

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET
TUESDAY 14 JANUARY 2014**

Held at 7.00pm in the Council Chamber, Civic Centre, Pavilion Road, West Bridgford

PRESENT:

Councillors J N Clarke (Chairman), J A Cranswick, J E Fearon, N C Lawrence and D J Mason

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:

Councillors D M Boote, S J Boote, H A Chewings, A MacInnes and G R Mallender

12 members of the public

OFFICERS PRESENT:

D Banks	Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods
A Graham	Chief Executive
V Nightingale	Senior Member Support Officer
P Steed	Executive Manager – Finance and Commercial
D Swaine	Executive Manager - Operations and Corporate Governance

APOLOGY FOR ABSENCE:

Councillor Bell

38. Declarations of Interest

There were none declared.

39. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 3 December 2013 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

40. Update on Leisure Strategy

Councillor Fearon presented a report which detailed the work undertaken following Cabinet's decision on 15 October 2013 regarding the implementation of the Council's Leisure Strategy for West Bridgford. He stated that elements of the project had been considered by the Corporate Governance Group on 7 November and the newly formed Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Group on 18 November and 18 December 2013. By referring to the report he stated Members had been supportive of the proposals but had raised queries on the specification, consultation, resourcing and capital expenditure and the timeframe. He added that the recommendation of the Corporate Governance Group in relation to the project was set out at paragraph 3 of the report.

Commenting further he stated that the Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Group had fully considered the original proposals and were recommending a

number of variations. With regard to swimming the Group had felt that the pool should retain a family friendly aspect, with some spectator seating, which could be included within a café area. The Group did not support the inclusion of a moveable floor in the pool. With regards to the sports hall it was recognised that this area needed to be flexible to accommodate various activities; it was also noted that the design might have to change following any decisions by Rushcliffe School on the retention of any community use of their facilities.

Councillor Fearon indicated that the Member Group had considered squash provision and it was anticipated that this would remain as part of the school site, however, if not the Group recommended that this too should be included and that additional funding should be explored. In relation to gym and fitness it was considered that three studios and an 800m² gym should be provided. The Group had been tasked to consider other provision including a climbing wall, an all weather pitch, and outdoor gym space. Councillor Fearon stated that the Group believed that these were not required as there was other provision in, or close to, the Borough.

Councillor Fearon informed Members that the Working Group had carefully considered the consultation responses with regard to indoor bowling and that they were proposing a six lane solution rather than the four lanes originally proposed. He said that this was to assist in making the Club viable, although it was recognised that there would need to be a flooring solution found in order for the space to be flexible and able to be used for events, weddings etc. The Group had also considered the need for catering and had decided that a café would be necessary but there was no requirement for a permanent licensed bar, as any events could be accommodated on a temporary basis.

With regard to soft play Councillor Fearon said that the Group had not wished to retain the current Run Riot facility although it was felt that it would be beneficial to have some provision, preferably near the café if this could be accommodated within the design. Also it was put forward that snooker should be retained but only if it could be easily accommodated.

As Chairman of the Working Group, Councillor Fearon, thanked the Executive Manager – Finance and Commercial and his staff for their hard work in obtaining and collating the facts. He also wished to thank the public for engaging with the Council through the consultation exercise. In conclusion, he said that the Council was at an early stage of the project and that the next step would be to appoint architects in order that thorough costings could be considered.

Councillor Cranswick agreed that the work that had been undertaken gave the Council an outline specification for the project. It was important that the costs were evaluated to realise what activities could be accommodate.

Councillor Mason welcomed the fact that flexibility was being built into the specification. She supported the comments made that there was still a lot of work to be undertaken before a final decision was made. She was also pleased to see that the Working Group and officers had taken note of the consultation responses and that the public could be assured that their views had been taken into account.

In support of the proposals Councillor Lawrence raised the issue of further investigation of the type of pool that could be provided. He stated that the leisure pool at Rushcliffe Leisure Centre did not lend itself easily to traditional lane swimming. However it was important that any new facility was developed in such a way as to be family friendly. He proposed that the architects should consider the pool at Cotgrave Leisure Centre which encompassed both aspects.

