

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL**

THURSDAY, 21 SEPTEMBER 2023

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

PRESENT:

Councillors D Mason (Chair), A Brown (Vice-Chair), M Barney, J Billin, T Birch, R Bird, A Brennan, R Butler, J Chaplain, K Chewings, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, S Dellar, A Edyvean, S Ellis, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, E Georgiou, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Inglis, R Mallender, S Mallender, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, L Plant, D Polenta, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, C Thomas, R Upton, D Viridi, J Walker, R Walker, L Way, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler and G Williams

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

L Ashmore	Director of Development and Economic Growth
D Banks	Director of Neighbourhoods
G Dennis	Monitoring Officer
P Linfield	Director of Finance and Corporate Services
K Marriott	Chief Executive
E Richardson	Democratic Services Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

APOLOGIES:

Councillors S Calvert

26 Declarations of Interest

Councillor Parekh declared an interest in Item 11a.

27 Minutes of the meeting held on 13 July 2023

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 13 July 2023, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

28 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor informed Council that she had been a lot busier than she thought she would be over the last few months, and she was thoroughly enjoying it. The Mayor mentioned that she had hosted afternoon tea for some local Korean War veterans, enjoyed the summer sunshine at the Cinema in the Park event and at a number of cricket matches. She stated that she had particularly enjoyed the Hickling Scarecrow Festival, and thanked Councillor Combellack for showing her around. Councillor Mason informed Council about her successful Civic Dinner last week, which had 180 community volunteers

coming together to celebrate the contribution they made within the Borough and highlighted her charity fund raising afternoon tea next Thursday, to which there were still a small number of tickets available.

29 Leader's Announcements

Councillor Clarke announced that the Council had recently won a collaborative working initiative along with neighbouring authorities from the Association of Public Service Excellence, for the Green Rewards scheme, which incentivised residents to take action to reduce their impact on their environment as part of the Council's Carbon Clever initiatives.

Councillor Clarke also brought Council's attention to the recently awarded Green Flag award for Rushcliffe Country Park, its seventeenth consecutive award, and the first Green Flag award for Sharphill Wood. He congratulated the two 'Friends of' groups for all of their hard work in achieving those nationally recognised awards.

Finally, Councillor Clarke highlighted that nominations were now open for the Rushcliffe Community Awards and encouraged Councillors to put forward suggestions from their communities in the many award categories before the 15 October deadline.

30 Chief Executive's Announcements

The Chief Executive brought Council's attention to the two paper slips on each desk this evening and asked Councillors to complete these before leaving the Council Chamber this evening.

31 Citizens' Questions

A Citizens' Question had been submitted by Mr Terry Galloway. Mr Galloway attended the meeting to provide Council with insight into his very personal and traumatic experience of the care system before directing his Citizens' Question to the Leader of the Council:

"Do you accept that the voice of care experienced people should be heard in all policy decisions and service design?"

Councillor J Wheeler thanked Mr Galloway for his question and for sharing his experience and reassured Mr Galloway that the Council had a robust process for undertaking Equality Impact Assessments when undertaking significant policy shifts or reforms to service provision. Councillor Wheeler also brought the motion under agenda Item 11 to the attention of Mr Galloway and Council, where he expected further debate on this important issue.

32 Petitions

No petitions had been submitted.

33 Business from the last Council meeting

Question from Councillor Birch to Councillor Clarke.

“Rushcliffe Borough Council has spent £9,597 of taxpayer money applying for, and attending, the MJ Achievement Awards in London. Do you consider this to be an appropriate use of taxpayer money during a cost of living crisis?”

Councillor Clarke responded by saying that it was five years since Rushcliffe Borough Council had last attended the MJ Achievement Awards in London. The Council was the only district council to be shortlisted as a finalist for the Local Authority of the Year alongside five unitaries and counties, and as the only shortlisted district council it was possible to infer that Rushcliffe was indeed the best district council in the sector at this time, which was a magnificent achievement. The Awards were part of the sector’s work to promote best practice and continuous improvement and the shortlisting reflected well on Councillors of all parties and the officers who delivered the Council’s priorities. There was a cost to entering and attending such events; however, Councillor Clarke considered that the benefit to workforce morale and recruitment was immeasurable, and the benefits to the profile and high esteem in which the Council was held was the reward.

The Council did not budget to enter such awards and it was due to the excellent running of the Council, that it was in a position to be able to afford this from in-year budget efficiencies. In the context of the Council’s gross budget of £39.7m that amounted to 0.02% and Council was reminded that Rushcliffe had the lowest Band D Council Tax in Nottinghamshire and was within the lowest 25% in the country. Thus, the Council played its part to assist those struggling with the challenge of living costs, keeping Rushcliffe taxes low and continuing to provide excellent services to its residents.

