



**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL
THURSDAY 23 JUNE 2011**

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

PRESENT:

Councillor G S Moore – Mayor
Councillor I I Korn – Deputy Mayor

Councillors L J Abbey, Mrs S P Bailey, J R Bannister, D G Bell, Mrs D M Boote, S J Boote, N A Brown, B Buschman, R L Butler, H A Chewings, J N Clarke, T Combellack, L B Cooper, J A Cranswick, B G Dale, G Davidson, A M Dickinson, J E Fearon, J E Greenwood, M G Hemsley, R Hetherington, R M Jones, K A Khan, N C Lawrence, E J Lungley, A MacInnes, Mrs M M Males, G R Mallender, S E Mallender, D J Mason, F J Mason, B A Nicholls, E A Plant, F A Purdue-Horan, D V Smith, Mrs J A Smith, P Smith, J A Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood, B Tansley, H Tipton, T Vennett-Smith, D G Wheeler

OFFICERS PRESENT:

C Bullett	Deputy Chief Executive (CB)
A Graham	Chief Executive
S Griffiths	Deputy Chief Executive (SG)
N Morton	Head of Financial Services
P Randle	Deputy Chief Executive (PR)
L Reid Jones	Democratic Services Manager
D Swaine	Head of Corporate Services

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:

Councillors R A Adair, N K Boughton-Smith, J E Cottee, Mrs J M Marshall, S J Robinson

OPENING PRAYER

The Meeting was led in prayer by Sister A'Herne-Smith.

URGENT ITEM

The Mayor informed Members that he had agreed to the consideration of an urgent agenda item "Parish Election Request: Vacancy For Manor Ward Cotgrave". The request to call an election had been received from the Town Council after the agenda for this meeting had been finalised.

To avoid any undue delay bearing in mind that the next meeting of Council was not until September, the Mayor was of the opinion that this item of business should be treated as an urgent item and added to agenda under section 100B(4)(b) of the Local Government Act 1972.

1. **Declarations of Interest**

There were none declared.

2. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 19 May 2011 were received as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

3. **Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor informed Council that he had undertaken 21 engagements since the last meeting of Council, all of which had been enjoyable and varied. The Mayor highlighted the work being undertaken by numerous volunteers, all of whom had the same aim of improving people's lives, arranging enjoyable events and charity work. The Mayor reported that he had visited the British Legion several times and noted the work of Help the Heroes at Bingham Show. He drew attention to visits to two of the Borough's major employers: British Gypsum and CCN. The Mayor thanked Members for attending the Civic Service at Colston Basset. He drew attention to the Armed Forces Day followed by Proms in the Park which was to be held on June 24, and also his charity Sunday lunch to be held on July 24.

4. **Chief Executive's Announcements**

The Chief Executive reported that following the Manvers Ward Borough Election Councillors J E Fearon and D V Smith had been elected and he welcomed them to the Council.

5. **Leader's Announcements**

The Leader reported that he had appointed Councillor Fearon to the vacant post in Cabinet as portfolio holder for Community Protection.

6. **URGENT ITEM - PARISH ELECTION REQUEST: VACANCY FOR MANOR WARD COTGRAVE**

Councillor Clarke introduced a report regarding a request for a Parish election in the Manor Ward Cotgrave. This was seconded by Councillor Cranswick.

The Chief Executive informed Members that following the Parish Council elections in May there had remained one unfilled vacancy for the Manor ward in Cotgrave, as only three nominations had been received for the four seats. Under the relevant legislation the Town Council had the opportunity to fill the vacancy by co-option within 35 working days of the ordinary elections. At its meeting held on 15 June, the Town Council had rejected a motion to co-opt and instead resolved that there should be an election to fill the Manor Ward vacancy. The Town Council had indicated that it had also received a petition from local residents requesting an election. Subsequently the Borough Council had received a formal request to arrange an election for the remaining vacancy.

Councillor Tansley stated that he was a Cotgrave Town Councillor and that usually the parish or town council would co-opt a member. He was conscious of the additional costs of an election, however he was of the view that in the circumstances an election was the best way forward.