Concluding the debate Councillor Clarke stated that this was the first stage for taking the project further and it was important to determine a specification. He agreed that the pool should have a family friendly element. With regard to squash it was important to consider the school's intention in the development of proposals. With regard to Indoor Bowling he stressed that it was important to insure the level of provision provided sufficient flexibility so that it could be used for alternative purposes should there be a fall in demand. He believed that it was vitally important that the Council achieved value for money. He said that further work would be needed to provide Members with a detailed analysis of the costs and benefits so that an informed decision could be taken to progress this project. On this basis he suggested that Cabinet should amend recommendation a) of the report in order that further be undertaken to develop the design and cost options to accommodate the Bowls and Squash components of the scheme.

RESOLVED that Cabinet

- a) Agrees the outline specification proposed by the Leisure Facilities Strategy Member Group, as detailed in Appendix 1, and requests further work be undertaken, particularly to develop the design and cost options to accommodate the Bowls and Squash components of the scheme;
- b) Notes that any expansion to the specification may result in increased capital requirements for the scheme; and
- c) Notes the results of the public, user and stakeholder consultation exercise set out in Appendix 2 of the report.

41. Development of a Co-operation Agreement for Fleet Maintenance and Garage Service Provision

Councillor Lawrence presented a report which outlined the work undertaken to explore the development of a shared service approach for fleet maintenance and garage services with Nottingham City Council. He stated that this would facilitate the planned future disposal of the Abbey Road Depot site. He reminded Members that in early 2013 Cabinet had agreed to a formal procurement process for this service. However, following a detailed analysis of the life costs of the preferred bid it was assessed that the impact to the Council would be an additional £300,000 over ten years.

Cabinet were informed that during the procurement exercise it had become apparent that an alternative shared services opportunity was possible and that this would offer significant savings over the medium to long term. Councillor

Lawrence stated that this would be achieved through greater utilisation of vehicles and the possibility of an integrated fleet management approach. This arrangement would also include the maintenance of vehicles and equipment covered by the separate StreetWise Social Enterprise project.

Councillor Lawrence explained that this arrangement would be beneficial to both councils. It was anticipated that Rushcliffe Borough Council would reduce its costs by £78,000 per annum over a ten year period and the City Council would gain an income of £40,000 per annum.

Councillor Mason supported the recommendations as this project would be very beneficial to the Council both financially and environmentally. She commended officers on the outcome of the negotiations undertaken.

Following confirmation that the agreement had been considered by the Council's legal team Councillor Cranswick supported the proposal.

RESOLVED that Cabinet

- a. Support the implementation of the proposed Co-operation Agreement with Nottingham City Council as set out in the report;
- b. Agree that it will discharge the fleet and maintenance functions for Rushcliffe Borough Council;
- c. Authorise the Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods to enter into a Co-operation Agreement with Nottingham City Council for the joint service delivery of fleet maintenance functions in accordance with the terms of the draft agreement; and
- d. Request the Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods in consultation with the Executive Manager Operations and Corporate Governance make any necessary drafting or other amendments to the terms of the agreement which are necessary to reflect the agreed arrangements but which do not materially affect the proposals outlined in this report.

42. **Support for Parishes**

Councillor Cranswick explained that Members needed to agree the level of grant support that would be provided for the parish council and special expense areas of the Borough. He reminded Members that due to the reduction to the local government taxbase, following the introduction of the Council Tax Support Scheme in 2013, many parish councils had been unable to raise the same level of funding through the Council Tax as had previously been the case. To mitigate this the Department for Communities and Local Government had allocated funding to billing authorities to establish a support scheme for the parishes. He stated that the money had not been ringfenced and therefore a local decision had to be made. For 2013/14 the Council had agreed to support 45 parishes and the three special expense areas which had been negatively affected for that year. It had allocated all of the central funding plus an additional £3,400.

Councillor Cranswick informed Cabinet that the draft local government finance settlement for 2014/15 and 2015/16 did not provide any explicit funding for parish support and therefore any allocation would be via the Revenue Settlement Grant and the assumed levels of Retained Business Rates. He stated that these amounts would be reduced from the award received in 2013/14 by 13% for 2014/15 and by a further 15% in 2015/16. It was therefore proposed that the Council would support the parishes at the original amount less the reduction of 13% and 15% over the next two years. He stated that it was necessary for Members to consider any allocation at this meeting to allow parishes sufficient time to set their budgets in line with the council tax setting cycle.