The Mayor asked if Councillor Birch had a supplementary question.

Councillor Birch asked the Leader to justify to tax payers why it was necessary to spend £954 on an overnight stay for three people before giving a presentation at the shortlisting stage of the process.

Councillor Clarke informed Council that the expenses were incurred as this was the best way of attending to ensure that the presentation was delivered in the best possible way and that had resulted in the shortlisting and to the benefits already highlighted.

Question from Councillor J Walker to Councillor Brennan.

“Considering the new appointment of this Council's Leader and his relationship with the Chair of scrutiny, how will this Council ensure there is transparency and rigour around our scrutiny process?”

Councillor Brennan informed Council that the governance of the authority was dependent upon the integrity and robustness of processes it used to deliver its services, including its scrutiny process.

Proposed topics for scrutiny were put forward by Councillors or officers and the definition of scope of scrutiny as well as clear lines of enquiry and the driving

factors behind the request must be clearly set out. Those were firstly considered by officers, as to whether it was a legitimate item for scrutiny, whether it would add value, and was it achievable within the available resources. Only if the proposed scrutiny request met those standards would it be submitted to the Corporate Overview Group and would be published with the agenda. The Corporate Overview Group, which met quarterly was comprised of seven members, the Chairs and Vice Chairs of three scrutiny groups and an independent Chair. Three members of the Group were from opposition parties, with the Group supported by a senior officer.

Councillor Brennan confirmed that at each meeting, the submitted matrix was discussed, with the proposer of the matrix invited to speak, and officers explaining their recommendations and those meetings were open to the public, live streamed on YouTube and minuted. The vast majority of scrutiny work was undertaken by the Council's three scrutiny groups, which were politically balanced, supported by senior managers, held in the public domain, minuted and live streamed on YouTube.

The Executive Model of Governance followed by the Council was clear that scrutiny should provide checks and balances to the Executive and hold it to account and the current Chair of the Corporate Overview Group, had held this role for several years before standing down from the role for one year to undertake the role of Mayor. The nomination of Councillor Combellack had been agreed by all members of the Cabinet and was voted on by all Councillors at Annual Council, at which point no objections had been raised. No objections were raised at this point. Councillor Brennan concluded by stating that no woman should be prevented from holding a position of responsibility that they were qualified to hold by the position of their partner.

The Mayor asked if Councillor J Walker had a supplementary question.

Councillor J Walker clarified that the objection was to the appointment of the Leader of the Council rather than the Chair of the Corporate Overview Group and asked if the Council had sought advice from the Local Government Association in relation to his appointment.

Councillor Brennan confirmed that she would respond to the supplementary question in writing as she did not have the answer to hand.

Question from Councillor Plant to Councillor J Wheeler.

"The Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Scheme Action Plan states that there is already a Rushcliffe Youth Forum. What is the remit for this group?"

Councillor J Wheeler informed Council that this Forum was led by Nottinghamshire County Council, which was responsible for its role and remit. The Youth Forum campaigned on issues relevant to young people and the communities they lived in.

The Mayor asked if Councillor Plant had a supplementary question.

Councillor Plant asked what support had taken place since the Cabinet

decision in March 2023?

Councillor J Wheeler informed Council that the Service Manager – Corporate Services was leading on this project and had been building relationships with the new Chair of the Youth Forum, who had only been in post since the end of July, and Youth Services Officers at the County Council. It was early days yet, but the Cabinet was committed to engagement with the Youth Forum at the appropriate time.

34 Approval of the Scrutiny Annual Reports 2022/23

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership, Councillor Clarke 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 2022/23.

In moving the recommendation, the Leader was pleased to endorse the important work undertaken by the scrutiny groups, providing challenge to the Executive, being a critical friend, whilst also undertaking equally important policy development, and he invited each of the Scrutiny Group Chairs to deliver a brief summary of the year.

Councillor Brennan seconded the recommendation and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor J Wheeler, Chair of the Corporate Overview Group for 2022/23 thanked officers for their support, in particular the Service Manager – Finance and Corporate Services, as the lead officer. Councillor Wheeler referred to a key highlight, which was the introduction of asking Councillors to come to meetings to present their scrutiny matrix, which he felt made a key difference. Councillor Wheeler reiterated how important scrutiny was and hoped that all Councillors would play their part as it could make a real difference.

