

When telephoning, please ask for: Helen Tambini
Direct dial 0115 914 8320
Email democraticservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Wednesday, 22 September 2021

To all Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

A Meeting of the Council will be held on Thursday, 30 September 2021 at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West Bridgford to consider the following items of business.

This meeting will be accessible and open to the public via the live stream on YouTube and viewed via the link: <https://www.youtube.com/user/RushcliffeBC>
Please be aware that until the meeting starts the live stream video will not be showing on the home page. For this reason, please keep refreshing the home page until you see the video appear.

Yours sincerely



Sanjit Sull
Monitoring Officer

AGENDA

Moment of Reflection

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest
3. Minutes of the meeting held on 1 July 2021 (Pages 1 - 18)

To receive as a correct record the minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on 1 July 2021.

4. Mayor's Announcements
5. Leader's Announcements
6. Chief Executive's Announcements

Rushcliffe Borough
Council Customer
Service Centre

Fountain Court
Gordon Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 5LN

Email:
customerservices
@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Telephone:
0115 981 9911

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

Opening hours:
Monday, Tuesday and Thursday
8.30am - 5pm
Wednesday
9.30am - 5pm
Friday
8.30am - 4.30pm

Postal address
Rushcliffe Borough
Council
Rushcliffe Arena
Rugby Road
West Bridgford
Nottingham
NG2 7YG

7. Petitions

To receive any petitions in accordance with Standing Order No. 10 and the Council's Petitions Scheme.

8. Citizens' Questions

To answer questions submitted by Citizens on the Council or its services.

9. Petition: Community Governance Review (Bingham Town Council) (Pages 19 - 28)

The report of the Chief Executive is attached.

10. Appointment of Independent Persons (Pages 29 - 32)

The report of the Monitoring Officer is attached.

11. Devolution and "Levelling Up" in Nottinghamshire (Pages 33 - 38)

The report of the Chief Executive is attached.

12. Notices of Motion

To receive Notices of Motion submitted under Standing Order No.12

- a) This Council calls on the Government to provide funding over five years to local authorities accommodating vulnerable Afghan Refugees so that practical and social support can be provided and in the case of large families, considers deferring the application of benefit caps to avoid recreating poverty and homelessness.

Councillor R Jones

- b) This Council recognises that food waste contributes hugely to climate change and appreciates the carbon benefits that could be realised if Rushcliffe's household food waste was collected separately and processed via Anaerobic Digestion or In-Vessel Composting. Council will seek to influence relevant partners and agencies to bring this forward as soon as is practically possible.

Councillor C Thomas

- c) The "Planning for the Future" White Paper appears to be in tatters due to many of the government's own supporters having turned on it and the recent Cabinet reshuffle. The proposals could take away the right of local communities to comment on individual planning decisions by introducing zones where consent in principle is predetermined. Combined with wide-ranging changes to "permitted development rights"

this is undermining the more democratic process that has regulated planning decisions for generations.

This Council calls on the government to halt the destructive programme of so called "planning reform" set out in the "Planning for the Future" White Paper, particularly the zoning proposals, and keep local councillors, communities, and democracy at the heart of the planning process.

Councillor J Walker

13. Questions from Councillors

To answer questions submitted by Councillors under Standing Order No. 11(2)

Membership

Chairman: Councillor S Mallender

Vice-Chairman: Councillor T Combella

Councillors: R Adair, S Bailey, B Bansal, M Barney, K Beardsall, N Begum, A Brennan, B Buschman, R Butler, N Clarke, J Cottee, G Dickman, A Edyvean, M Gaunt, P Gowland, B Gray, L Healy, L Howitt, R Inglis, Mrs C Jeffreys, R Jones, R Mallender, D Mason, G Moore, J Murray, A Phillips, F Purdue-Horan, S J Robinson, K Shaw, D Simms, J Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood, C Thomas, R Upton, D Viridi, J Walker, R Walker, L Way, G Wheeler, J Wheeler and G Williams

Meeting Room Guidance

Fire Alarm Evacuation: In the event of an alarm sounding please evacuate the building using the nearest fire exit, normally through the Council Chamber. You should assemble at the far side of the plaza outside the main entrance to the building.

Toilets: Are located to the rear of the building near the lift and stairs to the first floor.

Mobile Phones: For the benefit of others please ensure that your mobile phone is switched off whilst you are in the meeting.

Microphones: When you are invited to speak please press the button on your microphone, a red light will appear on the stem. Please ensure that you switch this off after you have spoken.

Recording at Meetings

The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 allows filming and recording by anyone attending a meeting. This is not within the Council's control.

Rushcliffe Borough Council is committed to being open and transparent in its decision making. As such, the Council will undertake audio recording of meetings which are open to the public, except where it is resolved that the public be excluded, as the information being discussed is confidential or otherwise exempt.

This page is intentionally left blank



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 1 JULY 2021

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West
Bridgford and live streamed on
the Rushcliffe Borough Council YouTube channel

PRESENT:

Councillors S Mallender (Chairman), T Combellack (Vice-Chairman), R Adair, S Bailey, B Bansal, M Barney, K Beardsall, N Begum, A Brennan, R Butler, N Clarke, G Dickman, A Edyvean, M Gaunt, P Gowland, L Healy, R Inglis, Mrs C Jeffreys, A Major, R Mallender, D Mason, G Moore, J Murray, A Phillips, F Purdue-Horan, S J Robinson, K Shaw, D Simms, J Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood, C Thomas, R Upton, D Viridi, J Walker, R Walker, L Way, G Wheeler and J Wheeler

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

L Ashmore	Director of Development and Economic Growth
C Caven-Atack	Service Manager - Corporate Services
T Coop	Democratic Services Officer
P Linfield	Director of Finance and Corporate Services
K Marriott	Chief Executive
S Sull	Service Manager - Legal Services
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

APOLOGIES:

Councillors B Buschman, J Cottee, B Gray, L Howitt, R Jones and G Williams

9 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

10 Minutes of the meeting held on 20 May 2021

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 20 May 2021 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

11 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor informed Council that whilst her last few months had not been as full of engagements as she expected them to be, there were a few highlights she was able to share. She had enjoyed playing table tennis in Bingham marketplace to celebrate U3a day and had participated in the Great British Spring Clean in Lady Bay where residents were following the positive example set by Cotgrave by going 'plastic free' in local shops. She also mentioned the Lady Bay festival, the Queen's birthday service and raising the flag for Armed

Forces Day. The Mayor concluded with an update of her walking tour of the borough and thanked fellow Councillors for their support in aid of her three charities.

12 Leader's Announcements

The Leader of the Council welcomed all Councillors back to the Council Chamber. He went on to thank officers for the efforts they had undertaken to ensure Councillors felt safe returning and informed Council that this also extended to external meetings in Council facilities. Just this afternoon he had attended a meeting of the East Midlands Global Gateway (Freeport) in the Chamber, the Council's external partners were very impressed with the facility, and the meeting was an excellent showcase of what Rushcliffe had to offer. The Leader especially welcomed back Councillor Jeffreys following her illness and congratulated Councillors J Walker and Begum on their new positions as Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The Leader was proud to share a few statistics with Councillors that had been published that morning. Rushcliffe, he reported, had the country's third best collection rate for Council tax, the sixth best collection rate for Business Rates, and the second-best combined collection rate over the last twelve months. Finally, the Leader informed Council that the extension to the Coronavirus restrictions had led to the Proms in the Park celebration being postponed to September 2021, resulting in the Council's first major event being the Taste of Rushcliffe food festival in West Bridgford this coming weekend.

13 Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no Chief Executive's Announcements.

14 Citizens' Questions

There were no Citizens' Questions.

15 Business from the last Council meeting

Question from Councillor Thomas to Councillor Moore

"The CIL charge includes amounts collected for Leisure Centres and Playing Fields, which are held by Rushcliffe to be spent by Rushcliffe. Please provide a statement showing how much money has been collected to date under these two categories of expenditure and how much has been spent."

