that you will recognise from Supporting People and all other sorts of grants that have disappeared over the last 5 years, no ring-fence either, as it will simply be rolled into our main budget, for us to make local decisions with, which is fine, but what we know and what we've seen happen time after time, is that it's starts in the first year it's given to you, then it's rolled into your budget in year 2 and they point to where it is, and then by year 3 it's like sand tossed onto a beach. It's mixed and it's merged and it's not clear anymore. And actually, all we're clear about when we set a budget in the New Year is that our budgets have gone down considerably, and that there's no sense of protection for that money, and actually that our money to meet the needs of vulnerable adults and of older people will have diminished. That is of great concern to us.

What I can say though, in the short term, we've assessed all of the 50+ people who called on this fund, we've assessed their need. Some of their need has escalated, some needs have decreased, some have stayed the same. So I can assure that at the moment and for this financial year we will be able to meet need. What happens in the future is less clear, and will be subject to what the government does with our settlements.

Welfare Cuts

Councillor Wendy Smith asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Could the Deputy Leader comment on how the forthcoming welfare cuts are likely to affect Nottingham citizens and what we as a council can do to support them?

Councillor Graham Chapman replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor and can I thank Councillor Smith for the question. There's an age old saying about the budget: The more accolades it receives in the first 24 hours, the less successful it will be. And of course, vice versa. This budget has had a great deal of praise from parts of the Conservative media in the first 24 hours. It is interesting that it has been the political commentators in the self-same media who have got the most excited. It is equally interesting that the economic and financial commentators, the serious pundits, the Economist, the Financial Times, and the Institute of Fiscal Studies, are not in the least bit impressed. Indeed, the Institute of Fiscal Studies is excoriating about the budget. Indeed, the cracks are already appearing, but let's look first at the impact on the city, because that is the nub of the question.

There are 30,100 households claiming either in-work or out of work benefits in Nottingham. These contain, and this is important, 49,000 children. Regardless of the changes to individual benefits, the 4 year benefit freeze will reduce the worth of these benefits in real terms. That's 49,000 children who will be disadvantaged. The annual household benefit cap will reduce to £20,000 for out of work families. Nottingham City Council records show that 150 families from Nottingham are currently subject to that benefits cap, some of them have got people with disabilities in their household. With abolishing Work Related Activity Group Premium and the Education Support Allowance, we estimate that 4,550 disabled people will lose up to £30 per week.

On to tax credits. There are currently 15,600 families in the city who are claiming tax credits, who will be affected by the changes. This could act as a disincentive to finding work.

Young people, who reforms are most likely to affect, particularly 18-21 year olds, will be subject to the removal of automated entitlement to Housing Benefit. God knows what the government has got against the young. We all know of course, that it was them who were responsible for the economic crisis; they probably invested all of their pocket money in dodgy secondary banks! But god knows why they're expected to pay for it. I'll leave that question for the Conservatives to respond to.

In terms of housing, we are likely to see a severe reduction in our ability as a Council to build, and also in the ability of Housing Associations. Some increase in private sector rents are also likely to occur, because of the changes in the treatment of tax discounts for landlords.

In terms of employment, we are likely to see some increases in unemployment in the care sector and in the voluntary sector, because the restrictions on public spending will not compensate for the increase in the minimum wage, which we nevertheless welcome, but it has not been prepared for. It has been another rabbit out of the hat, with people rushing around having to pick up the bits.

So what can the Council do to support vulnerable citizens, which is the second part of the question? The Council will continue to support the vulnerable with a series of measures. These include welfare policy responses, for example the Hardship Support Scheme. I will point out that we are one of the few councils probably still clinging on to the Hardship Support system. Many councils have integrated that system into their mainstream budget. We have kept ours going, and it's been due to good financial management. And I won't take any credit; it's all due to the officers of course. We are also supporting discretionary housing payments, the Council Tax Support Scheme, and the Nottingham Plan to 2020.

