

## MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL

held at the Council Chamber - at the Council House

on 16 January 2017 from 14.00 – 17.02

### ATTENDANCES:

---

✓ Councillor Mohammed Saghir (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 Jackie Morris
✓ Councillor Azad Choudhry	✓ Councillor Toby Neal
✓ Councillor Alan Clark	✓ Councillor Alex Norris
✓ Councillor Jon Collins	✓ Councillor Brian Parbutt
Councillor Josh Cook	✓ Councillor Anne Peach
✓ Councillor Georgina Culley	✓ Councillor Sarah Piper
✓ Councillor Michael Edwards	✓ Councillor Andrew Rule
Councillor Pat Ferguson	✓ Councillor David Smith
✓ Councillor Brian Grocock	Councillor Wendy Smith
✓ Councillor Chris Gibson	✓ Councillor Chris Tansley
✓ Councillor John Hartshorne	✓ Councillor Dave Trimble
✓ Councillor Rosemary Healy	✓ Councillor Jane Urquhart
✓ Councillor Nicola Heaton	✓ Councillor Marcia Watson
✓ Councillor Mohammed Ibrahim	✓ Councillor Sam Webster
✓ Councillor Patience Uloma Ifediora	Councillor Michael Wildgust
✓ Councillor Corall Jenkins	✓ Councillor Malcolm Wood
✓ Councillor Glyn Jenkins	✓ Councillor Linda Woodings
✓ Councillor Sue Johnson	Councillor Steve Young

✓ Indicates present at meeting

## **60 ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Council agreed to vary the order of Council business, in accordance with Standing Orders, and debate the motion in the name of Councillor Alex Norris prior to the report on the Declaration on Alcohol.

## **61 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Councillor Liaqat Ali – personal  
Councillor Alex Ball – personal  
Councillor Josh Cook – personal  
Councillor Nick McDonald – personal  
Councillor Pat Ferguson – personal  
Councillor Wendy Smith – personal  
Councillor Mick Wildgust – personal  
Councillor Steve Young – personal

## **62 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS**

None.

## **63 QUESTIONS FROM CITIZENS**

Mr I.L. asked the following question of the Leader:

It seems that the Urgent Decision procedure is used rather a lot for decisions that, on the face of them, are not urgent. Examples from recent months:

1. 'Procurement for a Cafe/Bar & Event Catering Management Concessionaire at The Nottingham Theatre Royal and Concert Hall' 'Urgent decision required in order to maximise the income to the Council.' You could make almost any decision about an income-generating service urgent in that way. It does not mean that the decision is urgent.
2. 'Property Investment Acquisition – Project Highland' 'To allow for a timely purchase.' Similar to (1). This is a tautology - performing something urgently makes it timely almost by definition.
3. 'Approval of procurement of electricity supply for Nottingham City Council' 'To enable an immediate tender to be placed.' This one was £24,000,000 (over several years). I appreciate this is a tender and not money being immediately spent, but how can such a significant deal be undertaken without the opportunity for political input - even on the framework?
4. 'Island Site - consultancy fees to support CPO business case' 'To bring forward development of the site', that is no reason for urgency. There are millions upon millions of council funds being authorised to be spent under this procedure. It seems that there is a serious lack of accountability inherent in the Urgent Decision procedure.

Does the Councillor agree that the procedure is undemocratic and is allowing too much money to be spent without proper oversight? Will the Council please strengthen the requirements for undertaking decisions under the procedure? Will the Council further require the decision taker to submit much more detailed information to Full Council meetings, in order to allow councillors to scrutinise the decisions of portfolio holders? Will the Council finally consider establishing a post-facto review process for Urgent Decisions, including a role for citizens, which provides for the possibility of censuring portfolio holders who sidestep proper expenditure procedures?

Councillor Jon Collins responded as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. Nottingham City Council, like other major local authorities, has faced unprecedented government funding cuts over the past 5 years, creating significant pressures on budgets and services. In response we've taken an increasingly proactive and commercial approach to generating additional income. This does mean however, that a number of decisions, many of which relate to land and property management, have to be taken quickly and often within externally imposed timescales.

Every decision authorised by the Council is robustly checked to ensure that it is both financially viable and in line with all legal and constitutional requirements.

All non-exempt Executive decisions over £25,000 are published and made available at Loxley House for public inspection. The call-in procedure applies to all Executive Portfolio Holder decisions, and any Executive Officer decision with a value of £50,000.00 and above. The call-in procedure is also applicable to urgent decisions, but can be circumvented where delay is likely to seriously prejudice the Council or the public interests.

Nevertheless, it is important that even these urgent decisions are subject to appropriate challenge and scrutiny. That's why before a decision can be considered and taken as urgent, the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee must agree both that the decision proposed is reasonable and that given the circumstances should be exempt from the usual procedures.

Overall, I believe that the current arrangements strike a reasonable balance between the need to take timely decisions in an increasingly commercial environment, and remain accountable to the electorate for the use of local government powers and the use of public money. I do not, therefore, believe the current system is undemocratic but I am happy to accept that there may be ways of improving this aspect of the Council's work, and to ask that these procedures be reviewed.