Councillor Moore informed Council that to date, since the adoption of the Community Infrastructure Levy in October 2019, the Council has collected £815,402.13 of strategic CIL from developments across the Borough; no expenditure has happened to date. The CIL operated on the basis of a roof tax with monies received held in a Borough wide fund and not initially collected or apportioned for specific projects or types of infrastructure. Money would be spent on items in the infrastructure list and would be apportioned based on the identified funding gaps for each of the items on the list. The detail of this allocation would be the subject of a scrutiny review in October after which it would be considered at Cabinet. Councillor Moore outlined the items on the

infrastructure list as:

- Provision of Park and Ride along the A52 corridor and bus priority measures in West Bridgford.
- Provision of or improvements to playing pitches and ancillary facilities.
- Provision of or improvements to indoor leisure provision.
- Provision of additional secondary school places across the Borough through new provision or extension to existing provision.
- Provision of health facilities across the Borough through new provision or extension to existing provision.

Supplementary question

Councillor Thomas asked what the identified funding gaps for each of the five items on the CIL infrastructure list were.

Councillor Moore agreed to forward that information to Councillor Thomas.

16 Approval of the Scrutiny Annual Reports 2020/21

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services providing a review of the work undertaken by the Council's four Scrutiny Groups during 2020/21. The Leader invited each of the Scrutiny Group Chairmen to deliver a brief summary of the work of each Group over the year.

Councillor Combellack, Chairman of the Corporate Overview Group, reported that despite being a very difficult year for all, scrutiny had been successful. The transition from the previous scrutiny arrangements had been completed and reviewed, and the new arrangements were working well. The Corporate Overview Group continued to meet throughout Covid to manage the work programmes of all the scrutiny groups as well as scrutinising important topics such as quarterly finance and performance monitoring, health and safety, and customer feedback. Councillor Combellack had continued to meet with other councils via the East Midlands Scrutiny Network and reported that virtual meetings had increased membership and engagement within that group. She concluded by thanking all Scrutiny Group Chairmen and Vice Chairmen for their time and efforts over the last twelve months as well as the officers involved in supporting scrutiny meetings.

Councillor Clarke, Chairman of the Growth and Development Group, thanked his Vice Chairman, Councillor Viridi, and congratulated him on his new role with the Governance Scrutiny Group. He outlined a number of the important items his Group had scrutinised during the year such as the crematorium, a new policy for planning enforcement and the new development at Abbey Road, which he hoped would prove to be an exemplar of energy efficient housing that others could follow. He also commended Councillors on the other side of the chamber for raising the management of open spaces as an item for scrutiny which led to a very interesting and productive discussion.

Councillor Purdue-Horan, Chairman of the Governance Scrutiny Group, stated that the work of the Group was extremely important to the governance of the Council. He commended the tremendous amount of work both officers and external partners had produced this year to bring forward items such as internal audit, the Constitution review, a review of risk management, the Statement of Accounts, treasury and asset investment update, the Capital Investment Strategy, external audit, the Annual Governance Statement, a report on the Redmond Review, and the Council's Annual Fraud Assessment. The Group had also received an additional item assessing the impact of Covid-19 on the Council's operational stability – the 'going concern' report. Councillor Purdue-Horan thanked supporting officers and members of the Group, especially his Vice Chairman, Councillor J Walker.

Councillor Wheeler, Chairman of the Communities Scrutiny Group, stated that meetings of the Group had been very varied, with challenging issues to consider and he thanked all members of the Group for their excellent work. It was noted that the Group had made a number of recommendations and scrutinised some issues more than once, and all Councillors were welcomed to provide the Group with feedback and comments if they wished to do so. In conclusion, Councillor Wheeler thanked officers for their support throughout the year.

Councillor Robinson thanked all members of Scrutiny for their commitment over the last twelve months and Councillor Edyvean, in seconding the item, reminded Council that members of the Executive would be happy to attend scrutiny meetings when invited.

Councillor Bansal, on behalf of the Labour Group, agreed that many interesting topics had been scrutinised over the last twelve months and also thanked the officers involved in supporting scrutiny. He reminded Council that scrutiny should seek to gain the views of residents, community groups, users and experts and hoped that more use would be made of this aspect of scrutiny in the coming year.

Councillor Major noted the considerable work that had been undertaken by the Scrutiny Groups, which was vital to ensuring the Council's continued commitment to transparent governance. It was critical that the Scrutiny Groups continued to thoroughly scrutinise the work undertaken by the Council to ensure that residents were well served.

Those comments were echoed by Councillors R Mallender and Thomas.

It was proposed by Councillor Robinson and seconded by Councillor Edyvean and **RESOLVED** that the work undertaken by the four Scrutiny Groups during 2020/21 be endorsed.

17 **Councillors' Learning and Development Policy 2021-2025**

The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Customer Access, Councillor Moore presented the report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services, explaining that the Councillors' Learning and Development Policy had been reviewed following the 2019 Borough Council election, to reflect current

practice and the needs of Councillors in terms of training and development. The Policy, developed in conjunction with Member Development Group, ensured that Councillors were adequately trained, having the necessary knowledge, skills and attributes, to deliver effective decision making within the Borough. It provided both face-to-face and online training opportunities from both internal officers and external partners covering a wide range of topics. Councillor Moore concluded by reminding Councillors that training was vitally important and that, in his opinion, there was always something new to be learnt.

Adoption of the Policy was seconded by Councillor Brennan who thanked officers and the Member Development Group for updating this important Policy. She recognised that it was difficult to get the balance right between training that was essential to maintaining the good governance of the authority and keeping Councillors safe, and that which was desirable and designed to help Councillors undertake their roles more effectively. This was made more difficult because each person had a different skill set when elected as a councillor and a varied set of experiences to bring to the role.

Councillor J Walker commented that the training she had received both from officers and external providers had been of excellent quality and that she was happy to support the adoption of this Policy.

Councillor Major thanked the Member Development Group for its hard work in ensuring that Councillors were fully trained and supported to undertake their role and was happy to support the adoption of this Policy.

Councillor R Mallender welcomed this Policy coming forward for adoption and informed Council of the debate held at Member Development Group on the two occasions the Policy had come to the Group. He stressed the importance of Councillors being appropriately trained to carry out their roles, urged Councillors to go online and undertake the essential e-learning courses and to speak to officers if they identified any specific training, they would like to undertake which could be funded from the Members' Training budget.

Councillor Shaw reported that as a member of the Member Development Group he was also very happy to recommend the adoption of this Policy.

RESOLVED that the Councillors' Learning and Development Policy 2021-2025 be adopted.

18 **Ruddington Neighbourhood Plan**

The Portfolio Holder for Business and Growth, Councillor Edyvean presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth, providing information on the Ruddington Neighbourhood Plan. Councillor Edyvean advised that the documents had been introduced by the Localism Act 2011 and were recognised by the National Planning Policy Framework, with local residents empowered to shape the future of their community. A plan had to in general conform with the strategic policies of the local planning authority and if the plan was made part of the Local Development Plan, then planning applications within that area would be determined in accordance with both the

Rushcliffe Local Plan and the relevant Neighbourhood Plan. The Plan had been promoted by the Parish Council, publicised, consulted on, examined by an independent Examiner and considered by the Borough Council. If the Plan was approved, it would then proceed to a referendum and if more than 50% of those voting voted “yes” then the Borough Council was required to “adopt” the Plan. If the result was “no”, then the Parish Council would have to decide what it wanted to do.

Councillor Inglis, in seconding the recommendations, stressed the importance of an adopted Neighbourhood Plan to support communities wishing to influence development in their local area. The Ruddington Neighbourhood Plan was an excellent and detailed Plan and the community deserve the opportunity to adopt this through a referendum.

Councillor Gaunt recognised the massive effort behind the detailed Plan and thanked the Neighbourhood Planning team in Ruddington for their time. He extended this thanks to the parish councillors and volunteers who had spent the last four years consulting and engaging with the community to shape the document. The Neighbourhood Plan could not have come at better time for Ruddington where the community had really come together over the last twelve months through the pandemic to support local residents and businesses.

Councillor Major recognised the time, energy and passion of local people in Ruddington and their desire to influence the future of their community.

Both Councillors R Mallender and Thomas congratulated the community on an excellent Neighbourhood Plan and wished them luck at the polls.

RESOLVED that, subject to a majority vote in the referendum:

- a) the Ruddington Neighbourhood Plan be adopted; and
- b) that the Director – Development and Economic Growth be granted delegated authority to issue a statement setting out this decision as soon as possible following the referendum.