Councillor Viridi, Chair of the Governance Scrutiny Group advised that the Group had responsibility for and approved the Council's finances, monitored its approach to risk, as well as other corporate issues, and its work could not be under stated. Councillor Viridi referred to the importance of having a robust governance framework in place, which ensured that the Council remained accountable. It was important that appropriate scrutiny and review was undertaken, to provide assurance to the auditors that the correct controls and processes were in place, and given the ongoing financial uncertainty nationally, it was vital that the Council effectively managed risk. The report highlighted the key areas considered by the Group throughout the year and progress made, and Councillor Viridi wished the new Chair, Councillor Edyvean and the Group, a successful year. Councillor Viridi thanked his Vice-Chair, Councillor Gowland for her support, together with other Group members, partners who had attended meetings, and officers, in particular the Director – Finance and Corporate Services and the Service Manager – Finance for their continued support.

Councillor Williams, Chair of the Communities Scrutiny Group, reported that the Group had covered a wide range of issues, which touched the lives of many

residents, including the Sports Development programme looking at future activity and wellbeing, and highlighted the initiatives and achievements that had been implemented. The Group had also looked at how the Council engaged with the community through the External Communications Strategy and the Customer Access Strategy, which highlighted new and improved ways to increase engagement with residents. Councillor Williams thanked his Vice-Chair, former Councillor Murray for her support, together with other Group members, for their invaluable input during meetings. Councillor Williams thanked the Service Manager – Neighbourhoods, as the lead officer, other officers who had attended meetings to present their reports and answer questions, and to Democratic Services for its support.

Councillor Clarke, Chair of the Growth and Development Group advised that the Group had scrutinised many interesting topics, covering two areas of operation in the Council related to growth and to the Council's function as the Local Planning Authority. The Group had scrutinised a follow up report on Conservation Areas and sewerage infrastructure and discharge, which had involved inviting representatives from outside organisations to the meeting. Councillor Clarke stated that the Covid-19 Business Recovery update had scrutinised the way in which the Council had supported recovery from the pandemic and had highlighted how quickly officers had responded to ensure grants were paid quickly. Councillor Clarke advised that the Group had scrutinised the UK Shared Prosperity Fund, together with other diverse topics, including hedges and hedgerows, and finally an update on the large development at Fairham. Councillor Clarke thanked officers for all their support, fellow Group members and the Vice-Chair Councillor Butler.

Councillor Gowland thanked officers, the Chairs of the Groups, and partner agencies involved and requested that in future, any issues brought forward but not accepted were listed, to provide a record.

Councillor R Mallender thanked the Chairs for their comments and officers for their hard work and agreed with Councillor Gowland that it would be helpful to log all topics that came forward. Councillor Mallender made particular reference to the work of the Communities Scrutiny Group, of which he was a member, and referred to the Access Agreement for the Canals and Rivers Trust, and the importance of keeping and extending the water in the canal. He referred to the Carbon Management Plan, and the considerable work still to be undertaken. Council noted that some fantastic work had already been done to reduce the Council's carbon footprint, and ultimately the partners that the Council worked with, and residents. Councillor Mallender referred to the Environment Policy, which included extending hedgerows across the Borough, which in turn would help with biodiversity net gain, increase, and protect wildlife and green spaces.

Councillor Thomas thanked and acknowledged the improvements that had been made to the scrutiny process over the past few years and hoped that this would continue, and the responsiveness and the work of officers was also appreciated.

Councillor Clarke thanked Councillor Thomas for her positive, supportive comments and referred to the request for a list of topics not accepted to be included, and he confirmed that this would be investigated to find the best

approach going forward.

It was **RESOLVED** that the work undertaken by the four Scrutiny Groups during 2022/23 be endorsed.

35 **Notices of Motion**

Councillor Parekh left the room for consideration of the item.

- a) The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Gowland and seconded by Councillor Polenta

“This Council resolves to treat people with care experience as if they have a Protected Characteristic”

In moving the motion, Councillor Gowland referred to the thought provoking comments made by Mr Terry Galloway earlier in the meeting regarding the significant trauma often carried by care leavers, and even without that trauma, those people would most likely still be without the infrastructure and support that the majority of young people enjoyed. Councillor Gowland stated that care leavers required extra support and the purpose of the motion was to ensure that going forward the Council looked at its policies and procedures to ensure that care leavers and their needs were considered in general. The Children’s Social Care Act 2017 related to young people up to the age of 25, which meant that the Council could be considered as a Corporate Parent and Rushcliffe had a Care Leavers Offer, which should be continuously reviewed. Councillor Gowland confirmed that currently care leavers did not have a protected characteristic and if this motion was accepted it would mean that they would be included in Equality Impact Assessments (EIAs), which could then impact on how they were treated, for example, in respect of Council Tax collection and homelessness. Council was advised that 52 councils had already passed this, and it was hoped that Rushcliffe would join them today.