#### **64 PETITIONS FROM COUNCILLORS ON BEHALF OF CITIZENS**

None.

#### **65 TO CONFIRM THE MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 14 NOVEMBER 2016**

The minutes of the meeting held on 14 November 2016 were confirmed and signed as a true record by the Lord Mayor.

## **66 OFFICIAL COMMUNICATIONS**

The Deputy Chief Executive reported the following:

The GMB Nottingham Panthers Ice Hockey Club made history last night in Italy when they became the first British Team to win the Continental Cup, winning all their games in the 'round robin' event against teams from Denmark, Kazakhstan and Italy, and having won through 2 previous 'round robin' events in Spain and Denmark to reach the finals. This is a major milestone for British ice hockey with the Panthers, again, leading the way.

In November of last year, The Palmer Court development in Lenton was awarded the title of 'Best Social or Affordable New Housing Development' at the grand Final of the Local Authority Building Control Building Excellence Awards. A panel of industry experts judged a list of the highest quality projects from around England and Wales, rewarding the best in technical, innovation, sustainability and design.

Carol Norman, Headteacher from Welbeck Primary School in the Meadows and Chris Cook, who has chaired the Nottingham City Safeguarding Children Board since 2015, have both been awarded the OBE in the Queen's Honours List.

PC Sam Flint, Nottinghamshire Police's dedicated Children in Care officer who works in partnership with the Council has received a British Empire Medal. PC Flint started as the Children in Care Police officer 12 years ago when a pilot was launched to help prevent young people in care from committing crime. Rosalind Taylor, former Headteacher at Middleton Primary School, has also received a British Empire Medal, having volunteered as an Eco-Schools Green Flag Award Volunteer for over 10 years.

Marcellus Baz has also been awarded a British Empire Medal. In December last year, Marcellus also won the prestigious BBC Get Inspired Unsung Hero award at the 2016 Sports Personality of Year recognising the positive impact his Nottingham School of Boxing has had on young people in Nottingham.

Finally, it is with sadness that I report to Council the passing of Mr Inder Lal Batra. Mr Batra was a prominent and well respected Board member on the Nottingham Asian Arts Association and Chair of the Indian Community Centre for many years. Throughout the 70s, 80s and 90s, he served as Chair of the African Caribbean and Asian Forum, Nottingham and District Race Equality Council and the Indian Community Centre.

Councillor Toby Neal and the Lord Mayor spoke in tribute to Mr Inder Lal Batra and a minute's silence was held.

Councillor Georgina Culley noted that 16 January marks Martin Luther King Day and requested that it be noted by Council.

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

None.

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

Councillor Georgina Culley asked the following question of the Leader:

Does the Leader of the Council believe it is acceptable for a councillor to be suspended during a 6 month investigation for anti-Semitic comments with no action taken and for the councillor to be allowed to keep their allowances for the entire period?

Councillor Jon Collins responded as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor. The law on such matters is set nationally and is very clear. All councillors elected in May 2015 hold office for a four year term unless they become subject to one of the statutory disqualifications. Legally, the suspension of a councillor from their membership of a political party or political group is irrelevant to their ongoing status as a councillor and therefore, whether or not allowances are paid. Since no city councillor has met the criteria that would lead to disqualification, the law is clear that council allowances remain payable regardless of my views or those of the Council.

Having said that, personally I take the view that there should be a clear minimum expectation for the amount of work undertaken by councillors, and that failure to meet that without good cause should impact on the payment of allowances. Lord Mayor, notwithstanding this, the evidence shows that Nottingham Labour councillors work hard for their local communities and in general work harder than do Conservative councillors. For example, Labour Councillors on average deal with 12 times more cases and have a 10% better meeting attendance record than Conservative councillors.

Indeed, if we're talking specifics, just a few years ago a member of the very small political group Councillor Culley leads, managed in a full year just 2 minutes out of 6 Health Scrutiny meetings, 6 minutes of 6 Trusts and Charities meetings, and only 1 out of 6 Area Committees. That was a Conservative councillor who during that whole year, remained a Conservative councillor, Conservative party member, Conservative group member, and presumably subject to Conservative group discipline, but apparently Councillor Culley did nothing about it.

Lord Mayor, sadly the law, I'll re-iterate, is clear on these matters. Regardless of what any of us think, Councillors are elected as individuals, and as such unless they breach the statutory criteria, they are ultimately accountable to the electorate alone for how they do their job.

---

Councillor Jim Armstrong asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

Bearing in mind the 63 staff cuts the Council is currently proposing to make, how much funding, if any, has the Council provided to trade unions in the form of facility time over the last three years?

Councillor Graham Chapman responded as follows:

The answer is £388,000 in 2013/14, £317,000 in 2014/15 and £324,000 in 2015/16. So, it has actually gone down. It represented 0.2% of the wage bill of £164,000,000 in 2015/16.

When I first received this question, my reaction was one of déjà-vu. The Conservative group roll this out annually, obviously by definition, every year. Every year they get the same response and every year, it is one of the 3 populist measures the Conservative group provide, which normally add up to about £1,000,000, as a way of fixing our billion pound budget.