19 **Revisions to the Council's Constitution**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Monitoring Officer that outlined revisions to the Constitution. Councillor Robinson reminded Councillors that the Constitution was a live, working document that was reviewed throughout the year. The amendments outlined in the report were mainly due to the internal restructure undertaken by the Chief Executive, delegated decisions, the changes required to remove reference to remote meetings during the pandemic, and the trial arrangements for the Planning Committee moving forwards. All amendments to the Constitution were listed in the appendix to the report to make it clear what had been amended. Councillor Robinson informed Council that the Governance Scrutiny Group had considered the changes to the Constitution last month. The Leader highlighted an error in section 4.5 of the report which related to the date of this meeting which should read 24 June 2021.

Councillor Robinson focused on the changes to the start time of Planning Committee, which would be trialled for six months. He highlighted the success of previous trials on changes to processes, such as the changes to scrutiny in 2019, the introduction of e-learning and paperlite for Councillors and encouraged Councillors to give it a go even though they might have some reservations.

Councillor Gowland asked to move an amendment to the recommendation, that Council approved the revisions to the Constitution, without the change to Standing Orders to allow Planning Committee meetings to move to the afternoon.

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Begum.

Councillor Gowland stated that although she appreciated that the change to the start time for Planning Committee was to be a trial, she considered that there were other alternatives, which could solve the issues that had been identified. It was noted that sometimes residents who had attended evening meetings had been unable to speak, as meetings had been adjourned due to the lateness of the evening; however, it was important to realise that by moving the meetings to the daytime, many people who worked would have to take time off to attend. It was accepted that sometimes less attention might be given to applications, if it was very late; however, it was hoped that other alternative solutions could be found, rather than moving the start time of the meeting. It was important to ensure that people who worked were not discriminated against, and the impact that this would have on Councillors should also be acknowledged. By moving meetings to the afternoon, it could mean that fewer Councillors who worked would be able to sit on the Committee. Although employers should give time off work to allow Councillors to attend meetings, it was noted that this often was not the case, and some employers were not supportive. Councillor Gowland reiterated that although this was a trial, she considered that the issue should be revisited, with other alternative options, before this significant change was made.

Councillor Begum reiterated the comments made by Councillor Gowland and stated that some Councillors were already taking time off work to sit on other committees, and this change would add additional pressure to workloads.

Councillor Thomas requested a recorded vote on the amendment and informed Council that she felt this would be a significant and harmful change, as afternoon meetings would reduce democracy. Whilst she was aware that employers should offer time off for Councillors to attend to the business of the Council, she explained that many occupations did not lend themselves to this type of flexibility and that publishing the agenda one week in advance would not be enough notice to organise time-off.

Councillor Major reiterated comments previously made and stated that this change would lead to a significant proportion of both Councillors and residents being discounted from participating at Planning Committee meetings, even if it was for only six months, and that would be very damaging to the Council.

Councillor R Mallender reminded Councillors that other local authorities had daytime meetings, as well as evening meetings and that this change would undoubtedly affect which Councillors could participate in the Committee and who could attend meetings to speak due to work or childcare issues.

Councillor Brennan reminded Council that what was proposed was a trial and that all aspects of this would be taken into account. She also highlighted that for many people, attending an evening meeting was just as difficult, such as those working in the hospitality industry or with emergency services, as well as those with children to care for.

Councillor Clarke pointed out that everyone was right and that it was because there were so many valid but opposing views that a trial was necessary to see what would work and what would not. He went on to say that to remain a good Council the authority needed to continually evolve and that those changes should be based on evidence, evidence that would be collected during the trial. He concluded by reminding Councillors that this change had been put before a cross-party scrutiny group, so everyone had already had the chance to comment and shape the trial moving forward.

Councillor J Walker referred to people who were unable to be flexible regarding their working arrangements and stated that many would struggle to attend daytime meetings, and although it was acknowledged that this was a trial, she considered that it would not work.

Councillor Combellack believed that the potential changes to the start time of the Planning Committee were timely, as it was right to assess the Council's working practices as result of pandemic.

Cllr Butler reminded Council that he had considerable experience of chairing the Council's Planning Committee and was in favour of the changes proposed. Even with the slightly earlier start time, the meetings were very long and complex and whilst public speaking had introduced much more depth to the decision-making process it had also had an effect on the length of meetings. Unfortunately, he had not yet found a way of beating the human body clock and was concerned that the ability of the Committee to absorb information and make important decisions late into the evening was unreasonable. He reminded Council that the reviewers who had conducted the Planning Peer Review a few years ago had been concerned that the Council still held planning meetings in the evening as many other authorities had moved to day-time meetings. He concluded that whilst appreciating that the change would not suit all he wished for Council to agree the change so that evidence about the impact could be collected and assessed.

Councillor Gaunt expressed his disappointment that there had not been an opportunity to consider a range of options or alternatives to the single solution proposed for the trial. He went on to say that it was too early to assess the lasting impact of the Covid-19 pandemic and how this would affect residents' working arrangements and their future ability to attend Planning Committee.

Councillor Edyvean informed Council that speakers who could not attend a particular day-time meeting could submit a written statement, which would be

read out at the meeting by the Chairman.

Councillor R Mallender asked for clarification on how the feedback from the trial would be captured.

Councillor Way expressed concern about the negative public perception of a written statement over the option of being able to address the meeting in person.

Councillor Robinson informed Council that he was disappointed that the proposals for Planning Committee had been met with such resistance as there were many other examples of trial periods resulting in significant and positive changes for the Council and the Borough's residents.

Councillor Gowland acknowledged that some people would find it difficult to attend meetings whenever they were held. She went on to say that it would be useful to have an open discussion on all aspects of how the Planning Committee operated. In conclusion, Councillor Gowland reiterated the importance of being able to come and speak in person at a meeting, rather than having to submit comments, that would be read out in their absence.

In accordance with Standing Orders - Council 16.4, a recorded vote was taken on the amendment to the motion as follows:

FOR: Councillors B Bansal, N Begum, M Gaunt, P Gowland, A Major, J Murray, K Shaw, C Thomas and J Walker

AGAINST: Councillors R Adair, S Bailey, M Barney, A Brennan, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, G Dickman, A Edyvean, L Healy, R Inglis, Mrs C Jeffreys, D Mason, G Moore, A Phillips, F Purdue-Horan, S Robinson, J Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood, R Upton, D Viridi, R Walker, D Wheeler and J Wheeler

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors K Beardsall, R Mallender, S Mallender, D Simms and Way

The amendment to the motion proposed by Councillor Gowland was lost.

Councillor Robinson informed Council that the proposed changes to the Constitution had been through scrutiny and had not been objected to by any Group or individual. He reminded Councillors that what was being proposed was a trial, feedback would be gathered from all parties and would be fully evaluated before a final decision was made.

Councillor Thomas requested a recorded vote on the original motion.

In accordance with Standing Orders - Council 16.4, a recorded vote was taken on the original motion as follows:

FOR: Councillors R Adair, S Bailey, M Barney, A Brennan, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, G Dickman, A Edyvean, L Healy, R Inglis, Mrs C Jeffreys, D Mason, G Moore, A Phillips, F Purdue-Horan, S Robinson, J Stockwood, Mrs M

Stockwood, R Upton, D Viridi, R Walker, L Way, D Wheeler and J Wheeler

AGAINST: Councillors N Begum, M Gaunt, P Gowland, A Major, J Murray, C Thomas and J Walker

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors B Bansal, K Beardsall, R Mallender, S Mallender, K Shaw and D Simms

The motion was carried.

It was proposed by Councillor Robinson and seconded by Councillor Edyvean and **RESOLVED** that the revisions to the Constitution be approved.

20 Notices of Motion

a. The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Way and seconded by Councillor J Walker.

“This Council notes the alarming decline in number of hedgehogs and threat of extinction and pledges to:

(i) Adopt landscape management practices on land it owns and manages that are supportive to hedgehogs and their habitat.

(ii) Encourage other agencies/councils operating in Rushcliffe to do likewise.

(iii) Conduct a public awareness campaign to encourage the public to adopt supportive practices.

(iv) Include appropriate conditions and advisory notes on planning consents to support the species.”