For housing strategy, we have a very good homelessness prevention strategy. We are tackling fuel poverty, we are trying to reduce the number of empty homes, and we have a strategy for supporting young people who are homeless: although I can see the number increasing given the fact that they've had their benefits withdrawn.

On to employment and training support. We have an employer hub, we have the highly successful Nottingham Jobs Fair, and the Nottingham Jobs Fund. And of course we have our own apprenticeship scheme. It's as comprehensive as anywhere in the country.

For financial vulnerability and assistance, we have officers developing a more preventative approach, which is increasing access to advice centres and trying to get people into work, and you will hear a lot more in the manifesto discussion later.

So, we will continue to try and provide homes, and we will continue to provide a decent care system for our elderly citizens, as decent as we can with the increasing costs and reduced budgets. But there will be damage to the lives of many of our citizens, to many of the most vulnerable, particularly the children. And actually, much of the burden will be transferred from the well off southern taxpayers, to northern local council taxpayers. And that is a fact: a transfer of responsibilities from the south to the citizens of this city.

But there is a bigger picture still that affects this city. This budget has no strategy. It's not just me saying it, it's the Financial Times, it's the Economist, it is the Institute of Fiscal Studies, and it is a number of independent commentators. It is a bag of mixed messages, contradictions, and unintended consequences. And I'll detail that in 3 areas, housing, work and productivity.

Housing. After 5 years of coalition government, which was going to release the private sector to build homes, the annual new builds in this country is 140,000, an all-time low. And that's after 5 years of promises and rhetoric. We are now told the solution is relaxing planning on brownfield sites. This is an Aunt Sally. The reason why most brownfield sites have not been developed is nothing to do with planning permission, it is to do with decontamination and infrastructure costs. Most councils want their brownfield sites developed, and most of them would be very happy to have them developed for housing. Moreover, this is in the same week as the Chancellor undermined council and Housing Association house building with an arbitrary rent reduction, and 2 weeks after the announcement of Right to Buy for Housing Association tenants. The combination of this could lead to Housing Associations in this city going out of business. Finally, there was a reduction in tax allowances for buy-to-let, which may take pressure off new builds. It may well actually take pressure

off. I don't disagree with this approach, but the impact and the unintended consequences could take more pressure off. All this, in my view, will lead to a reduction in the house building programme. It will create chaos in the social rented sector. It will create an increase in rents, and it will, paradoxically, create an increase in benefits paid out to the private sector for renting. This is paradoxical, this is one of those unintended consequences. Jon thinks it's intended, in that case I also ask, what is going on?

Then we've got getting into work. We are told that the Tory party is the party of working people. Well one important fact: the rise in the minimum wage will cost £4 billion nationally. The loss in tax credits is £8 billion. That's a £4 billion gap, it stares you in the face; there will be a £4 billion loss to working people in this country. It is an attack on those in work. Moreover, reducing the income threshold from £6,450 to £3,820 for Working Tax Credits is a disincentive to getting into work, but it's also in parallel with a reduced taper for benefits withdrawal once in work proposed under Universal Credit. There is also a failure to provide the care system and voluntary organisations with funding sufficient to cover the cost of increasing minimum wage is likely to lead to redundancies. If you combine that with part time working, zero hour contracts, endemically low wages across a wide range of sectors, and now the loss of Working Tax Credits, we have managed to get ourselves into a position where work has ceased for the first time since the 1960s to be a way out of poverty.

Finally, I want to mention productivity. We are told there are 2 budgets: 1 fiscal and the other economic. We had plenty of discussion earlier on about the fact that this budget is not a budget for productivity, housing is not the way through. The way through, as people have said, is very candidly to do with infrastructure, it is to do with skills, and it is to do with SMEs (small and medium enterprises). There is nothing here for any of those. That is the failure of the budget. I think I've reached my full time, I did have something a bit more exciting to say, but I'm afraid you're going to be deprived of it! Thank you.