Councillor Chewings stated that in Cotgrave there was support for local democracy and she had actively tried to increase turnout in both the parish and borough elections. She stated that she believed the Revolutionary Party had called for voter participation, but had then had attempted to push through a co-option. She continued by saying that it was wrong for one group to support a co-option when 60 people had signed a petition calling for an election. She stated that voters had a right to trust Councillors and have faith in the democratic process, particularly in view of the important and significant decisions to be made in Cotgrave.

Councillor Butler spoke in support of the request and said he was also a member of the Town Council and that whilst it was unusual to call for an election, because of the strong feeling in Cotgrave and the number of people who had signed the petition, the election was the only way forward. He acknowledged that this would result in extra work for the Returning Officer and his staff, however it was necessary to resolve the present situation.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) pursuant to section 21(2) of the Representation of the People Act 1985 and section 39(4) of the Representation of the People Act 1983, the Borough Council directs that an election be held to fill the remaining vacancy for the Manor ward of Cotgrave Town Council as soon as reasonably practicable, and
- (b) the Chief Executive be authorised to fix a date for the election.

7. APPOINTMENT TO UNALLOCATED POSITIONS ON COMMITTEES

It was proposed by Councillor Clarke and seconded by Councillor Cranswick that, following the Manvers Ward election the unallocated positions on committees be filled in line with the report and the attached appendix as circulated. He added that the proposal was to appoint positions as follows:

- (i) Corporate Governance Group – Councillor N C Lawrence
- (ii) Performance Management Board – Councillor D V Smith
- (iii) Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee – Councillor J E Fearon (Chairman)
- (iv) Licensing Committee - Councillor J E Fearon (Chairman)

Additionally the report highlighted that the Cabinet Portfolio holder for Community Protection was nominated as Chairman of the Alcohol and Entertainments Committee and also Chairman of the Licensing Committee. The remainder of the positions contained in the appendix to the report were as agreed at Annual Council in May 2011.

Councillor Davidson sought clarification of the composition of the Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee as the appendix to the report appeared to conflict with the appointments previously agreed at Annual Council, particularly in respect of the Vice Chairman of the Alcohol & Entertainments Licensing Committee and the Vice Chairman of two of the scrutiny groups. Consequently the meeting was adjourned at 7.25 pm in order to clarify the position.

The meeting reconvened at 7.30 pm and the Chief Executive stated that the appendix to the report was not entirely correct and he apologised for this. He confirmed the positions requiring clarification that had previously been agreed at Annual Council as follows:

- (i) Corporate Governance Group Vice Chairman – Councillor E A Plant
- (ii) Performance Management Board Vice Chairman – Councillor R M Jones
- (iii) Alcohol & Entertainments Licensing Committee Vice Chairman – Councillor G Davidson.

RESOLVED that the nominations to the positions as set out below be approved:

- (a) Corporate Governance Group – Councillor N C Lawrence
- (b) Performance Management Board – Councillor D V Smith
- (c) Alcohol and Entertainments Licensing Committee – Councillor J E Fearon (Chairman)
- (d) Licensing Committee - Councillor J E Fearon (Chairman)

8. **OFFICER EMPLOYMENT PROCEDURE RULES – REFERRAL FROM CABINET**

Councillor Clarke, seconded by Councillor Cranswick, proposed the revised Officer Employment Procedure Rules which had been considered by Cabinet, following referral from Council, in May 2011. Subsequently Cabinet had considered the flexibility required in relation to the process for the recruitment to the posts of Chief Executive and Deputy Chief Executives. As such the proposed revised rules now included the requirement for Council to determine the scope of intended applicants, and whether the stated post(s) should be advertised internally, externally, or both.

Councillor Davidson stated that he felt some unease that the Council could appoint a Chief Executive without an external advertisement. He felt that it was important to ensure the council had the best possible choice of candidates and external advertisement would assist with this.

Councillor Plant stated that the amended paragraph had resolved the previous the ambiguity, as it clarified Council's role and whether the advertisement should be external. She recognised the financial climate, however was of the view that the Council needed to ensure that the senior positions were advertised externally, in line with transparency and openness.

RESOLVED that:

- (a) the revised Officer Employment Procedure Rules set out in appendix A of the report be approved and
- (b) the Head of Corporate Services be authorised to make the necessary amendments to the Council's Constitution to reflect this.

9. SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT

Councillor Clarke, seconded by Councillor Cranswick proposed the Scrutiny Annual Report. In doing so, he acknowledged the importance of the report and the role of scrutiny in developing policy and holding the Executive to account.

Councillor Davidson commented on the importance of scrutiny and the valuable part it played in the Council's work. He believed this was demonstrated in the report through the wide range of topics successfully scrutinised.

Councillor MacInnes welcomed the report and felt that scrutiny was operating well, however he stated that it was becoming routine and repetitive and more emphasis was needed on community concerns rather than routine monitoring reports. He stated that whilst each topic should be debated on its merits and not on party politics, pre-meetings by political groups, were in direct contradiction of the true spirit of scrutiny.

Commenting further Councillor MacInnes stated that he believed there was a need for the training of new members on scrutiny. In concluding, he stated that the main reason for scrutiny operating well was that there was a feeling of shared ownership amongst Members, however this he felt, may change following the Annual Council decision not to appoint opposition Members to chair scrutiny committees. He hoped this would not be the case.

Councillor Wheeler thanked Members and officers for their support on Performance Management Board through a very challenging year.

Councillor Vennett-Smith thanked Councillors Lawrence and Dale for the excellent way they had chaired the Partnership Delivery Group. He informed Members that the meetings had been fun to attend and he had enjoyed being involved. Councillor Lawrence acknowledged Councillor Vennett-Smith's comments. He added that there had been a huge range of partnerships and subjects covered over the last year. He wished the new Group every success.

Councillor Tansley stated that the report reflected the credit due to the scrutiny groups. He drew attention to the Cricket Club loan arrangement and the Cotgrave Positive Futures Partnership which had been doing good work with the young people in Cotgrave. As a result the Police had noted that levels of crime and anti social behaviour had fallen.

Councillor J Smith endorsed the previous comments and repeated the thanks to officers, as chairman of the Community Delivery Group. She informed

Members that the most interesting meeting had been a presentation by Cropwell Bishop Parish Council who were compiling a village plan. This had brought together a number of groups in the parish and had identified issues to take forward such as the need for affordable housing and allotments. Councillor J Smith also highlighted the work of the Leisure Strategy Review Member Panel, which had not finally reported, but would tie in with the development of the Local Development Framework.

Councillor Purdue-Horan drew attention to a comment made by Councillor Plant at the last meeting of Corporate Governance Group in relation to how difficult it can be for Members to understand the topics being scrutinised, and agreed with this. He acknowledged the outstanding support from officers and the fact that the Council had negotiated its way through some difficult financial issues this year, given the uncertainty in interest rates. He stated that whilst it was not the most interesting of topics, however it was very important.

Councillor R Mallender concurred with the earlier comments regarding Community Development Group. He stated he was pleased the Group had considered climate change and affordable housing as these were of vital importance to the Borough.

RESOLVED that Council endorse the report and recognise the valuable work undertaken by the four scrutiny groups

10. **QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 11(2)**

1) Question from Councillor Jones to Councillor Clarke

What does the Leader think of the lack of honesty and the disrespect shown to three former Rushcliffe Borough Councillors, who were retiring for reasons of moves of residence and physical disability, by the leaflet circulated to Rushcliffe residents by some Conservative candidates before the recent election?

Councillor Clarke responded by saying that the information in the leaflet was factually correct and that he had every respect for the Members in question who were now retired.

As a supplementary question Councillor Jones asked what would the Leader do to avoid such unwarranted attacks on long serving Members in future.

In response Councillor Clarke stated that it was important to consider what was defined as unwarranted however he would be mindful of this in future.

2) Question from Councillor S Mallender to Councillor D Mason

Can you confirm that residents of the Borough will be paying the annual charge of £25 for the opt-in green wheelie bin collection service in 2011/2012 despite the fact that the opt-in service will run for just 9 months this year?

In response Councillor D Mason confirmed that those residents opting-in to the service would indeed pay the £25 as the collection was from April to April.

As a supplementary question Councillor S Mallender asked whether there would be any recompense to residents in the following year as the service had not run for a full year.

Councillor D Mason repeated that the service had not ceased in April therefore it was for 12 months.