Usually, when asked the question, we provide a coherent, but often quite abstract argument about the great use of the Council of permanent union representatives. The reason we continue to support full-time union representation is that we have to deal, day in, day out, with HR issues, and we know how much easier it is to deal with things collectively through informed channels, rather than in a fragmented way through people who have no time to grasp the issues, because they are working on other things. This experience is not something the Conservatives have had for some considerable time, I think since 1987. So, I do understand that they cannot appreciate the necessity of it.

This year however, I was quite pleased to receive this question, because rather than relying on general arguments, we have had a very tangible example of the essential value of full-time trade union representatives. We have just concluded an agreement with the workforce which has provided a good deal for the low paid, allows the Council to compete for services to maintain jobs and maintain those services, as well as provide long term savings. So, it gives us stability, it gives us direction, and it is the envy of many other councils. This deal has been worth and will be worth millions in the long run to the Council.

To illustrate how significant this is, one of the main reasons many other councils are in difficulty and are having to make far more redundancies than we are in responding to government cuts, is because amongst other things, they have not tackled some of the staffing issues and the increment issues. Yet we have achieved this in Nottingham. We have achieved this because we had people to negotiate with collectively on the union side. It wasn't easy, it was frustrating at times, but we got there. And the hard truth is, without this agreement, there would have been far more job cuts, and far more loss of service, and all you've got to do is look at what's happening with other councils compared with our 60-odd cuts this year. I'll just give you an example of one other major authority that is talking about 1,000 redundancies.

We have avoided this, partly because of the agreements we have made, in the past and currently.

On that basis, I would like to thank the officers from HR who have been responsible for this, because they've done a great deal of very hard work, but actually I'd also like to thank members, because members were instrumental in arriving at this deal. I'd like to thank Councillor Heaton, I'd like to thank Councillor Neal, and I'd like to thank Councillor Liversidge. Not only have they benefitted the current account, we had reserves set aside to some degree in case of future calls on us through union action, and that looks as though it has been suspended. Moreover, there are other councillors in the room, who I will not cite, who were also instrumental in getting us to this deal, which has benefitted virtually everybody.

Finally, I would remind the Conservatives that the art of running a good Council, as with running a good railway company, as with running a good sports warehouse distributor network for that matter, is to work with the staff, with union representatives and not against them. It is the collaborative German model which works, not the confrontational model which the Conservatives seem to favour, and which in the end does not work.

---

Councillor Andrew Rule asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Energy and Sustainability:

Could the Portfolio Holder provide an update on the progress of Robin Hood Energy?

Councillor Alan Clark responded as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and I thank Cllr Rule for his question. Robin Hood Energy began trading in September 2015 and is wholly owned by Nottingham City Council.

Its biggest successes have been that it has taken 5% of market share in Nottingham, it has set up Pay As You Go (also known as prepayment meters), it has launched a supply service for commercial customers, started installing SMART meters, has become a Feed In Tariff supplier and has built a white label product with one public sector (White Rose Energy) and 2 private sector partners (The Energy Deal and Brighter World).

Robin Hood Energy, perhaps unlike some larger suppliers, has been hitting the national headlines for all the right reasons, challenging other energy suppliers on fairer prices, challenging the industry on making systems easier for customers, and working closely with OFGEM on reaching customers who don't switch supply. Perhaps Councillor Rule saw the Daily Mirror a week last Friday.

Robin Hood Energy is in a period of significant growth, and during 2017/18 we will begin to be considered as a medium-sized supplier in the domestic market. We are currently on a similar trajectory since inception as some of the most successful entrants were at a similar stage in their development.

A talented team is at the heart of this success. We are attracting experts from Coop, OVO, the Big 6 and other small suppliers, with skills that really complement the existing team. The existing staff will transfer to the direct employment of Robin Hood Energy on 1 February 2017 setting up the commercial model that is required for a company within this market. So, there is a busy year ahead, but we are in a really strong position in the retail energy sector.

---

Councillor Andrew Rule asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing:

Could the Portfolio Holder provide an overview on the terms of reference for consultation process being undertaken in respect of the City Council's plans for selective licencing?

Councillor Jane Urquhart responded as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and thank you so very much Councillor Rule, I really am genuinely pleased to be able to answer this question today. I suspect, as with Councillor Clark's question just now, that there will be a supplementary question which is actually the question that you really want the answer to, but you perhaps decided not to ask it on the formal Council paper, because maybe it's something that you don't want to be on the Council agenda. I don't know, we'll wait and see. People may be wondering why I would be so pleased to answer an opposition question. Well, it's because today is the first day of the consultation that Councillor Rule refers to and so on the very day that we begin this extensive 11 week consultation, it's really good to be given the opportunity to remind both Councillor Rule, his colleagues, and any other members, and any members who may also be landlords, as well as tenants of the private sector, about our commitment to improving standards within the private rented sector in Nottingham.

Housing is, of course, one of our key priorities. It's a key priority in the Council Plan, both in terms of house building and in terms of improving the quality of the housing stock across our city, whether it is social housing stock, private rented stock, or even private dwelling houses. Councillor Rule's own Conservative government too, seem to be recognising the benefits that regulation and licensing regimes can bring. They too, have been consulting on changes to the definition of what is a house in multiple occupation, which if approved, would widen the definition thereby including far more privately rented HMOs in the mandatory licensing scheme, which is required of all areas by legislation.