Councillor Way informed the Council in moving the motion that in the first half of the 20th century there were estimated to be over 30 million hedgehogs in Britain, but this number has now fallen to around one million. It was noted that, despite a petition for the government to review the inclusion of hedgehogs to be protected under section 5 of the Countryside and Wildlife Act 1981, local action could not be instigated to protect the species before the petition be debated in Parliament on 5 July 2021.

Councillor Way stated that much of the decline in the number of hedgehogs was due to the loss of habitat by developers. Councillor Way provided the example of the Rempstone Road development in East Leake where hedges had been removed and replaced by an open seeded grass area which is of no benefit to any wildlife. It was also noted that the guidance provided by the Council for developers stated that hedges should not be removed during hibernation periods in the winter however, hedges had been removed in February 2021 on Lantern Lane, East Leake. Councillor Way was concerned that despite the Council intending to prevent this from happening, there was little being done to ensure compliance.

It was suggested that the Council could protect hedgehogs by either reducing or eliminating strimming under hedges, which would save animals from injury, more areas could be included in the 'no-mow' scheme and the reduction of the use of pesticides. Additionally, areas where it was known that hedgehogs were known to be active would benefit from the use of road signs to encourage drivers to slow down. Also, it was noted that the Council should encourage its partners to follow this guidance and that with good practice others would follow. Councillor Way stated that a comprehensive and widespread publicity campaign needed to be undertaken and support given to groups trying to promote the welfare of hedgehogs. It was noted that the Council should encourage residents to provide hedgehogs with areas in their gardens to be reconnected such as planting hedges, providing rough areas for shelter or making small holes in walls or fences so they could move freely around in search of food and mates. Therefore, this would provide the public with advice on how to provide habitats for hedgehogs and inform them of the benefits of encouraging wildlife into their gardens.

Councillor J Walker seconded the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Brennan remarked that she had only seen one hedgehog whilst living in her current home of 15 years and recognised that the Council needed to help hedgehogs to foster their survival. Councillor Brennan supported the motion but noted that the Council was already trying to protect hedgehogs, for example, practices agreed recently by Cabinet as part of the Rushcliffe Nature Conservation Strategy and the inclusion of hedgehogs as a local bio-diversity action plan species which sought to support the habitats of wildlife currently in danger. It was also stated that the Council encouraged developers to include hedgehog gates and holes in fences in order for them to move around more freely. Councillor Brennan informed the Council that in 2019, Streetwise received training to avoid injury to hedgehogs whilst carrying out maintenance work.

Councillor Brennan proposed an amendment to the motion:

“This Council notes the alarming decline in number of hedgehogs and threat of extinction and pledges to:

- (i) Strengthen landscape management practices on land it owns and manages that are supportive to hedgehogs and their habitat.
- (ii) Encourage other agencies/councils operating in Rushcliffe to do likewise.
- (iii) Build on existing plans to conduct a public awareness campaign to encourage the public to adopt supportive practices.
- (iv) Continue to include appropriate conditions and advisory notes on planning consents to support hedgehogs and keep these under review in the event of changes to the protected status of the species.”

Councillor Barney seconded the amendment to the motion and thanked the Councillors for welcoming him as a member of the Council. In thanking

Councillor Way for moving the original motion however, he agreed with Councillor Brennan that the Council's current efforts should be acknowledged. Councillor Barney was also pleased to note that local Facebook groups had been set up to support the species.

In responding to the amendment, Councillor Way thanked Councillor Brennan for supporting the majority of the motion.

Councillor Jeffreys encouraged Councillors to not use slug pellets as hedgehogs may eat the poisoned slugs.

There was no further debate. After being put to the vote, the amendment to the motion was accepted and became the substantive motion.

Councillor Way requested that enforcement be necessary if developers were not compliant to planning conditions in regard to protecting hedgehogs and their habitat.

Councillor Brennan proposed that the substantive motion be amended to:

“This Council notes the alarming decline in number of hedgehogs and threat of extinction and pledges to:

(i) Strengthen landscape management practices on land it owns and manages that are supportive to hedgehogs and their habitat.

(ii) Encourage other agencies/councils operating in Rushcliffe to do likewise.

(iii) Build on existing plans to conduct a public awareness campaign to encourage the public to adopt supportive practices.

(iv) Continue to include appropriate conditions, enforcement where possible and advisory notes on planning consents to support hedgehogs and keep these under review in the event of changes to the protected status of the species.”

Councillor Robinson seconded the proposal.

There was no further debate. After being put to the vote, the amendment to the substantive motion was accepted.

Councillor Gowland congratulated the Council working in Abbey Ward to increase the presence of wildlife.

Councillor R Mallender supported the motion and noted that despite streets on new developments in West Bridgford being called Hedgehog Gardens, Magpie Close, and Foxfield way it was those developments that were contributing to the destruction of wildlife and their habitats.

On being put to the vote the substantive motion was carried.

- b. The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Thomas and seconded by Councillor Major.

“This Council understands the concerns that our residents have about infrastructure not being developed alongside housing and resolves to:

(i) Proactively work to ensure that developer contributions for the infrastructure items that are Rushcliffe’s responsibility, whether collected through S106 or CIL, are spent in a timely fashion to mitigate the impacts of development, providing regular progress reports

(ii) Proactively monitor the contributions collected with respect to Rushcliffe housing developments on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council and other agencies, (regardless of signatory), to likewise ensure that contributions are spent promptly and relevant to the developments

(iii) By such timely spending on infrastructure, reduce over time the total amount of developer contributions held by Rushcliffe and any reliance on this to service the council’s cash flow

(iv) Provide, as part of the budget reporting round, annual reports of S106 and CIL contributions held, collected and spent during the year, including which developments attracted the charges and what the money was spent on, with locations.”

Councillor Thomas informed Council, in moving the motion that residents were very concerned about the development of appropriate and necessary infrastructure to support new developments within or adjacent to their communities. This included pavements and crossings, community centres, play parks and access to public transport. Residents were aware that developers were required to make contributions to infrastructure projects and that this funding was held by the Borough Council. Councillor Thomas informed Council that developing the necessary infrastructure to support both new and existing communities was of paramount importance. She pointed out that there was no transparent way of residents finding out how much money had been contributed by developers as this information was not routinely published for residents to scrutinise. Whilst she accepted that there was a significant amount of work involved in managing these funds, it was not sufficient for the Council to act as an efficient banker. The purpose of this motion was to avoid large sums of unspent money sitting in the Council’s bank account and to provide traction to move spending along.

Councillor Major stated that the motion spoke for itself so in the interests of transparency and to benefit the local communities as intended, she would be happy to second the motion and reserve her right to speak.

Councillor Moore stated that all members of the Council were aware of the infrastructure pressures that new housing developments brought to the Borough. He informed Council that a framework for allocating CIL funding would be considered at scrutiny in October 2021, and a firm proposal would be submitted to Cabinet in December 2021, which would enable the Council to distribute funds early in the new year. Councillor Moore went on to inform

Councillor Thomas that parish councils were already able to access the proportion of funding due to them and that the Council had a dedicated Planning Contributions Officer to monitor the funding and ensure it was channelled to where it was needed. He added that the Council was legally obliged to publish a s106 and CIL statement by 31 December each year. The statement detailed all cash flow including payments made to other bodies such as the County Council but that the Borough Council could not control how fast other bodies converted this funding into action. Councillor Moore moved to proceed to the next item on the agenda under Standing Orders – Council 14.11 and that this be put to the vote.

Councillor Robinson seconded the proposition and reiterated the comments made by Councillor Moore and advised Councillors that the Government was considering combining CIL and Section 106 monies, new guidelines would be issued, and it was therefore not timely to consider this at the moment.

The Mayor used her discretion to allow short statements from other political groups.

Councillor J Walker felt this was a timely motion which would hopefully result in clarity for local communities. She reported that she had attended a parish council meeting earlier in the week where there had been many questions regarding CIL and Council was advised that parishes did not have the information they needed to access funding and, as a consequence, it was not being used. She concluded her remarks by informing Council that it was clear to her that this motion would have a direct impact on the communities represented in this Chamber and requested that a recorded vote be taken on the request to move to the next item on the agenda.

Councillor R Mallender informed Council that he understood the frustration behind this motion. He understood the trade-off between additional housing and a new school or health centre, which would benefit both the existing and new communities but all too often new housing was built without the necessary infrastructure being developed alongside. More transparency of information would help manage residents' expectations.