11. **NOTICES OF MOTION**

- (a) Proposed by Councillor R M Jones and seconded by Councillor K A Khan:

Council recommends that a West Bridgford Member Group be established to examine the specific local issues facing West Bridgford from the imminent Sharphill development, to hear the views of residents and community groups and partners of the Council and to comment to Cabinet accordingly.

Councillor Jones stated that the motion proposed a way for the Council to take a lead in putting localism into practice in its main urban area. It proposed a way for the Council to improve inclusion and understanding of public services and would enable the public to participate in improving their local area in response to population changes specifically when there was growth in housing. He continued by stating that outside West Bridgford many areas had parish, village and neighbourhood plans, which involved wide local consultation and residents involvement. In West Bridgford, he said, there was no equivalent local or neighbourhood plan, no master plan, no vision for the continued growth of estates and no framework for involving the many interested groups in shaping their area.

Councillor Jones stated that the motion proposed a low cost way of enabling people to input into the development of the area making use of existing Members. He continued that the County Council's Local Area Forum had neither teeth nor resources to fill the void although it could play a part in helping the proposal. In relation to neighbourhoods and areas, Councillor Jones believed these were hard to define. However, he was of the view that these became real when services were concerned. He felt that the Council was missing the understanding of local people as there was no involvement or local plan for West Bridgford as a whole.

Councillor Jones pointed out that the population of the existing areas of West Bridgford was changing and would continue to change with the new housing. He went on to say that most people did not know what the changing population trends were or what the causes were. He thought that many people feared the traffic consequences of the next housing development but few people had seen the measures which would accompany the housing in terms of bus services, sports facilities, allotments and traffic measures. Councillor Jones stated that the views and interests of residents and the various neighbourhoods, the consequences for travel plans and traffic, carbon footprints and ownership of such proposals were not in the equation and needed to be, particularly as the Sharphill development involved considerable sums of money transferring from the Developers to local services. He believed that the public had a key interest in what these monies were used for.

Councillor Jones stated that the proposal would aim to increase public understanding and involvement at a time of change and uncertainty. He recognised that the proposal would require officer support but suggested that at the same time there would be some reduction in the large amounts of officer time spent answering the enquiries, complaints and observations of individual residents. He recognised that there were various ways in which a Member Working Group could connect with the individuals and groups in the community and that if this motion was supported, that these would require further discussion and agreement. He felt that there was time to do this in a measured and relatively leisurely fashion if the Council acted now before the next estate, Sharpill, was progressed. He stated that the Council should do this now so that West Bridgford residents were not once again left out of the process.

Councillor P Smith referred to the Secretary of State's findings in 2009 whereby the Council was to ensure clear consultation and clear actions between the developer, County Council and the Borough Council. This, he stated, was being followed and consultation was being carried out on the basis of need. He was of the opinion that the level of co-ordination between the three was a credit to them. He stated that there were other wards adjacent to the ward affected and that it would be courteous to keep them informed.

Councillor Wheeler stated that the West Bridgford Local Area Forum had recently elected Councillor Dickinson and Councillor R Mallender as Chairman and Vice-Chairman respectively. He was of the view that the Forum needed to change shape and direction and become more focussed, however the Forum had community representation and involvement and therefore it was unnecessary to set up a further body. He asked Councillor Jones to consider withdrawing the motion and leaving it in the hands of the Forum.

Councillor Cooper stated that there was no precedent for setting up such a group. He concurred with the view that the West Bridgford Area Forum was the most appropriate vehicle to take this forward, given that it already had member representation and represented some 30 local organisations.

Councillor Dickinson stated that she had been elected as Chairman of the Forum, an organisation which was not funded by the County Council. She informed Members that the Constitution enabled the Forum to provide a service to residents and extend the membership including the formation of sub groups similar to that being proposed by Councillor Jones. She continued, there were currently two vacancies on the management committee.

Councillor S Mallender spoke in support of the motion. She said that often the community were not consulted or informed of changes and gave the example of the doctors' surgery and changes to road junctions. The proposal would enable a proper community plan for West Bridgford to be put in place.

Councillor Bannister stated that he understood the implications of large housing developments but there was a need to include Members from adjoining wards. It was important for people to be involved and their views to be fed back into Cabinet. He stated that representation through the Local Area Forum was only legitimised by councillors who attended.