Our consultation though, runs from now until 31 March 2017. It gives local people, tenants, landlords, letting agents, and other interested individuals and organisations the chance to comment on the proposal which would see a selective licensing scheme introduced requiring private landlords to obtain a license demonstrating that they and their properties meet the required standards. The many good landlords within our city would not find this a particularly onerous challenge, as they already provide decent homes for people to live in. However, too many people are suffering poor conditions, lack of repairs, and unsafe homes, as a result of landlord who either do not know how to make the homes they rent safe, or are neglecting to do so.

The Department for Communities and Local Government guidance on selective licensing sets out the requirements of the consultation process, and so the Council has considered those consultation requirements, which are detailed in the relevant parts of the Housing Act 2004. The recommended minimum consultation period in the guidance is 10 weeks. Our consultation period will be 11 weeks. The Council is required to conduct a full consultation, and will be consulting with all the relevant interested parties, such as, but not limited to: local residents, tenants, landlords, managing agents, other members of the community who live or operate businesses or provide services within the proposed designation area, and those residents and businesses who operate in the surrounding areas of our city – it's important that those adjoining boroughs next to us are also aware of our intentions.

In planning the consultation, we recognise the scale of the proposed scheme, and the number of different stakeholders and interested parties to be engaged with, and careful consideration has been made to ensure that the consultation reaches all of those interested parties. So, we are setting out in the consultation document why we are proposing this scheme, what alternative remedies we have considered, and why those are considered insufficient, how a scheme would tackle the specific problems identified, and how the outcomes we believe the scheme would achieve. The consultation would also include indicative information on the proposed fee, and any licenses to be issued.

So, to comply with the consultation guidance we are required to have a mechanism for capturing all views in order for us to consider and respond to them. Surveys, being widely accepted as the most appropriate methodology for achieving this, therefore, we are having an online survey which has been designed for that very purpose. So, there is the ability for people to respond, either online or in writing. The widespread communication about the consultation will ensure that sufficient numbers of people are reached, and are encouraged to give their views. A number of consultation events have also been planned, with key stakeholders such as landlords, communities of interest, and residents. The Council is also actively working with its partners to promote the consultation across all communities, and as I've mentioned engaging with neighbouring authorities to promote the consultation beyond our boundaries.

That gives quite a detailed overview of the consultation that we embark upon today. But of course, this isn't the first time that people in our city have been informed about the scheme. Information went out, in the form of a press release, in November 2016, when the Executive Board made the decision to put the scheme forward for consultation, and made clear our intention to make a submission to the DCLG based on our plans and on the outcome of that consultation. We are aware, of course, that Councillor Rule and his colleagues were well aware of that decision, as they made the decision to call it in, only later to withdraw that call-in. Landlords organisations, both EMPO locally and the National Landlords Association, have been aware of the proposals for some time, also having had regular meetings with both myself and Councillor Ball in his former roll as my Executive Assistant.

But maybe more importantly, why do we in Nottingham think that we need such a scheme? Why are we doing this? What we know, is that the amount of privately rented housing in Nottingham increased by 12% between 2001 and 2011. That's 3%

higher than the average for England, and indications are that since 2011 that percentage has increased significantly further still. So, private renting is really important for a large proportion of our citizens. Research that we have carried out, and which was detailed in the appendices to the Executive Board report, which is also a matter of public record, indicates that there are now over 43,000 privately rented properties in the city.

I've said something already about our desire to improve quality in rented accommodation, but people will ask, are things really so bad, that for those 43,000 households, we need to take action? Well as I've said, many homes are managed well. However, there are significant proportions that are not. Last year alone, 4,500 people felt that their living conditions were worthy of complaint. Their complaints included faulty wiring and faulty gas boilers, and we all know that both of those things can be very dangerous. Other complaints included severe damp, cockroach and other vermin infestations, unrepaired broken doors and windows, and even in some cases a property without a door at all. Maybe that's ok, maybe that doesn't need action? Everyone has a right to live in a decent home. Our work with Nottingham City Homes over the past years has made sure that our council homes are up to standard. Our work in collaboration with Nottingham City Homes and other social housing providers in the city are driving forward a Nottingham standard for the quality of social housing.

Our work with houses in multiple occupation, under both mandatory and additional licensing, has begun to improve quality in that sector. Selective licensing is the means that we will use to improve conditions in the rest of the privately rented sector. But is it just the tenants of those privately rented houses who want to see their living conditions improve? Well no, actually. What we also know is that poorly managed and maintained properties in areas with high proportions of private rented housing also contribute to higher levels of crime and antisocial behaviour in those neighbourhoods. I know my casework reflects some of that, and I know many of my colleagues have casework reflecting exactly those issues, right across our city.

So, Councillor Rule, and your colleagues, I hope you're now clear about our consultation plan, clear about our commitment to our citizens who live in private rented accommodation. Perhaps, having withdrawn your call-in of the decision to consult on this scheme, you'll now join with us in seeking to improve living conditions in our city?