Councillor Thomas reported her disappointment that there was a desire to move this motion straight to a vote without a proper debate. She felt that this displayed a misunderstanding about how Rushcliffe residents felt about the issue.

Councillor Major also stated that she understood the sentiment behind the motion and did not believe that transparency was a big ask. She also felt that taking this item through scrutiny would delay the process.

Councillor Robinson reminded Council that the Borough Council could only spend a small proportion of the CIL and s106 funds. The majority of money was for partners in health and the County Council to spend, Rushcliffe was just a banker. Therefore, the Council's efforts need to be focused on influencing its partners. He concluded his remarks by stating that information about the amount of CIL and s106 funding collected each year is available on the Council's website as it had to publish this annually by law.

In accordance with Standing Orders - Council 14.11, a recorded vote was taken to move to the next item on the agenda:

FOR: Councillors R Adair, S Bailey, M Barney, K Beardsall, A Brennan, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, G Dickman, A Edyvean, L Healy, R Inglis, Mrs C Jeffreys, A Major, R Mallender, D Mason, G Moore, A Phillips, F Purdue-Horan, S Robinson, D Simms, J Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood, R Upton, D Viridi, R Walker, D Wheeler and J Wheeler

AGAINST: Councillors B Bansal, N Begum, M Gaunt, P Gowland, J Murray, K Shaw, C Thomas, J Walker and L Way

ABSTENTIONS: Councillor S Mallender

The vote was carried and there was no further debate.

Councillor J Walker requested a recorded vote on the motion.

In accordance with Standing Orders - Council 16.4, a recorded vote was taken on the motion as follows:

FOR: Councillors B Bansal, N Begum, M Gaunt, P Gowland, A Major, J Murray, K Shaw, C Thomas, J Walker and L Way

AGAINST: Councillors R Adair, S Bailey, M Barney, K Beardsall, A Brennan, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, G Dickman, A Edyvean, L Healy, R Inglis, Mrs C Jeffreys, D Mason, G Moore, A Phillips, F Purdue-Horan, S Robinson, J Stockwood, Mrs M Stockwood, R Upton, D Viridi, R Walker, D Wheeler and J Wheeler

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors R Mallender and S Mallender

The motion was lost.

21 **Questions from Councillors**

a) **Question from Councillor Thomas to Councillor Moore**

“Please provide a statement showing how much CIL has been collected since introduction of the levy in October 2019, how much has been distributed (itemised by town, parish, West Bridgford etc) and what has been spent on the five items on the Infrastructure List (which includes playing fields and leisure centres), giving a description and location of each project.”

Councillor Moore informed Councillor Thomas that information had been pulled together by officers and that she could collect that after the meeting.

The below information highlighted the amount of CIL that had been collected and distributed. Funds were distributed twice a year in April

and October (the difference between the amount distributed in Keyworth and the amount collected was due to funds not being received before April, the remaining £9,301.58 would be paid over in October).

CIL Admin (5%) £51,229.43
Strategic CIL £815,402.13

East Bridgford NCIL (15%) £626.22 (with £634.10* distributed to the parish council)
Keyworth NCIL (25%) £12,514.15 (with £3,212.57* distributed to the parish council)
Kneeton NCIL (15%, capped) £2,500.00
West Bridgford NCIL (15%) £63,604.64

Supplementary question

Councillor Thomas asked if it was true that £20million was currently held by the Borough Council and remained unspent.

Councillor Moore agreed to forward that information to Councillor Thomas.

b) Question from Councillor Gowland to Councillor Brennan

“The bowls club has been a long-standing feature of the Arena from well before the building was redeveloped, and clearly we might expect the generally more elderly membership to drop during a pandemic. Please can you explain how the Council has supported bowls club to increase its membership, prior to any changes that the Council might make that would limit the viability of the club.”

Councillor Brennan responded that Rushcliffe Indoor Bowls Club was an independent club, which had historically received far more support than any other sports club from both Council officers and the leisure operator, to aid the administration of the Club and support membership growth. The Council supported the Club through facilitating events, coaching courses, marketing and accessing grants to purchase equipment. The Council and the leisure operator had met regularly over the years with the Club and discussions had continued during the Pandemic. Unfortunately, there was a decline in membership pre-pandemic, and that had continued. The bowls hall was the subject of a Cabinet paper on 13 July 2021, and the papers for that would be published shortly. There was an opportunity to raise a question at the Cabinet meeting via Group Leaders once those papers were published.

Supplementary question

Councillor Gowland asked if Councillor Brennan could reassure her that any Equality Impact Assessments undertaken would take account of the age distribution of people involved in the Club.

Councillor Brennan responded in the positive.

The meeting closed at 9.21 pm.

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank



Council

Thursday, 30 September 2021

Petition: Community Governance Review (Bingham Town Council)

Report of the Chief Executive

Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor S J Robinson

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. The Council has received a Petition entitled “Bingham, Deserves Better” (the “Petition”), from at least 635 valid signatories (i.e. from registered electors in the Bingham administrative area) calling for a Community Governance Review of Bingham Town Council.
- 1.2. The Petition was considered by Cabinet on Tuesday, 8 June 2021. The purpose of the approach was to facilitate a wider opportunity to collate views outside of the process laid out in the Council’s constitution. To achieve this, it was agreed that a Member Working Group would be set up to consider the Petition and the next steps before the Petition was referred to Council. However, subsequent legal advice recommended that the Petition be referred direct to Council (without the prior involvement of the Member Working Group) in accordance with the Council’s Standing Orders to decide whether to accept the Petition and proceed with a Community Governance Review. As a result, the previous resolution of Cabinet will not take effect and the first meeting of the Member Working Group was cancelled by delegated decision of the Chief Executive.
- 1.3. This report sets out the next steps to be taken in response to the Petition. It considers the validity of the Petition and duties of the Council in relation to it.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that:

- a) the Council does not accept the Petition;
- b) the Council does not proceed to conduct a Community Governance Review of Bingham Town Council;
- c) the Council provides a written response to the Petition organisers, indicating its reasons for rejection of the Petition;

- d) the Chief Executive writes to Bingham Town Council and Nottinghamshire County Council sharing the contents of this report and setting out what is agreed by Council; and
- e) the Council supports a commitment to working collaboratively with Bingham Town Council in response to any requests for support from the Town Council.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

3.1. The Council received the Petition from the residents of Bingham calling for a Community Governance Review of Bingham Town Council. The Petition asks the Council to:

- dissolve Bingham Town Council and take over its operation until new elections can be held; and
- reset the culture and strengthen the procedures at Bingham Town Council.

3.2. The Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007 (“the 2007 Act”) requires a Community Governance Review to be undertaken upon presentation of a valid Petition¹ provided it has not concluded a previous review in connection with the whole or a significant part of the area within the relevant two-year period.

3.3. The Petition is not valid within the meaning of the 2007 Act as a result of the recommendations sought falling outside of the scope of the 2007 Act. The Council is therefore not able to hold a Community Governance Review.

3.4. Moreover, the Petition is effectively seeking to trigger fresh elections at Bingham Town Council. Neither the 2007 Act nor the Government Guidance on Community Governance Reviews² (the “Guidance”) envisage the use of a Community Governance Review (“CGR”) for this purpose. The appropriate method for addressing the issues raised in the Petition is by way of standards proceedings for breaches of the Councillors Code of Conduct (“Code”).

4. Supporting Information

Background

4.1. The Petition, dated 5 April 2021, seeks a CGR of Bingham parish. The Petition highlights the following concerns in relation to the running of Bingham Town Council. The following is an excerpt from the Petition:

¹ Section 83, 2007 Act

² [Guidance on community governance reviews \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://publishing.service.gov.uk)

What we know:

- * The Town Clerk was unfairly dismissed and subsequently reinstated, but 'Staff Issues' still repeatedly appear on the Agendas.
- * Excessive use of 'Private & Confidential' makes it impossible to follow key issues resulting in a lack of 'Openness and Accountability'.
- * Staffing review commissioned two years ago, at a cost of £4550, highlighted several concerning issues within the council. Recommendations of the report have not been implemented.
- * Correspondence between Human Resource consultants and two Councillors has been withheld from other Councillors by 'bloc' vote from the controlling group.
- * Human Resource Consultant expenses of £9000 in this financial year (based on Council's own estimate). The Consultants have declined to quote for a new contract.
- * Town Clerk's advice as 'Proper Officer' is regularly ignored by the controlling group.
- * Events have resulted in the use of no less than seven 'Extraordinary' meetings in 2020.