Tram Line 2 Opening

Councillor Andrew Rule asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Jobs, Growth and Transport:

I'm sure the portfolio holder will join me in welcoming the completion of the urban section of the A453. The work on the A453 coupled with the construction of phase two of the tram has caused particular disruption to the residents of Clifton North ward and, whilst I do not expect the portfolio holder to be able to provide a concrete date for completion of the tram works, would he at least give a definitive time-frame from the contractors under which they anticipate completing the works? Does he share my opinion that in the event that phase two is completed ahead of phase three, it should be operational from that point, rather than waiting for the completion of phase three and opening both services together, in order that residents of Clifton North can begin to use the service?

Councillor Nick McDonald replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Rule for his question, and welcome him to the Council, and congratulate him on his maiden question. The

question is well put. Can I firstly say that yes of course we all welcome the re-opening of the A453, although as Councillor Rule correctly implied with his question, the urban section may now be open, but the longer section out to the M1 is still subject to restrictions, and they're expected to be in place for some time. This is a road that people in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire have been waiting to see developed for a very long time; so of course, we should all be delighted to see it near completion.

Infrastructure of this nature makes an enormous contribution to the growth of regions. Whilst we're all delighted to see the A453 completed, I would hope that Councillor Rule will join me and others who have spoken today in lamenting the somewhat cynical decision of government to suspend electrification of the Midland Mainline immediately after a general election. If this government truly wants to see a national recovery that stimulates growth and ensures that growth is felt across the regions of the UK, and not just in the South East, it is projects like this that will ensure that growth is generated. Too often the East Midlands loses out, and that needs to change.

Councillor Rule also asks about the tram, which of course has been a major source of jobs and regeneration, is transforming the economy of the city, and transforming the transport system. Whilst this is an issue more correctly within the purview of my colleague Councillor Urquhart, but since I am on my feet I will make a few comments about it. In terms of the timeline for completion, in recent weeks the tram contractor Taylor Woodrow Alstom has been finishing construction activity on the new tram lines to Clifton and Chilwell, to allow the new infrastructure to be subjected to a comprehensive testing and commissioning programme. It's fundamental that that happens, and that it happens properly. In parallel to this, the tram operator is preparing for the start of passenger services by training staff to use the new equipment, particularly at the tram depot in Hyson Green, which has been expanded and is now fully upgraded. Tram drivers have also been driving trams along the new lines to familiarise themselves with the new routes, to establish the safest and most appropriate ways to drive in varied locations, and to allow the public to become familiar with the trams in their neighbourhoods. Again, it's fundamental that that happens and that it happens properly.

This is expected to be completed later this month, when the final stage of testing will take place. This last stage will include a trial period, during which proposed services timetables will be operated. Once all parties are happy that it's running efficiently and effectively, and there is full confidence that the same levels of exceptional reliability enjoyed by passengers on line 1 will also be delivered on the new lines, the expanded network will be open for public service. A precise date cannot yet be publicised, but it is clear that we are now nearly there.

It is expected that the above activity will be completed in an integrated manner across both new lines. That is the right thing to do. The 2 new lines are being developed together, and much of the work that needs to be done on testing is best done across those 2 lines. It is therefore extremely unlikely that one line will be available to be open to the public before the other, nor would that be a good idea.

I will just make a final point on this. I think we're all aware that the tram project is a number of months behind. Now that is not unusual, these are highly complex projects. I don't know if people are aware of the tram construction project in

Edinburgh that was almost 6 years delayed. There is another important point though. This project was very strategically, very deliberately, put in the hands of the private sector to deliver, at the risk of the contractors. Now the reason it was set up like that by government is firstly, so that there is no cost to the public from any delay, and secondly, so that the private sector can deliver that project in a way that is not constrained by the public sector. Now that does not mean we've not been putting immense amounts of pressure on the contractors, of course we have. The contractual levers that we have, by design by government, are not contractual levers that allow us to speed the project up significantly. I think, however, we're all delighted that it's going to be open very soon, and I would finally just say that this is going to have a transformational effect on the city when it is completed. I think that when it is completed and when it is open, then we'll all recognise what an important thing it is for the city, and also that the very brave decisions that we took as a council to make it happen, to fund it, are decisions that were worth taking.