---

Councillor Eunice Campbell asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Early Years and Early Intervention:

Would the Portfolio Holder for Early Years and Early Intervention inform Council of progress with breastfeeding rates in Nottingham?

Councillor David Mellen responded as follows:

Thank you Lord Mayor, and can I thank Councillor Campbell for her question. I'm proud to be able to report to Council today on progress that has been made in Nottingham with breastfeeding rates amongst mums and babies across the city. It's

not a topic that we spend a lot of time discussing in this chamber, it's nevertheless an important factor in enhancing life chances of a child right at the start of their life. The World Health Organisation encourages breastfeeding for all children as a way of both promoting and protecting the health of babies and their mothers.

Breastfed babies will typically have fewer infections and tummy bugs, as well as a reduced risk of more serious conditions like sudden infant death syndrome, type 2 diabetes, obesity and heart disease, with of course fewer consequent visits to hospital as a result. Babies who are breastfed are also less likely to have cardiovascular diseases in adulthood. Breastfeeding is good for mothers too, because it lowers the chances of obesity and heart disease in women, as well as breast and ovarian cancer.

However, breastfeeding is not necessarily easy to start or sustain. Negative expectations and embarrassment mean that in particular young mums are less likely breastfeed their babies than older mothers. There are not enough places outside of the family home where women can have the comfort and privacy needed to breastfeed. I am nevertheless pleased to report to Council today that our breastfeeding prevalence at 6-8 weeks is now at 47.7%, higher than the county rate of just 39.8%, and higher than the England average of 43.2%. This is great news for Nottingham, and work in promoting breastfeeding is great early intervention, and a contribution to addressing health inequalities later in life that we've often discussed here.

Whilst the choice to start and continue breastfeeding is a complex one, enabled or hindered by access to the right support or not, we believe that our breastfeeding peer support has a key role in increasing our breastfeeding rates. Nottingham breastfeeding peer support service has been in place since September 2012. This service targets women, who are less likely to breastfeed, particularly those under the age of 25. This means a contact offering a home visit between 24 and 48 hours following the transfer home from hospital. Peer supporters, and I believe this is one of the most important things, are recruited from and reflect the diversity of the community in which they work, and are women who have previously breastfed themselves. The peer supporters received externally accredited training prior to supporting women. Paid peer supporters offer support before birth and afterwards, tailoring their support to the needs of the women. Peer supporters have regular support from and access to a health professional for consultation.

Lord Mayor, this worthwhile scheme has helped to increase breastfeeding rates in Nottingham, and I congratulate the service on their success, and wish them all the best in theirs and others efforts to increase these rates even further in the future.

---

Councillor Carole McCulloch asked the following question of the Portfolio Holder for Education, Employment and Skills:

If 98% of schools are to see their funding cut, can the Portfolio Holder tell Council how much schools in Nottingham are set to lose?

Councillor Sam Webster responded as follows:

Can I thank Councillor McCulloch for raising this important issue about the future funding of schools in Nottingham City? On Wednesday 14 December 2016, the Secretary of State for Education, Justine Greening MP, announced a new funding formula for schools up and down the country. The Conservative government's new method of funding directly targets schools in Nottingham for potentially the biggest real term reduction in budgets they've ever faced. Whilst our schools in Nottingham are set to lose tens of millions of pounds in the coming years, in keeping with the current Tory theme, schools in some of the wealthiest areas of England are set to gain. By targeting Nottingham, Conservatives have demonstrated yet again that they don't act in the interests of our children, our schools, or our city.

This latest move, quite simply, takes money from children in Nottingham, only to hand it to wealthy, rural, and surprisingly mainly Conservative voting shire areas, such as Cambridgeshire and Buckinghamshire. Other large cities, urban areas, and areas with the highest level of child poverty, such as Birmingham, Manchester and Liverpool, are also being targeted in the same way.

Only last month, the outgoing Chief Inspector of Schools warned the government that they must do more to tackle the growing gap in education outcomes for children in wealthy areas and lower outcomes for children in poorer parts of the Midlands and the north of England. This latest announcement shows that, yet again, the government is ignoring the problem of educational inequality. Rather than recognising and working to deal with the challenge, the government's proposals will, in my view, make matters worse.

This process is being driven with overall funding cuts in mind nationally. The National Audit Office has warned that schools face an 8% real terms cut in funding per pupil by 2019/20. The scale of these cuts means that schools in England will have to reduce spending by £3,000,000,000 between now and 2019/20. Incidentally, it's the first drop in funding since the mid-1990s, when the Tories were last in majority government. Looking at the latest funding formula, we're able to predict that during the transitional first year, Nottingham schools will see a reduction in core funding of £2,600,000 with a £5,100,000 per year cut in the full subsequent years. And 98% of Nottingham schools will receive lower funding under the new Tory school funding structure. That's 87 out of 89 of our schools.

Just to give you an idea of how individual schools might be affected, I've picked out a few examples based on our predictions:

- Nottingham Academy, reduction in core funding of £447,000 – 3% of their budget;
- Bluecoat Academy, £290,000;
- Ellis Guilford School, £224,000;
- Southwark Primary, reduction in core funding of £78,000;
- Ambleside Primary School, £77,000 – 2.9% of their budget.