In Summary:

Considerable time and money has been spent on Staff issues to the detriment of infrastructure projects. We also believe that progress on issues highlighted in the 2016 'Community Led Plan' and the 'Brilliant Bingham' initiative for the future of Bingham have been stifled by these distractions and regrettably neither fully embraced. This has led to ineffective performance, a weakened non-inclusive community and Council, where civic values, responsibility, and pride have been undermined, resulting in a lack of efficiency and community cohesion where standard Governance rules have been broken.

4.2. The Petition seeks a CGR with the following proposed recommendations:

What we would like:

- * Dissolve the Council and take over the operation until new elections can be held.
- * Reset the culture and strengthen the procedures at the Council so that the above mentioned concerns cannot continue.

- 4.3. The Petition was initially considered by Cabinet on 8 June 2021. At the meeting of 8 June 2021, Cabinet did not take a decision on the Petition as that is a decision for Council, but it resolved to establish a Member Working Group to consider the outlined request for a Community Governance Review and make recommendations to Cabinet in September 2021, which would then proceed to Council.
- 4.4. However, concerns were raised regarding the decision to form a cross-party Cabinet-led Member Working Group and the Council's adherence to the publication requirements in relation to the first scheduled meeting and the Cabinet decision. As a result, the Chief Executive took a decision in consultation with the Leader pursuant to the emergency provisions in the Council's Constitution to refer the Petition direct to Council and Cabinet's resolution dated 8 June 2021 will not take effect. This approach supports a strict interpretation of the Council's Standing Orders.
- 4.5. It should be noted that referring the Petition to Council does not overturn the decision of the executive as no decision on the Petition itself was in fact taken. It will however result on the resolutions of Cabinet not taking effect.
- 4.6. It should also be noted that standards proceedings for breaches of the Code have been followed in respect of some of the concerns raised in the Petition (and a Standards Committee hearing has been held).

Obligation to undertake a Community Governance Review (CGR)

- 4.7. A CGR is a review that can be carried out by a principal authority (unitary or district Council). CGRs are undertaken in order to make recommendations for the creation of new parishes and establishment of parish councils, and about other matters such as making changes to parish boundaries and electoral arrangements³. The outcome of a CGR is that the Council or Local Government Boundary Commission as applicable may by order give effect to the recommendations.
- 4.8. The proposal of devolution of community governance to principal authorities was introduced in the 2006 Local Government White Paper entitled “Strong and Prosperous Communities”⁴:

2.56 At present parishes are created by Government and the Electoral Commission based on the recommendations of a review carried out by the local district or unitary council, or in response to a petition by local residents. We will simplify and speed up this process by devolving the power to create parishes to district and unitary authorities, allowing them to implement the recommendations of parish reviews and to respond to petitions from local communities. We will make it clear that there will be a presumption in favour of the setting up of parish councils so that local authorities will be expected to grant communities’ requests to set up new parish councils, except where there are good reasons not to, and that existing parish councils are not to be abolished against the wishes of local people.

2.57 However, parishes are not the most appropriate form of community governance everywhere. We will broaden local authorities’ review powers, so that in the course of a review they will also be able to consider whether other forms of community governance are more appropriate.

- 4.9. The nature of CGRs connects to community governance rather than council standards. The legislative change identified as required for the change in control of community governance is identified as:
- devolve the power to create new parishes from the Secretary of State and the Electoral Commission to district and unitary authorities and allow parishes to adopt alternative names;
- 4.10. The proposal was implemented in the Sections 79 to 102 of the 2007 Act which sets out the legislative framework for CGRs. Decision making in relation to CGRs should comply with the Guidance.

³ See section 87-92 of the 2007 Act

⁴ [Strong and prosperous communities The Local Government White Paper CM 6939 \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](http://publishing.service.gov.uk)

4.11. Under Section 83 of the 2007 Act, a principal council must undertake a CGR, if it is not already doing so, in response to a valid Petition which relates to the whole or part of its area. The only exception to this duty is if:

*“(a) the principal council has concluded a previous community governance review within the relevant two-year period, and
(b) in the council's opinion the petition area covers the whole or a significant part of the area to which the previous review related.”⁵*

4.12. As such, provided a Petition is valid, the Council is under an obligation to undertake a CGR with terms of reference that allow for the Petition to be considered.

Validity of the Petition

4.13. In order to be considered valid, a Petition must meet the conditions set out in at Sections 80(3) to 80(6) of the 2007 Act. Sections 80(5) and 80(6) of the 2007 Act relate to circumstances in which a new parish is to be constituted or the area of an existing parish is to be altered and are therefore not relevant to the Petition. The conditions with which the Petition must comply are that:

- The number of signatories to the Petition must be at least 187 electors, as the Petition area (Bingham) has between 500 and 2,500 local government electors (section 80(3)(b));
- Under Section 80(4), the Petition must:

*“(a) define the area to which the review is to relate (whether on a map or otherwise), and
(b) specify one or more recommendations which the petitioners wish a community governance review to consider making”.*

4.14. With at least 635 valid signatories, the Petition comfortably meets the number required under section 80(3)(b) of the 2007 Act. A map of the existing boundary was also provided pursuant to section 80(4)(a) of the 2007 Act.

4.15. As noted above, the Petition does propose recommendations, namely that the Council:

- “dissolve the [Bingham Town] Council and take over the operation until new elections can be held”; and
- “Reset the culture and strengthen the procedures at the [Bingham Town] Council so that the above-mentioned concerns cannot continue”

4.16. However, these are not recommendations within the 2007 Act, which a CGR is lawfully able to make. The possible recommendations are specified under Section 79 of the 2007 Act which provides that a CGR is conducted “for the

⁵ Section 83(3)

purpose of making recommendations of the kinds set out in sections 87 to 92.”

4.17. Sections 87 to 92 of the 2007 Act provide for:

- the constitution of new parishes;
- the alteration or abolition of existing parishes;
- the consideration of whether or not a parish should have a Council;
- consequential recommendations and specifically electoral arrangements;
- the grouping or de-grouping of parishes, and consequential matters.

4.18. It could be argued that the first requested recommendation seeks abolition of the Parish Council (rather than an election). However, it should be noted that where a CGR is required to make recommendations as to whether or not a new or existing parish should have a council, it must make a recommendation that a parish has a council if it has 1,000 or more local government electors⁶. Bingham has more than 1,000 residents and as a result, the outcome sought (if this is the case) is not a recommendation the Council should make.

4.19. Overall, it is not considered that the recommendations sought in the Petition fall within the scope of possible recommendations that a CGR could consider making. As a result, the Petition fails to meet the requisite condition under 80(4)(b) of the 2007 Act and is not valid. The Council is not therefore obliged to undertake a CGR.

Undertaking a discretionary CGR

4.20. Notwithstanding that the Council is not obliged to undertake a CGR as a result of the Petition, it may do so at any time. Indeed, the Guidance indicates that it should consider on a regular basis whether such a review is needed:

- 26.** Otherwise, the 2007 Act provides for a principal council to conduct a community governance review at any time. Principal councils will want to keep their community governance arrangements under review, and they should ensure that they consider on a regular basis whether a review is needed. A review may need to be carried out, for example, following a major change in the population of a community or as noted earlier in this chapter (see paragraph 15) to re-draw boundaries which have become anomalous, for example following new housing developments being built across existing boundaries. Principal councils should exercise their discretion, but it would be good practice for a principal council to consider conducting a review every 10-15 years – except in the case of areas with very low populations when less frequent reviews may be adequate.

⁶ Section 94, 2007 Act

4.21. The Guidance identifies circumstances in which it would be helpful to undertake a CGR, namely where there have been changes in population, or in reaction to specific or local new issues⁷. The circumstances set out in the Petition relate to “ineffective performance” from Bingham Town Council rather than to issues concerning parish boundaries. As such, a CGR would be of limited benefit in addressing the concerns raised. Indeed, whilst the Council could proceed to undertake a CGR, it would be forced to conclude that the recommendations sought could not be made as they are not within the scope of the 2007 Act.