Councillor Polenta seconded the motion and reiterated the comments made by Councillor Gowland regarding the significant inequalities, discrimination and disadvantages faced by care leavers at every stage and in all aspects of their lives. Councillor Polenta referred to the difficulties faced by children in care, when they were placed great distances away from any support networks they did have, which further exacerbated problems for them going forward. Councillor Polenta stated that she hoped that the Equalities Act would soon be amended to include care leavers, and in the meantime over 52 councils had voted to include care leavers as a protected characteristic and she stated that it was the Council’s responsibility to be champions of children in care.

Councillor J Wheeler thanked Councillors Gowland and Polenta for bringing this motion forward and referred to the Council’s strong track record of supporting care leavers and acknowledged that some care experienced people could face significant barriers open leaving the care system. Councillor Wheeler advised that the Council undertook a range of service measures to support care leavers, including being a signatory to the County Council’s Partnership Strategy for Looked after Children and Care Leavers. Support provided included a Joint Care Leaver Local Housing Offer, which any care

leaver could apply to, priority on the Housing Register was already offered, as was free access to the Council's leisure facilities and discounted Council Tax. The Council was represented at the Notts Care Leavers Partnership meetings and Councillor Wheeler confirmed that the Council did consider the impact of its decision making through its EIA process and advised that those would be reviewed later this year, to decide if any improvements needed to be made. Councillor Wheeler confirmed that the Conservative Group would be supporting the motion and stated that if there was anyone who had left the care system and needed support, they should contact the Council.

Councillor Plant was pleased that this very important motion was being supported and felt that the disadvantages faced by care leavers throughout their lives could not be over stated, and it was pleasing that this motion had already been supported by 52 other councils. Councillor Plant referred to Mr Terry Galloway's moving speech and his tireless efforts to ensure that this motion was supported across the country, and the more councils that supported it, the more pressure that could be brought to bear on the Government to legislate for care experience to become a protected characteristic. Councillor Plant reiterated previous comments regarding the dreadful neglect and abuse experienced by many care experienced people, together with the stigma and discrimination they also often faced, so anything that this Council, with its partners could do was crucial. Councillor Plant questioned if the Local Offer for Care leavers, approved by Cabinet in 2019, had been reviewed or subject to scrutiny since then, to assess the impact on care leavers, and she considered that this would be an appropriate time to do that. Councillor Plant questioned how many Councillors were aware of the Local Offer and requested that Councillors receive appropriate training on this issue.

Councillor S Mallender reiterated the thanks given to Mr Terry Galloway for speaking so movingly and spoke of the many care experienced people and care leavers that she had met through her work and stated that it was now a last resort and a very difficult decision for councils to place a child into care. Sadly, Government statistics were showing the number of children in care rising, and she asked all Councillors to support this motion, and to lead the way before the Government legislation went through.

Councillor Chewings also thanked Mr Terry Galloway and stated that whilst he would be supporting the motion, he noted that this motion was much shorter than the previous, more detailed one submitted by Councillor Gowland to the last Council meeting, which he believed she had withdrawn on the grounds that amendments were coming forward. Councillor Chewings was saddened by that and asked the leading group to look at the previous motion and work with all Councillors to implement support for care leavers. Councillor Chewings also asked for the Care Offer to be reviewed as a matter of urgency and for people with care experience to be included in general engagement exercises and discussions, to allow them to help shape and influence what the Council did, and for the Council to call on its partners to adopt those key principles too.

Councillor Barney stated that he had already spoken of his support of this issue at an earlier meeting at the County Council and referred to the personal connection he had and was pleased to champion the voice of care experienced

children as Mr Terry Galloway had done so eloquently earlier in the meeting.

Councillor Clarke referred to the importance of this issue and to the detailed comments in support made by Councillor Wheeler and as the consensus in the room demonstrated general agreement, he confirmed that the Conservative Group would be very happy to support this and take it forward.