However, several teaching unions are predicting that Nottingham City schools will see a total reduction of £27,500,000 by 2020, taking into account both the proposed national funding formula, and no inflationary increases per pupil. That's a double whammy of flat funding plus a new national funding formula that hits Nottingham

schools and equates to a loss of £750 per Nottingham pupil. Many teachers, parents and school governors have already contacted me expressing dismay and concern at this attack on our local schools. I know that many of my Labour Group colleagues volunteer as school governors, and so are well aware of the existing strains on school budgets, even before these cuts come into effect.

It is important that we all recognise the vital role our schools play in our communities. The vast majority of schools in Nottingham provide much more than a Monday to Friday 9:00 to 15:30 education service. On my visit to Southglade Primary in Bestwood a few weeks ago, the head teacher was telling me about the school breakfast club – making sure children are set up for the day ahead, providing additional support to parents who are on a limited budget, and enabling early drop offs so parents can get to work. Dovecote Primary School in Clifton also operates an after school club until 17:30. Trinity School in Aspley ensures that every child learns how to play a musical instrument. Bluebell Hill Primary in St Anns prides itself on pupil enrichment, with trips, experiences and visits for all pupils, regardless of family income.

I could go on. But the truth is that almost all Nottingham schools go way above and beyond traditional teaching in the classroom. They do so because of the communities they serve, because of the needs that exist in our communities in Nottingham. They do so because for children to learn, thrive and succeed, they need additional input from teachers, teaching assistants and support staff in our schools. I, and my colleagues in the Labour Group, am well aware of the challenges many people face in the communities we represent. We're well aware of why our schools need to be properly funded. These budget cuts will mean cuts to important aspects of school life. Faced with reducing funds, schools in Nottingham will have to reduce services, and it's the added enrichment, the out-of-hours service, the holiday clubs, the breakfast clubs, the trips to broaden the horizons of our children, the reading sessions for parents, the extra-curricular sports, culture and arts activities, that will I fear be first to go.

To put the scale of reductions into context, the savings are equivalent to 15 fewer teachers at Nottingham Academy, or 7 fewer teaching assistants at Southwark Primary School in Basford, that could be the effect of these cuts to our local schools. The Government has been taking direct control of schools under the academisation process, and has significantly reduced the role of councils in the funding and running of schools. Now we can see a clear motivation and policy decision by the Conservative party to attack many schools that educate the poorest children in the most challenging circumstances. Well the people of Nottingham will see this for exactly what it is – another Tory attack on our city. There's no way to dress it up, a Conservative government wants to take money away from children in Nottingham with one hand, and give it to schools in some of the wealthiest parts of the country with the other. These are choices, time and time again, that Conservatives make the wrong choices for Nottingham.

So, Councillor McCulloch's question has highlighted the issue we face. I say to my Labour colleagues that during this consultation process, we have a job to do – to inform parents, carers, and grandparents about these unfair proposals, to enable as many people as possible to take part in public consultation, and to campaign along

with the city's Labour MPs to defend Nottingham school against the Tories familiar reverse Robin Hood policies of taking from the poorest to give more to the richest.

---

Councillor Leslie Ayoola asked the following question of the Leader:

In December, Director of the CBI Carolyn Fairbairn described Nottingham as the high growth capital of the UK outside of London. Would the Leader of the Council comment on this achievement and how the Council supports economic growth in Nottingham?

Councillor Jon Collins responded as follows:

Since launching the Nottingham Growth Plan in 2012, we have seen significant progress in the development of the local economy. It is our ambition to make Nottingham the best place in the UK to start and grow a business, so I am pleased to see this recognised in the latest CBI report which shows that the city has the highest proportion of high growth businesses outside London, and third overall outside of Camden and Westminster.

This fact was also reflected in recent job growth figures, which showed a 7.7% increase for the city, which in itself was amongst the top 10 jobs growth rates in the country as a whole, and was one of only 4 cities that saw a positive increase in jobs growth, again right across the UK.

This achievement is a result of the decisions we have taken to support and grow our local economy, and the work and commitment of the Council and its partners. For example, we launched the Growth Hub in April 2015 to support high growth business, and it now directly supports 500 small to medium sized enterprises in Nottingham, with 51 different support programmes available for businesses, including start up, finance, innovation and sector specific business advice. We have established the Creative Quarter, which has supported over 1,000 businesses and seen the creation of nearly 1,000 jobs as well as some 250 apprenticeships.

We have invested over £1,000,000,000 in the city's infrastructure, including the £560,000,000 tram extension, the £70,000,000 refurbishment of Nottingham station, improvements to the ring road at around £16,000,000 and improvements to the street environment in and around the Creative Quarter.

We have also invested in key employment sites, so for example the £40,000,000 expansion of BioCity to create and secure 250 jobs, the regeneration of Sneinton Market and Dakeyne Street to support 46 new creative and digital businesses, and the further development of Southglade Food Park creating 110 jobs.

We have created a new Place Marketing Organisation to promote the city to wider national and international markets, and are on track to secure new investment to deliver 1,000 jobs for the city this year, building on the success of the Invest in Nottingham team, which has secured investment to create over 1,100 jobs in the last 3 years.