Councillor S Boote was of the opinion that there was a democratic deficit in West Bridgford, as there was no parish council, no plan, and therefore no parish councillors to take a local interest. He felt the relationship with Cabinet was key to ensuring views were input at the highest level.

Councillor Lawrence said, that as Chairman of the Community Development Group he was looking forward to provisions in the Localism Bill which would enable community groups to come forward saying they wanted to do their own things. He felt that it could be difficult for a member group to deal with West Bridgford as the definition of a community was not clear.

Councillor Clarke reminded Members that the Localism Bill was not yet law, and therefore could not yet be used. He was of the view that a new group would interfere with the work of ward members and that the precedent was not needed. Furthermore the establishment of such a group was unnecessary as there were clearly established mechanisms in place for engaging with the community. Additionally he believed local Councillors, as community leaders, had a fundamental role to play in engaging with their communities.

Councillor R Mallender stated that the work of the proposed group would be to complement the work of the West Bridgford Local Area Forum and not be in competition with it. There were multiple levels of representation in the Borough and this proposal would give the Local Area Forum a role similar to a parish council.

Councillor Vennett-Smith said he had listened to the debate and was totally perplexed by it. He expressed the view that there was a void in West Bridgford in that a tier of government was missing and he questioned whether reliance on the Forum was workable, given that it had no funding.

Councillor Khan felt that there was a compelling case for a member group and urged Members to support the motion.

In summing up Councillor Jones said that it was disappointing that the ruling Group did not want to do something new and responsive for the residents of West Bridgford. He was also disappointed at the attitude by some Members to town and parish councils in that they were seen as irrelevant for West Bridgford. His proposal was a means of involving the groups and people of the locality in a way other than the Local Area Forum which had no officer support, no planning function and no connection with the Council's Executive.

The motion was put to the vote and declared lost.

(b) Proposed by Councillor S J Boote and seconded by Councillor R M Jones

Council regrets the considerably reduced standard of grass-cutting and the increased number of complaints following the decision by the County Council to withdraw from the bilateral agreement for cutting County grass and Borough trees. Council resolves to continue to press the County Council to return the standard and frequency of grass-cutting and tree-cutting to their former state.

Councillor Boote introduced the motion stating that the number of complaints about grass cutting had increased, partly because of the growing season, but also because of the withdrawal of the bilateral agreement for cutting grass. He acknowledged that the Council did a decent job of grass cutting however there were issues with verges and the highway since the changes had come into force.

Councillor D Mason agreed with the motion and informed Council that she had been in dialogue with the County Council Cabinet Member and officers from the County and Borough Councils. She continued, saying that no decision had yet been made and that discussions were continuing.

Councillor S Mallender commented on tree pollarding and also how it was not good to leave the grass to grow in areas, other than areas where it was part of the natural habitat. Councillor MacInnes concurred that trees created problems at times of the year and that if not lopped regularly could cause damage to properties.

Councillor Clarke stated that he agreed with the spirit of the motion and reiterated that Councillor D Mason had been in discussion with the County Council. He informed Council that the solution may not be to return to the previous arrangement and that it may lie in finding other partners. Councillor Clarke, seconded by Councillor D Mason, proposed an amendment to the motion in the following terms:

Council regrets the considerably reduced standard of grass-cutting and the increased number of complaints following the decision by the County Council to withdraw from the agreement for cutting County grass and Borough trees. Council resolves to continue dialogue and work with the County Council and any other appropriate organisation to ensure grass cutting and tree maintenance are brought back to a standard expected by Rushcliffe residents.

Councillor Boote formally accepted the amendment on the grounds that it was about achieving a decent standard of grass cutting. Councillor Jones welcomed the comments of Councillor D Mason.

Councillor S Boote thanked Councillor D Mason for her positive comments and noted that grass and trees were continuing to grow while the talks were taking place. He re-iterated that it was not about doing the work, rather about returning the overall appearance of the Borough to its former state.

The motion, as amended, was put to the vote and declared carried.

(c) Proposed by Councillor G R Mallender and seconded by Councillor S J Boote

Council regrets the decision to charge for the use of the new public toilets in Bridgford Park and recommends that no entry charge is made for these or any new public toilets.