4.22. Instead, the appropriate process for removal of an ineffective council is a democratic election which it is not in the power of the Council to trigger whether through a CGR or otherwise.

4.23. Furthermore, the Guidance indicates that CGRs should not be undertaken during electoral reviews by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England (‘LGBCE’):

28. Principal councils should use their knowledge and awareness of local issues when deciding whether to undertake a review. However, principal councils should avoid starting a community governance review if a review of district, London borough or county council electoral arrangements is being, or is about to be, undertaken. Ideally, community governance reviews should be undertaken well in advance of such electoral reviews, so that the LGBCE in its review of local authority electoral arrangements can take into account any parish boundary changes that are made. The LGBCE can provide advice on its programme of electoral reviews.

4.24. The LGBCE is currently carrying out an electoral review of Rushcliffe Borough Council for which consultation is ongoing and final recommendations are not expected until 1 March 2022. Details of the review are available on the LGBCE website⁸.

4.25. In circumstances in which:

- any CGR would be forced to conclude that the recommendations sought could not be made and therefore concerns raised by residents could not be addressed; and
- undertaking a CGR would be contrary to guidance as an electoral review is already ongoing,

proceeding with a CGR could be considered an unacceptable use of public funds. It could also potentially cause reputational harm by proceeding to undertake a review that has no prospect of making any of the petitioners’

⁷ Paragraph 12 to the Guidance

⁸ [Rushcliffe | LGBCE Site](#)

recommendations. It is therefore not appropriate to proceed with a voluntary review in this case.

Managing standards in local government

- 4.26. Whilst the concerns raised in the Petition do not relate to issues of community governance as envisaged in the 2007 Act, they do relate to potential matters of Councillor conduct and the actions of Bingham Town Council falling below the standards expected by parish electors.
- 4.27. Parish councils are required under Chapter 7 of the Localism Act 2011 to:
- Promote and maintain high standards of conduct by members;
 - Adopt an appropriate code of conduct;
 - Have regard to a failure of a member to comply with the code of conduct in deciding to take action and the nature of that action.
- 4.28. Bingham Town Council has been offered support in order to address the concerns around standards (including an open letter from the Monitoring Officer to all councillors in July 2020).
- 4.29. More recently, Rushcliffe Borough Council has engaged with the National Association of Local Councils (NALC) which has advised that it is developing a package of support for local councils which is likely to comprise of an independent peer review supported by NALC and the Local Government Association. This could result in an action plan being drawn up which could include support for the chairman and clerk over a 6-12 month period. It is strongly recommended that Bingham Town Council considers welcoming external peer support to work with the council over a period of time. This is a well-recognised tool in local government to support councils to operate in a highly effective and high performing manner to deliver the best services and outcomes for residents.

5. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

- 5.1. *Accept Petition and undertake CGR* – The Council is unable to accept the Petition as valid as it does not comply with the requisite conditions under Section 80(4) of the 2007 Act.
- 5.2. *Reject Petition but undertake CGR* – Whilst the Council is empowered to undertake a CGR notwithstanding the validity of the Petition⁹, it is not considered appropriate in the circumstances in which:
- The Council is not aware of concerns relating to ward boundaries that could be addressed by a CGR;
 - A CGR cannot address the concerns raised by the Petition; and
 - An electoral review by the LGBCE remains ongoing.

⁹ Section 82, 2007 Act

6. Risks and uncertainties

- 6.1. A failure to take any action to address concerns over the running of Bingham Town Council may have a reputational impact on Rushcliffe Borough Council. Whilst it should be acknowledged that Bingham Town Council is a democratically elected Council taking independent decisions, Rushcliffe may continue to offer what support it can to Bingham Town Council in order to best serve the local electors. This is set out in paragraph 4.29.
- 6.2. There is some risk of judicial review challenge to the Council's decision to reject the Petition. It is understood from taking independent legal advice that such a challenge has a low chance of success.
- 6.3. Undertaking a voluntary review (i.e. going against the recommendations) would be at a cost not budgeted for.

7. Implications

7.1. Financial implications

There are no direct financial implications arising from this report.

7.2. Legal implications

The legal position in relation to this matter has been addressed in detail in the body of this report.

7.3. Equalities implications

There are no equalities implications arising from this report.

7.4. Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 implications

There are no crime and disorder implications arising from this report.

8. Link to Corporate Priorities

Quality of Life	N/A
Efficient Services	N/A
Sustainable Growth	N/A
The Environment	N/A

9. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that:

- a) the Council does not accept the Petition;
- b) the Council does not proceed to conduct a Community Governance Review of Bingham Town Council;
- c) the Council provides a response to the Petition organisers, indicating its reasons for rejection of the Petition;
- d) the Chief Executive writes to Bingham Town Council and Nottinghamshire County Council sharing the contents of this report and setting out what is agreed by Council; and
- e) the Council supports a commitment to working collaboratively with Bingham Town Council in response to any requests for support from the Town Council.

For more information contact:	Katherine Marriott Chief Executive 0115 914 8349 kmarriott@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	Report to Cabinet 8 June 2021 'Petition: Community Governance Review'
List of appendices:	N/A



Council

Thursday, 30 September 2021

Appointment of Independent Persons

Report of the Monitoring Officer

Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor S J Robinson

1. Purpose of report

This report recommends the appointment of Mr Christopher Richards and Ms Helen Richardson as the Council's Independent Persons for standards as required by the Localism Act 2011 (the Act).

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED the Council appoints Mr Christopher Richards and Ms Helen Richardson as its Independent Persons for standards under section 28(7) of the Act for a fixed period of two years.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

The Council is required pursuant to Section 28(7) of the Act to have access to at least one Independent Person.

4. Supporting Information

4.1. On 12 December 2013, Council approved the appointment of Mr John Baggaley as its Independent Person. Mr Baggaley has remained in post as the Council's single Independent Person.

4.2. On 11 July 2019, Council adopted the Best Practice Principals and recommendations of the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL). Best Practice 7 states:

“Local authorities should have access to at least two Independent Persons”.

4.3. The roles were advertised pursuant to Section 28(8)(c) of the Act. The Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer conducted interviews in May 2021 for two Independent Persons. Following the interviews, Mr Christopher Richards and Ms Helen Richardson were considered suitable persons for the role. Both have considerable experience which lends itself to the role, in particular, conducting Ofsted and HR investigations. Further details of their relevant experience have been provided to the Group Leaders in advance of the meeting.

4.4. It is proposed that Mr John Baggaley continue in the role alongside Helen and Christopher for a period of 12 months to 30 September 2022, to provide support and training to Helen and Christopher alongside the Monitoring Officer.

4.5. The appointment of the Independent Person must be approved by the majority of the membership of the Council.

5. **Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection**

No alternative options are considered given the application of the Act.

6. **Risks and Uncertainties**

The Council would fail to meet its statutory obligations as prescribed by the Act if it did not have access to at least one Independent Person. Whilst the Council could continue with Mr John Baggaley as its single Independent Person, the CSPL report recommends that Independent Persons be appointed for a fixed term of two years, and that the Council have access to at least two. Mr Baggaley has acted in the role on behalf of the Council since 2013.

7. **Implications**

7.1. **Financial Implications**

An annual allowance equivalent to that payable to the co-opted members of the Standards Committee (currently £320) is payable to the post-holders.

7.2. **Legal Implications**

The legal implications are set out in the body of this report.

7.3. **Equalities Implications**

There are no direct implications.

7.4. **Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 Implications**

The Independent Person will be consulted upon complaints concerning member misconduct, including allegations that could constitute criminal offences, such as the failure to declare disclosable pecuniary interests under the Members' Code of Conduct.

8. **Link to Corporate Priorities**

Quality of Life Efficient Services Sustainable Growth The Environment	The appointment of Independent Persons supports all Corporate Priorities.
---	---

9. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED the Council appoints Mr Christopher Richards and Ms Helen Richardson as its Independent Persons for standards under section 28(7) of the Act for a fixed period of two years.