We have supported Nottingham businesses exporting abroad by promoting links into key developing markets, leading trade missions with over 20 local companies to India and China. We have developed the highest 4G coverage in the UK and have one of the highest coverages of broadband of any major city, with 98% of the city having high speed broadband.

We've developed the £10,000,000 N'Tech Grant Fund which levered in £47,000,000 of private sector funding and secured around 2,000 jobs to help innovative businesses to grow, and we continue to support innovation by working closely with the universities.

Lord Mayor, we recognise that the city is not unique in still facing significant challenges, but the CBI report shows that the city is starting to deliver on its potential, and we are determined to continue to grow the local economy for the benefit of all of our citizens.

---

Councillor Ginny Klein asked the following question of the Deputy Leader:

How has the government contributed to creating the £9 million gap in adult social care funding for next year in Nottingham and how will that gap be met?

Councillor Graham Chapman responded as follows:

I'll start by defining the problem, with 3 very significant facts. Fact 1 – there have been weekly declarations of black alerts at Nottingham University Hospital. A black alert is when there are no spare beds at the hospital for incoming emergency cases. Fact 2 – nationally, there has been a 40% increase in bed blocking, where people can't leave hospital for want of care at home, which for the most part is provided by councils. That's a 40% increase in bed blocking. Fact 3 – it costs £2,500 to keep a patient in a hospital bed, on average. It costs £450 per week to care for the same person at home. I will repeat that: £2,500 to keep a patient in a hospital bed on average for a week, £450 to keep them in their home, looked after.

So, the logical and practical thing to do, in terms of good government, and good financial management, would be to increase the amount available to councils for adult care. That is sensible, it's logical. It's what anybody would do. This would allow councils to relieve the pressure on hospitals, and effectively to save money, but this has not happened. Indeed, the opposite has been the case. Councils, including Nottingham, not only have had to cater for an ever increasing number of elderly and disabled people, they have not only had to find additional money for the minimum wage in the care sector. The very budgets we use to pay for services like adult care have been substantially reduced by the very government which is expecting us to do more, and I'll contrast this with the Health Service. The Health Service is suffering because the funding has not kept up with increased demand. Adult social care is suffering because the budgets have not kept up with increased demand, but also because the budgets have been cut. We have had a double whammy.

This is not just a Nottingham phenomenon, it has happened across England. The government's response has been belated this year, as it was last year, and it has

been to try and bridge some of the gap by requesting an increase of 3% in everybody's council tax. Last year it was an increase of 2%. I've got 2 things to say about this. First, this 3% levy will still leave a £7,000,000 gap in Nottingham. So it is inadequate. Secondly, resorting to council tax rises is an unsustainable way of paying for adult social care, especially in poorer areas. The poorer the area, the lower the council tax base, but a higher demand for adult care. That is the equation. So the council tax rises in poorer areas, is far more punitive and far less able to cover the costs than in better off areas. That's just logical, it makes sense, all part of the redistribution that we were talking about earlier. This means that councils all over the country are left with a problem – do they increase the council tax, knowing it is unfair, knowing it is regressive, and knowing it is not fit for purpose as a means of funding adult care centrally, or are we prepared to see the service for the most vulnerable and elderly and disabled deteriorate, and bed blocking in hospitals increase further still? It is a deliberate ploy by the government to shift the blame and put us in between a rock and a hard place with our electorate.

The whole situation reveals a real failure of planning and coordination by central government, with not a little politics of blame adding to the mix. All I can say at this stage is that we, in this Council, will do our utmost to keep this service going. It will be a priority, but it will inevitably be at the expense of other services that we provide. If we can come to an arrangement with the local Clinical Commissioning Group, which we will have to, it will also be at the expense of other parts of the NHS. Now, I've got to congratulate Councillor Norris, for the negotiations that he's currently carrying out, there as good as any that I've seen elsewhere in England. But, at the end, there has to be a long term solution, and that solution has to include more money and more money means more tax to pay for it, because it doesn't grow on trees. Well, it does actually, because you can print it in the bowels of the treasury, that is by the by, most of that has gone to the banking sector, and most of that is floating around the system, and not being invested, but that's by the by. I would actually start with increasing corporation tax, but corporation tax is, perversely, going down.

What is clear, is that we can't go on as a nation with this immature approach that we have, that decent, key public services can be provided year on year on year on the back of cuts and every increasing efficiencies, and that we do not have to pay. In my view, the public sector and councils are past the point of relying on efficiencies, and they passed that some time ago, it's just that government hasn't realised it. Virtually every council and every hospital with thousands of patients are now paying the price.

## **69 MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME - REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL**

The Leader presented a report on the Members' Allowance Scheme – Report of the Independent Remuneration Panel, copies of which had been circulated.

### **RESOLVED to**

- (1) adopt the recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) in full;**
- (2) adopt the revised Members' Allowances Scheme, incorporating the amendments recommended by the IRP, with effect from 1 April 2017;**

- (3) amend the Constitution, in light of the amendments recommended by the IRP.