Enviroenergy Debt

Councillor Jim Armstrong asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability:

In the interests of transparency would the leader of the council confirm that Enviroenergy accrued an £18m debt? Could he also explain how this debt was accrued in the first place? What does this debt stand at now and how is this debt being repaid?

Councillor Alan Clark replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Armstrong for his question. Enviroenergy has had a challenging history as a council owned company, and by 2013, a substantial debt was accumulated. It should be noted that this was directly as a result of the company being unable to pay the city council for the supply of steam from the Eastcroft incinerator for the period 2002 through to 2012. The debt position as of 31 March 2015 is £15,086,000.

The company position and financial status are subject to review. In 2013 the staffing arrangements were transferred to the city, under service level agreements to serve the company. Under new management arrangements, improvements in the company's financial performance have been made for the company, resulting in an improved financial outturn position for 2014/15. This improved financial performance now facilitates for all steam consumed to be paid for by the company, and importantly, to commit to a robust repayment schedule for the debt in entirety by 2030. The repayment schedule will also enable the company to meet the council's medium term financial plan contributions.

The business planning process for Enviroenergy strives for continual improvement in order to secure the future of this green company, serving over 4,000 city homes, and in turn actively supporting the fuel poverty agenda for Nottingham. The progress made has not only secured local work provision, but provided employment opportunities, including the provision of an apprenticeship scheme.

There is an unprecedented amount of opportunity ahead. Building on the strong foundations of Enviroenergy for a successful future, whilst still delivering a stable financial position for the city council.

Pedestrian Crossing Safety

Councillor Georgina Culley asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Jobs, Growth and Transport:

Will the portfolio holder confirm what action he has taken regarding the pedestrian crossing at the junction of Canal Street with Carrington Street which, according to latest figures from the Department for Transport, is one of the deadliest crossings in the country?

Councillor Nick McDonald replied as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Culley for a very interesting question. In answering that question, I think I ought to clarify where Councillor Culley got these figures from, because they aren't Department for Transport figures at all. It does make one wonder where these figures could possibly have been found. Well, perhaps I can assist with that.

Councillor Culley's question is in fact based on a story that appeared in the Mail Online website on 2 June this year, which claimed that the crossing at Canal Street and Carrington Street in Nottingham had seen 8 deaths between 1999 and 2010. It was not based on latest figures, it purported to be from Department for Transport figures from 2011. However, fortunately, or perhaps unfortunately, if your only aim is to use a sensationalised and inaccurate story to take a cheap shot, these figures aren't accurate. In fact they're far from accurate. Our own figures show that there has only been 1 death at this location, which pre-dated the statistics quoted in the Daily Mail article, as it occurred in 1995.

1 death, albeit 20 years ago, is 1 death too many. But it is clearly a far cry from the 8 deaths inaccurately reported in the Daily Mail. We therefore queried the story with the Daily Mail when it was published. We were told that the article was based on copy submitted by a South West news agency, although the article purports to be based on 1 from 2011 carried out by the BBC. In fact the Daily Mail explained that the South West news agency used local newspaper coverage to base the figure of 8 deaths on. The Nottingham Post, however, has absolutely no record of this, presumably because our own road safety statistics don't support it. In fact, the BBC reports from 2011 when the data was first published, confirm that there were no deaths on this junction in that period. Our Media team therefore made the point to the Daily Mail that describing it as "Britain's deadliest junction", and claiming that there had been 8 deaths over the period was inaccurate, and they asked for it to be removed. The Daily Mail said it had been published in good faith, but they did remove it, and it never appeared in their newspaper.

The story is, in short, a load of rubbish. Had Councillor Culley made even minimal effort to check the situation with officers, which presumably she would have done if she had any actual genuine concern about the issue, she would have been given the proper facts. But Councillor Culley, you aren't actually interested in properly

investigating issues like this, are you? That would be way too much effort. What you're interested in doing, is trying to find a way to take a cheap shot at the Labour Group in Full Council. You spotted an article in the Daily Mail. The fact that you read a rag like that says a lot. You spotted an article in the Daily Mail, you didn't check it, you didn't raise any concerns with officers, you didn't ask any questions, you just copy and pasted it into a question to Full Council with no further thought. Absolutely abject.