In proposing the motion Councillor R Mallender stated that there had been a campaign for 20 years for new toilets, and now these had been opened, but with complex door mechanisms and a 20p charge. He felt that it would be

better not to charge in future and make use of the concierge in the kiosk as an alternative.

Councillor Cranswick stated that the purpose of the charge was to reduce and eliminate petty vandalism in the toilets. Furthermore it had been agreed by the Council and therefore there was no reason to change it.

Councillor MacInnes considered that this was a difficult issue to deal with as services should be free at the point of delivery, but they should also be clean and free of vandalism. He stated that income generation should not be the main factor, and he would support a reduction in the charge if possible. Furthermore if the charge did not stop the vandalism then this would need to be reviewed in six months.

Councillor S Mallender, whilst grateful for the new toilets, commented that with a 20 pence charge only a 20 pence piece would fit, and often people did not have a 20 pence with them. She asked whether the Parking Officers could monitor the toilets for vandalism. She also stated that elderly persons' organisations were of the view that there should be no charge for toilets.

Councillor Combellack reminded Members of the tradition to pay to spend a penny and that inflation had meant this was now 20 pence. If it resulted in toilets being clean and vandalism free then it was satisfactory to charge.

Councillor Clarke stated that this was not a statutory service and Council had passed a resolution for the charge. He informed Members that there had been positive comments and that the toilets had had 1,500 users per month since opening. Furthermore the toilets had been welcomed by park users and it was perfectly fair to charge a nominal fee for a high level of service.

Councillor S Boote stated that it was short sighted of the Council not to provide free toilets. He continued by saying that businesses and jobs would suffer as a result. He also suggested a community toilet scheme, whereby the Council would pay businesses a small sum of money in return for members of the public being able to use their toilets.

In conclusion Councillor R Mallender re-iterated that the kiosk should be staffed so that the toilets could be free of charge.

The motion was put to the vote and declared lost.

(d) Proposed by Councillor J N Clarke and seconded by Councillor J A Cranswick

This Council recognises and welcomes the Government's continued investment and support in developing the national infrastructure, but believes the Government should defer any further investment in the High Speed (HS2) project at this time, and re-consider its national infrastructure priorities and where it focuses its funding allocations.

This Council believes that the funding allocated to HS2 should be re-directed to assist areas around the country by supporting and funding infrastructure improvements to help re-vitalise local economies.

To help regeneration of the East Midlands, and in particular Nottinghamshire and Rushcliffe, this Council calls on funding by Central Government to be used, for example, to:

- a) Improve the existing rail facilities to ensure increased reliability
- b) Bring forward the electrification of the Midland Mainline
- c) Accelerate the upgrading and dualling of the A453 urgently and without delay
- d) Increase the speed and scale of investment in high speed broadband countrywide, to assist in supporting both urban and rural economies
- e) Improve access links to East Midlands Airport

Consequently, this Council will continue to work with other local authorities and businesses to campaign and lobby, as appropriate, to achieve these aims.

In moving the motion Councillor Clarke stated that he was not against HS2 in principle, but that there was an enormous cost to the project. He stated that the Council should recognise that the money could be re-focused on priorities which were needed more to help the greater Nottinghamshire area to prosper again. Councillor Clarke questioned the benefit to businesses if the link went ahead and where the station would be. He stated that there were still problems with the East Coast line and that the Midland mainline required electrifying: the money for the HS2 could be better re-invested in improving what we had. He went on to say that the A453 was critical to the greater Nottinghamshire area and it was vital that it was improved and dualled as a matter of urgency. Regarding upgrading broadband, Councillor Clarke said that it was vital for the rural economy and for those working from home. He stated that he was trying to redirect and refocus the money. Councillor Clarke drew Members' attention to an alteration in the wording of the motion, that being the word 'halt' on the third line be replaced with the word 'defer'.

Councillor Bannister, seconded by Councillor MacInnes moved an amendment to the motion, that being to replace paragraphs one and two of the original motion with the following words and keep the remainder as on the agenda, so that the proposed amended motion would read as;

This Council recognises and welcomes the Coalition Government's continued investment and support in developing the national infrastructure, including the investment in the High Speed Train (HS2), but believes that as a matter of national economic priority the Coalition Government should expand its current programme and increase the overall funding allocation.