## 70 DECISIONS TAKEN UNDER URGENCY PROCEDURES

The Leader submitted a report on decisions taken under urgency procedures, as set out on pages 25 to 30 of the agenda.

**RESOLVED to note the urgent decisions taken, as follows:**

- (1) **Urgent decisions (exempt from call-in);**

<u>Decision ref number</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2650	10/11/16	Hall of Fame, National Football Museum, City of Football	Exempt	Urgent decision required to allow for implementation.
2651	10/11/16	Nottingham College Skills Hub: Approval for loan and site transfer	£19,600,000	The Government's decision to provide funding for the merged College was received on 2 November and an immediate decision was required on the City Council's contribution in order to take a LEP-wide decision.
2662	18/11/16	Sale of freehold interest of land at Chilwell Road / Ellis Grove, Beeston Nottingham	Exempt	A delay in proceedings could jeopardise the sale, leading to additional expense for the Council.
2668	22/11/16	Nottingham Cold Weather Plan: Accommodation for Rough Sleepers	Up to £133,000	In order to put in place the necessary arrangements (e.g. staffing, etc) can commence with immediate effect so that the proposals can be delivered from 1st December 2016.
2671	29/11/16	Software Maintenance and Support for Corporate GIS (Geographical Information System)	£44,254	The contract renewal was urgent and due on 4 November 2016.

<u>Decision ref number</u>	<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Reasons for urgency</u>
2674	01/12/16	Property Investment Acquisition - Project Boot	Exempt	In order to facilitate a timely purchase.
2676	05/12/16	Refurbishment Works at 58 Carlton Road and Space 2	£360,000	The D2N2 LEP funding has to be spent by 31/03/2017 and a contractor is in place and ready to start work. The delivery plan has a timescale and an early start is needed to ensure a timely finish.
2695	22/12/16	Broadmarsh Enabling - Phase 1	Exempt	To adhere to the imposed external deadlines for the shopping centre build programme.
2696	23/12/16	Investment Acquisition - Project Duke	Exempt	The delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would seriously prejudice the Council's interest.

**(2) Key decisions (taken under special urgency procedures).**

<u>Date of decision</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Decision Taker</u>	<u>Reasons for special urgency</u>
10/11/2016	Nottingham College Skills Hub: Approval for loan and site transfer	£19,600,000	Leader of the Council	The decision is urgent because the City Council's contribution needs to be approved in principle prior to a LEP meeting on 14 November 2016 where decisions on the LEP's contribution are to be made. The decision could not have been taken earlier because the Government's decision to provide funding for the merged College was received on 2 November 2016.
20/12/2016	Property Investment Acquisition	Exempt	Leader of the Council	The decision is urgent because a condition of the sale is an exchange on the 20 December 2016 with completion on the 10 January 2017 subject to timely receipt of the legal pack.

The Leader presented a report on amendments to the Constitution, as set out on pages 31 to 32 of the agenda.

**RESOLVED to**

- (1) note that Councillor Alex Ball has been replaced as Executive Assistant for Housing by Councillor Neghat Khan;**
- (2) note the new Executive responsibility and delegation, as agreed by the Leader of the Council and outlined in paragraph 5.3 of the report;**
- (3) approve the amendments of the Constitution required by the above changes.**

**72 MOTION**

Moved by Councillor Alex Norris, seconded by Councillor Neghat Khan:

“The Council notes:

- The impact of harmful drinking in our communities
- The impact that alcohol has on health inequalities
- The Full Council Motion in the name of Councillor Ball passed in October 2013
- That Nottingham has received 7 consecutive Purple Flag Awards for its vibrant and safe Night Time Economy

This Council will:

- Sign the Nottingham City Declaration on Alcohol
- Encourage and support public, private and community sectors in the city to sign the Declaration.”

**RESOLVED to carry the motion.**

**73 DECLARATION ON ALCOHOL**

Councillor Alex Norris, Portfolio Holder for Adults and Health, submitted a report on the Declaration of Alcohol, as set out on pages 33 to 38 of the agenda.

**RESOLVED to endorse the Nottingham City Council Alcohol Declaration.**

**74 MOTION**

Moved by Councillor Corral Jenkins, seconded by Councillor Eunice Campbell:

“Super Kitchen is a network of social eating spaces that aims to bring communities together to enjoy good food that would otherwise be wasted. There are currently 20 operating in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire and they focus on the values of community, social eating and combating food waste.

The City Council recognises that;

- Eating as part of a group can provide both physical and mental health benefits and improve wellbeing
- Loneliness and isolation affects many members of our communities and social eating is an effective way to help to combat this
- Social eating and community events based around meals can improve social cohesion
- Food waste is extensive across the City and recycling surplus food should be encouraged

The City Council therefore supports the ambition to establish Nottingham as the UK's 1st social eating City, starting with the launch event today. The Council also supports the implementation of three key pledges by the end of the campaign:

- By year's end, there will be a Super Kitchen in every area of the City
- Every day of the week, somewhere in the City, there will be a Super Kitchen meal available
- Each Super Kitchen will offer free meals for those in need via a Super Spoon, 'pay it forward' meal campaign."

**RESOLVED to carry the motion.**