So let me give you some proper facts. As a result of the investments Nottingham City Council has made, the hard work and the expertise that colleagues across the council have put in over the last few years, improving the safety on our roads, educating our children, road safety deaths have reduced by over 60%. That is the difference between the Labour Group in the city, and the Conservative Group. Whilst we're spending time improving safety, reducing the dangers to residents, investing in infrastructure, investing in our city, using not just the council's money, but ingesting our own efforts, our own ideas. Whilst we on the Labour side are doing that, the Tories' only contribution is a nonsense article from the Daily Mail, used to have a go at the city, rather than defending the city. That's why there are 3 of you.

23 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE LEADER ON THE ADOPTION OF THE LABOUR PARTY MANIFESTO AS COUNCIL POLICY

The Leader submitted a report on the adoption of the Labour party manifesto as Council policy, as set out on pages 23 to 40 of the agenda.

Councillor Andrew Rule, Councillor Georgina Culley, and Councillor Jim Armstrong voted against the recommendation, and asked that their votes be recorded.

RESOLVED to adopt the plans in the Nottingham Labour Manifesto 2015 as a basis for Council policies for the current term of office.

24 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE LEADER ON GENERAL AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Leader submitted a report on general amendments to the Constitution, as set out on pages 41 to 146 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to:

- 1) agree the amendments to the terms of reference for the committees listed in Appendix 1 of the report, to reflect the agreed membership of these committees for this municipal year;**
- 2) delegate authority to the City Council members of the Joint City and County Health Scrutiny Committee to make health scrutiny referrals to the Secretary of State in urgent circumstances as outlined in paragraph 5.3 of the report;**
- 3) note that in the light of ongoing significant restructuring processes, a full report on the revised Employment Procedure Rules will be presented to September Council for its agreement;**

- 4) agree to amendments to the Employment Procedure Rules (Part 4) to reflect changes to the political balance of the Council to clarify current appointment processes pending the full revision to the Rules, as per paragraph 5.6 of the report;
- 5) note the new / revised executive delegations as agreed by the Leader of the Council, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report;
- 6) note the scheme of executive delegation to officers, to which the delegations referred to in these recommendations will be added as set out in Appendix 3 of the report;
- 7) note the terms of reference for the Health and Wellbeing Board Commissioning Sub-Committee, as set out in Appendix 4 of the report;
- 8) note an addition to the call-in procedure to ensure compliance with the law relating to political balance, as set out in paragraph 5.11 of the report;
- 9) note that Part 3 of the Constitution (management structure chart) will also be updated to reflect the latest revisions to the Council's officer management structure, as agreed by the Appointments and Conditions of Service Committee.

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

The Leader submitted a report on decision taken under urgency procedures, as set out on pages 147 to 152 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to note the urgent decisions taken as follows:

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

<u>Decision reference number</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
1989	13/05/2015	Third Floor Studio at York House, 15 King Street, Nottingham, NG1 2AY	Exempt	The likely delay would risk the interest in the use of the site.
1991	15/05/2015	Commercial Opportunity for Energy services	Exempt	To avoid delay in submitting the tender.
1992	15/05/2015	Installation of solar panel car park canopy at Harvey Hadden Leisure Centre	Exempt	The meet the narrow window of opportunity for installation.