Councillor Fearon supported the proposals stating that the parishes would welcome this approach. Councillor Clarke agreed with the previous statement, however, he warned that after the two years the funding would more than likely cease and that the parishes should make their calculations on this basis. He added that they would need to start considering how they would manage the situation in the future.

RESOLVED that Cabinet adopt the 2014/15 and 2015/16 funding allocations in relation to support arrangements for Parish Councils and Special Expense Areas as outlined at Appendix1 of the report.

43. **Establishment of the City of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee**

Councillor Clarke informed Members that there was a proposal to establish a joint Economic Prosperity Committee (EPC) of local authorities in the City of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire to drive future investment to assist growth and jobs in their local areas. This committee would improve joint working and decision making whilst also providing better links between the local authorities and the D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership. It was anticipated that this would maximise access to European and Government funding for growth, which would benefit businesses and residents. Similar arrangements were being established between Derby and Derbyshire local authorities. He stated that this was a prelude to better representation on the Local Enterprise Partnership.

It was proposed that the Leader of the Council would be appointed as its representative, with the Deputy Leader as a named substitute.

RESOLVED that Cabinet:

- a) Agree to the establishment of the Economic Prosperity Committee (EPC) as a joint committee of the following local authorities: Ashfield District Council, Bassetlaw District Council, Broxtowe Borough Council, Gedling Borough Council, Mansfield District Council, Newark and Sherwood District Council, Nottingham City Council, Nottinghamshire County Council and Rushcliffe Borough Council (“constituent authorities”);

- b) Agree to the Constitution (Terms of Reference, Membership and procedures) of the Economic Prosperity Committee as set out at **Appendix A** of the report
- c) Note that any relevant powers previously delegated by the Leader/Executive to individuals or bodies are not expressly withdrawn and will be held concurrently;
- d) Appoint the Leader of the Council as the Council's representative on the EPC with the Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Resources to act as substitute;
- e) Agree to Nottingham City Council hosting the Committee and providing all necessary secretarial, legal and financial support services, (including S151 and Monitoring Officer roles) and the annual costs involved (estimated to be around £30,000), to be met in equal share by the constituent authorities, until such time as that this can be recovered in part or in whole from external funding streams;
- f) Agree that this Council's annual contribution to the cost of servicing the Committee is estimated to be around £3,300 with any expenses for subsistence or travel in relation to the attendance of councillors at meetings on EPC business being met from the existing budget provision for Members' allowances;
- g) Note that, in accordance with Section 9F of the Local Government Act 2000, constituent authorities who operate executive governance will need to make formal scrutiny arrangements to review or scrutinise decisions made in connection with the exercise of functions of the EPC and that the Council's existing scrutiny arrangements will apply; and
- h) Note that, for the reasons set out in the report, the Committee will have no powers to co-opt.

44. **Green Waste Club Scheme – Renewal Process for 2014/15**

Councillor Lawrence presented a report which outlined the renewal process for the Council's garden waste collection service for 2014/15. By referring to the report he reminded Members that the scheme had been successfully operating since the Council had introduced the charges in 2011. Even though there were 28,000 people using the service the present charges did not cover the total costs for running the service, especially as consumables had increased. It was therefore proposed to increase the fee to £30 for the first and £15 for each additional wheeled bin. This would bring the fee in line with charges made by other local authorities and would bring the service back towards a cost recovery basis.

Councillor Mason stated that this was an opportune time to consider the fee as it had remained static since the scheme's introduction. She believed that it still represented very good value for money for residents, especially as other authorities charged between £30 and £69. This was evidenced by the large number of people who had joined the scheme.

Councillor Clarke stated that this was a valuable service that represented good value for money. He highlighted the Council's recent decision to deliver this service to part of the Newark and Sherwood area at a fee of £30. He believed that, in the future, the Council could offer the same arrangement to other areas.

RESOLVED that Cabinet endorse the renewal process for the Green Waste Club Scheme 2014/15.

The meeting closed at 7.35 pm.

CHAIRMAN