This Council believes that a substantial proportion of this increased sum should be directed to assist areas around the country by supporting and funding infrastructure improvements to help to re-vitalise local economies.

To help regeneration of the East Midlands, and in particular Nottinghamshire and Rushcliffe, this Council calls on funding by Central Government to be used, for example, to:

- a) *Improve the existing rail facilities to ensure increased reliability*
- b) *Bring forward the electrification of the Midland Mainline*
- c) *Accelerate the upgrading and dualling of the A453 urgently and without delay*
- d) *Increase the speed and scale of investment in high speed broadband countrywide, to assist in supporting both urban and rural economies*
- e) *Improve access links to East Midlands Airport*

Consequently, this Council will continue to work with other local authorities and businesses to campaign and lobby, as appropriate, to achieve these aims.

Councillor Bannister stated that any extension to the HS2 was unlikely to run through the Borough, however it was a way of ensuring that the UK didn't become left behind as Far Eastern countries developed further. Furthermore the HS2 showed national ambition and was to be supported. There was a big difference between standard and high speed rail and therefore a need for infrastructure.

Councillor Cranswick said that this was unrealistic as the government was unlikely to provide any more funding.

Councillor Davidson supported the amendment, however felt that there was no evidence that the money would be available if there was no HS2.

Councillor S Boote said that with the formidable £30 billion bill, the government could neither afford to build or not build the HS2. The UK was one of the most densely populated countries and demand for transport was growing. He continued, saying it was not possible to pile more trains onto existing lines and therefore it was necessary to plan and build infrastructure for the future.

Councillor R Mallender supported the amendment saying that the HS2 could potentially add £125 billion to the economy.

Councillor Butler stated that the amended motion was idealistic rather than realistic: if there was an endless supply of money then it should be pursued however improvements to existing infrastructure would be more beneficial.

Councillor Lawrence agreed with Councillor Butler in that it was unrealistic to expect more money and that there was a need to be positive of what was being achieved. It was necessary to look to the future.

Councillor MacInnes said that it was realistic to pursue both strategies at once: the regional economy would grow with national investment and vice versa. Furthermore high speed links would speed up business transactions. It was however important that the builder of trains and rolling stock in the Midlands be awarded the contract rather than an overseas company.

Councillor Bannister concluded that the project needed to happen sooner rather than later and stated that the A453 had been deferred many times and was a vital project.

Councillor Clarke said that the Council needed to campaign for improvements in the infrastructure and that the amendment suggested there was more money available but he knew this was not the case.

The amendment was put to the vote and lost.

Councillor Vennett-Smith was of the view that the original motion was slightly nebulous to the Borough and that the shopping list was somewhat idealistic and questioned whether it could be achieved for the same cost as the HS2.

Councillor R Mallender disagreed with the motion as it sought to defer HS2. He stated that there were significant benefits of the HS2 which outweighed the cost, these included freeing capacity on other lines, a modal shift from short haul flights to high speed trains.

Councillor Jones stated that if the motion deleted the reference to where the government should spend the money he would support it, however there was no view that the money would be moved.

Councillor Lawrence was concerned that the motion was based on misunderstanding in terms of whether the money would be re-directed. He stated that there was insufficient money to widen the A453. He was fully supportive of the proposed alternatives for spending, however he felt it did not need a motion to support it. He continued saying that HS2 was the biggest regeneration opportunity for the Borough in years and that the economy would be boosted if it proceeded.

Councillor Hetherington stated that there was not a single example in the world of a request for station being turned down, and the best option for Rushcliffe was an interchange station. He expressed concern about the motion saying that support for an HS2 station was a priority.

Under Council Procedure Rule 9.1 Councillor Clarke, seconded by Councillor Cranswick moved to extend the closing time of the meeting to no later than 10.30 pm. When put to the vote, Council agreed to this extension.

Councillor Purdue-Horan stated that he had been inspired when Councillor Clarke had presented the motion regarding the HS2 and whilst the Council on its own might not achieve a u-turn on it, it may be able to do this with further support.

In conclusion Councillor Clarke stated that nationally if enough support was given to the proposals within the motion it would be possible to achieve something which was supportive of and consistent with the aspirations for Rushcliffe.

The motion was put to the vote and declared carried.

The meeting closed at 10.10 pm.

MAYOR