For more information contact:	Sanjit Sull Monitoring Officer 0115 914 8332 ssull@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	N/A
List of appendices:	N/A

This page is intentionally left blank



Council

Thursday, 30 September 2021

Devolution and “Levelling Up” in Nottinghamshire

Report of the Chief Executive

**Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership,
Councillor S J Robinson**

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. This report provides a general overview of the latest government position on devolution and covers what has been happening locally in Nottinghamshire.
- 1.2. The Leader and Chief Executive have been involved in “County Deal” discussions with the Leader and Chief Executive of Nottinghamshire County Council and the Nottinghamshire District Leaders and Chief Executives recently and Council is asked to endorse them taking a positive approach in relation to discussions around collaboration and devolution in Nottinghamshire.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council supports and endorses the Leader and Chief Executive’s involvement in continued discussions about a “County Deal” in Nottinghamshire with any arrangements affecting Rushcliffe Borough Council to be brought back to Council for full discussion and approval prior to adoption.

3. Reasons for recommendation

- 3.1 In order to take a positive and proactive role in shaping the future of any local government arrangements in Nottinghamshire, it is imperative for the Leader and Chief Executive of Rushcliffe Borough Council to be willing participants of discussions and negotiations.
- 3.2 Any formal agreements that impact on the Borough Council will be brought back to Council for full discussion and debate prior to agreement and adoption.
- 3.3 There is no current regional commitment for any change to devolved powers from government or joining up of local authority services.

4. Background

- 4.1 On 15 July, the Prime Minister set out a vision for new devolution deals across the country in his “Levelling Up” speech offering counties the ability to have devolved powers like some of the cities. On the same day, the Secretary of

State for Housing, Communities and Local Government wrote to Local Authority Leaders and Chief Executive setting out a commitment to “devolving power to local places and closer to citizens”.

4.2 The Secretary of State set out the following principles for a County Deal:

4.2.1 Strong local leadership will be fundamental. Whilst high-profile, directly elected individual leaders can provide a single point of accountability to local citizens and can act as a champion for their area, we will consider other governance proposals that increase stability and strengthen local leadership.

4.2.2 County devolution should operate across a sensible economic geography of a suitable scale and one based on local identity, bringing local partners together and with powers exercised at the right level to make a difference for local communities. We will be looking to do county devolution for example with the county council and its nearby unitaries, working with its districts as appropriate; or with the county council and its districts; geographically large unitary authorities, or a combination of say two such authorities where there is a recognisable single identity.

4.2.3 The nature and appropriateness of proposed governance structures will impact on the nature of the deal and the types of powers and flexibilities provided in a deal. We will expect demonstrable improvements in governance, efficiency, and local service join-up as part of the deal that support the delivery of levelling up.

4.2.4 We expect deals to include significant reform proposals, including ways to achieve greater financial efficiency, administrative streamlining and / or more joined up services in an area. This does not mean local government (unitary) reorganisation is a prerequisite to participation – although that remains a locally-led option available where there is strong local support.

4.3 In August, the Leaders of Nottinghamshire, Nottingham City, Derbyshire and Derby City Councils wrote to the Secretary of State expressing their interest in pursuing devolution.

4.4 On 1 September, all Nottinghamshire District Leaders and Chief Executives were invited to meet with the Leader and Chief Executive of Nottinghamshire County Council to discuss working closely together with the City Council to support a bid to be a “pathfinder” area for County Deals. It is expected that three areas in England will gain “pathfinder” status but other areas may also work up proposals for devolution deals and more details will be provided in the Government’s Levelling Up white paper in the autumn.

5. What powers might be devolved?

5.1 As yet, the detail of what powers might be devolved by government has not been finalised, but greater powers linked to the following could be part of a deal:

- Transport

- Land and housing
- Skills and employment
- Tourism
- Finance
- Environment
- Health and social care

In theory, it is for the councils involved to ask for the powers they would like to see devolved, and there are some blueprints for previous devolved powers in the combined authority and mayoral deals that have already been agreed.

- 5.2 The additional powers could make it easier for local authorities to tackle the issues facing them and their local residents and areas. The powers could assist with becoming more carbon neutral, securing the appropriate infrastructure for current or future population growth, having more controls over developing skills in the workforce, promoting social mobility and having a joined up further and higher education offer. There could be opportunities for more control and say over planning and housing and financial efficiencies. The East Midlands has had less central investment than other areas in recent times and a devolution deal may assist in addressing this. Several areas in Nottingham and the county were given level 1 and level 2 status in the Levelling Up Funding bid round meaning they were of medium or high priority. (Rushcliffe was classed as level 3.) Devolution would look to lift the whole county and city area in order to bring more jobs and productivity to Nottingham and Nottinghamshire as a whole.
- 5.3 In return, government will expect to see a commitment to public sector reform, but this does not have to mean Local Government Restructuring and the Leader and Chief Executive of County Council have said that they will not be pursuing a single county unitary bid at this time. Instead, public sector reform could involve shared working on eg waste management, more collaboration between councils, both county and districts, and with city. The integration of health and social care could be enhanced and closer working with police and fire could also be explored.

6. The governance of devolution

- 6.1 In 2015, the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee (EPC) was set up as part of a governance arrangement for the bid for a North Midlands Combined Authority. The bid did not succeed, but the EPC was formally constituted and has met regularly ever since. It is chaired by the city and county councils on a rotating basis with the districts taking the vice chair.
- 6.2 It is proposed that the starting point for the governance for any devolution deal based on a County Deal is the EPC. Legal advice will be sought on any amendments that would need to be made and any sub groups/committees that should be set up. There is funding available in the Business Rates Pool, which could be used for programme management and for legal advice.
- 6.3 Currently all the districts, the city and the county are members of the EPC and the Leader is Rushcliffe's representative. It will be imperative that all councils

take their own legal advice on matters relating to devolution and sharing of powers when there is more detail available on any deal.

- 6.4 If one or more districts decides it doesn't want to be fully involved in some or all aspects of devolution, it is proposed that mechanisms are put in place to ensure that a coalition of the willing can move forward, and other parties may join at a later date.

7. Next steps and timescales

- 7.1 As set out above, Nottinghamshire County Council has submitted an expression of interest in pursuing a County Deal, and indeed in being one of the Government's pathfinder authorities due to be announced in October/November. To this end, a meeting of the county leader, two district leaders and senior civil servants was held early September to discuss support for a bid.

- 7.2 There are 27 administrative counties in England and it is believed that the majority, if not all of them have expressed interest in a County Deal. Only three are expected to attain "pathfinder" status but there may be follow up County Deals with the others.

- 7.3 An indicative timeline is below, should the Nottinghamshire pathfinder bid be successful:

- Phase 1: September-November 2021
 - Levelling Up White Paper published and Pathfinder Bids developed
- Phase 2: November 2021:
 - SoS announces pathfinder devolution deals
- Phase 3: November 2021-April 2022:
 - As a pathfinder, local councils negotiate and co-produce the Nottinghamshire Deal
- Phase 4: April 2022:
 - Nottinghamshire Deal goes live.

8. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

The Council could decide that it does not wish to participate in discussions on the pathfinder or County Deal. However, that would close off potential possibilities for benefits to Rushcliffe and its residents. Participation at this stage is not a firm commitment to any change. Proposals will be brought back to Council for full discussion. Therefore, it is not recommended to follow this option.

9. Risks and uncertainties

Nottinghamshire may not win "pathfinder" status. However, there is still the opportunity to explore closer working arrangements with the different councils.

10. Implications

10.1 Financial implications

There are no financial implications arising from this report.

10.2 Legal implications

Legal implications of any proposed deal will be considered and reported back to Council.

10.3 Equalities implications

Any deal that results in benefits to the residents of the Borough should be welcomed. These implications will be properly assessed when more detail is available.

10.4 Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998 implications

There are no implications arising from this report.

11. Link to corporate priorities

Quality of Life	A County Deal should be predicated on making improvements to our residents. As such, the detail of any proposed County Deal will be assessed against all four priorities.
Efficient Services	
Sustainable Growth	
The Environment	

12. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council supports and endorses the Leader and Chief Executive's involvement in continued discussions about a "County Deal" in Nottinghamshire with any arrangements affecting Rushcliffe Borough Council to be brought back to Council for full discussion and approval prior to adoption.

For more information contact:	Katherine Marriott Chief Executive 0115 914 8349 kmarriott@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	N/A
List of appendices:	N/A

This page is intentionally left blank