<u>Decision reference number</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value of decision</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2002	21/05/2015	Approval of the costs of an Adults Care Package	Exempt	The decision was authorised retrospectively and therefore call-in was not appropriate (in accordance with part 4 of the Constitution).
2003	22/05/2015	Nottingham Playhouse Loan	Exempt	To avoid any delay to the loan.
2013	28/05/2015	Approval of the costs of a placement for a child in care	Exempt	To allow for a timely implementation of the decision.
2014	28/05/2015	Approval of the costs of a placement for a child in care	Exempt	To allow for a timely implementation of the decision.
2016	29/05/2015	Nottingham Enterprise Zone - Boots Campus Infrastructure Works	£7,000,000	To allow for a timely implementation of the decision.
2021	05/06/2015	Provision of Solar Panels to a Commercial Building on Dakeyne Street	Exempt	To meet the narrow window of opportunity to undertake the necessary work.
2025	09/06/2015	Proposed Museum Acquisition	£27,000	Any delay would likely prejudice the Council's interest.
2035	18/06/2015	Capital Maintenance grant allocations for 2015/16	£1,603,238	To avoid a delay in the placing of necessary orders.
2041	24/06/2015	D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Growing Places Fund Loan Approvals	£600,000	To avoid delays in the commencement of the project
2052	01/07/2015	Property Investment Acquisition	Exempt	To ensure acquisition can be completed quickly

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>
13/05/2015	Station Street Pedestrian Priority and Traffic Management Scheme - Approval of Funding and Phasing - Key Decision	£1,375,000	Leader of the City Council	The Council needs to access allocated European and Central Government funding within allotted timescales (end of November 2015 for ERDF and end of March 2016 for Local Growth Fund) and there is now not an Executive Board meeting until June, by which time there would not be enough time for consultation and scheme development.
15/05/2015	Commercial Opportunity for Energy Services	Exempt	Leader of the City Council	The decision is urgent and cannot be deferred due to the deadlines for submitting tenders.
29/05/2015	Boots Campus Infrastructure Works	£7,000,000	Leader of the City Council	The contract needs to be signed before the valuation of the preferred supplier expires at the end of May.
18/06/2015	Capital maintenance Grant Applications for 2015/16	£1,603,238	Leader of the City Council	In order to deliver the programme of works, orders must be placed as a matter of urgency to prevent schools being at risk of closure through health and safety or condition issues.
01/07/2015	Property Investment Acquisition	Exempt	Leader of the City Council	The decision needs to be taken before the next scheduled meeting of Executive Board.

26 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF LICENSING COMMITTEE ON THE REVIEW OF STATEMENT OF GAMBLING POLICY

The Chair of the Licensing Committee submitted a report on the review of statement of gambling policy, as set out on pages 153 to 196 of the agenda.

RESOLVED to:

- 1) approve the attached Draft Statement of Gambling Policy 2016-2019 for release for consultation purposes.**
- 2) retain the 'no casino' resolution and have this matter form part of the consultation.**

27 TO CONSIDER A REPORT OF THE CHAIR OF OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE ON THE OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2014-15

Councillor Parbutt submitted a report on the Overview and Scrutiny annual report 2014-15, as set out on pages 197 to 210 of the agenda.

Councillor Andrew Rule, Councillor Georgina Culley, and Councillor Jim Armstrong voted against the recommendations, and asked that their votes be recorded.

RESOLVED to accept the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report for 2014-15

28 TO CONSIDER CHANGING THE DATE OF THE MARCH 2016 MEETING OF COUNCIL FROM MONDAY 14 MARCH 2016 TO MONDAY 7 MARCH 2016

RESOLVED to change the date of the March 2016 meeting from Monday 14 March 2016 to Monday 7 March 2016

29 COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP

RESOLVED to note the committee membership changes, as below:

- 1) Joint Committee on Strategic Planning and Transport – Councillor Nick McDonald to replace Councillor Toby Neal. Councillor Toby Neal to be added to the list of substitutes.**
- 2) Overview and Scrutiny Call-In Panel – Councillor Andrew Rule to be appointed to a vacant position on the Panel.**
- 3) Health Scrutiny – Councillor Merlita Bryan to replace Councillor Brian Parbutt.**
- 4) Joint Health Scrutiny – Councillor Ilyas Aziz to replace Councillor Brian Parbutt.**
- 5) City Centre Forum – Councillor Dave Liversidge to replace Councillor Cat Arnold. Councillor Cat Arnold to be added to the list of substitutes. Councillor Merlita Bryan to be appointed to a vacant position on the Forum.**