In summing up Councillor Gowland stated that she was very grateful for the overwhelming support and thanked Mr Terry Galloway for encouraging her to bring this motion to Council. Councillor Gowland considered that as a well-resourced council, Rushcliffe should be leading the way in providing support for care experienced people, as they would suffer problems throughout their lives, especially those setting out on life in their early twenties. The importance of ensuring that both Councillors and local communities were aware of that provision was reiterated, as was the importance of having appropriate training on Corporate Parenting and EIAs. Councillor Gowland advised that the motion had been shortened, as she believed that the current words covered everything, and she ended by thanking Mr Terry Galloway for coming to speak at the meeting.

On being put to the vote the motion was carried.

Councillor Parekh returned to her seat.

- b) The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Birch and seconded by Councillor Chewings.

“Rushcliffe Borough Council notes with concern that:

- a) Bingham does not have adequate parking provision
- b) Despite the 2018 Bingham Masterplan identifying Bingham’s poor parking as the town’s primary issue, no adequate solutions have been delivered
- c) Council agreed to build 1000 new homes in Bingham without putting any additional parking infrastructure in place
- d) Council allocated £19.6 million to other capital projects in the Borough in 2022-23. Only £25,000 revenue has been allocated to Bingham’s new car park project
- e) The ‘Update on Car Parking in Bingham’ report does not go far enough to solve the parking problems.

Rushcliffe Borough Council therefore resolves to show leadership and ambition in solving Bingham’s parking issues.

Council will:

- 1) Make a formal written offer to Bingham Town Council to take over the proposed car park project by purchasing the land off them (subject to a business case being approved and on the condition that the land will be solely used for a long-stay car park)
- 2) Seek to obtain funding to provide step-free access to the north platform of Bingham station

- 3) Liaise with Nottinghamshire County Council to find holistic solutions to Bingham's parking problems, including dealing with the traffic chaos on Long Acre, improving parking in the Market Square and eliminating unwanted (and unsafe) parking on residential streets near the town centre through parking enforcement
- 4) Make a pledge to Bingham's residents that Council will aim to break ground on the new car park before 2027
- 5) Once the new car park is built, provide greater short-stay capacity in the existing town centre car parks.

Rushcliffe Borough Council also resolves to take the following actions:

- 1) Formally declare that the parking problems in Bingham is an urgent matter
- 2) Formally write to Network Rail to request an explanation as to why, specifically, they oppose the new car park at Butt Field
- 3) Formally write to East Midlands Railway and Network Rail to ask for a clear explanation as to why step-free access has not so far been provided for Bingham's disabled residents and to obtain assurances that they would support this project should grant funding be obtained.

Councillor Birch requested a recorded vote and informed Council, in moving the motion, that this issue had blighted Bingham for over 10 years and given that this was the first time it would be debated at a Rushcliffe Council meeting, he felt that it was time that a proper debate took place. Councillor Birch stated that Bingham, a bustling market town with a population of over 10,000 was the second largest settlement in Rushcliffe and a local hub for over 30 other smaller settlements. Councillor Birch advised that Bingham differed from many other places, as the majority of its shops were located in a small geographical area, and it also had a train station, which attracted commuters to the town. Bingham had 165 parking bays, and since 2014, it had been known that 2,000 vehicles parked daily in the town, with 60 of those spaces parked in all day by commuters or workers in Bingham. Councillor Birch stated that in reality there were only 66 bays available for people to use in the day and based on County Council data, only 8% of vehicles used 60% of the daily parking capacity. Councillor Birch referred to recent comments made by Councillor Inglis regarding parking spaces in the town centre and stated that the number of parking bays was an irrelevant metric on identifying if there was adequate parking provision, it was how the bays were used and for how long which was important. Council was reminded that Bingham had very few private parking spaces in the retail units, nor much on-street parking. Councillor Birch stated that the current provision failed to meet the needs of residents and visitors, and this was having a financial impact on local businesses and was stopping people from being able to access local amenities and facilities, with the elderly and disabled worse effected. Councillor Birch called for immediate action and stated that Rushcliffe should have resolved this problem years ago and he considered that the working group would be a talking shop. Councillor Birch stated that data highlighting the problem the been published in 2014, and since then a Parking Strategy and the Bingham Masterplan had been produced, both of which had identified that parking was the main issue for the town, and yet

nothing had been done. Councillor Birch noted that nearly £20m had been earmarked for capital projects in the Borough, yet it was his understanding that no substantial figures had been budgeted for parking in Bingham going forwards and questioned the importance of the issue to the Council. Councillor Birch stated that his motion proposed an holistic solution, with the key element being the construction of a new long stay car park. A site, already owned by the Town Council had been earmarked and it would almost double capacity, and most importantly it would free up space in the existing car park for short stay parking. Following on from that, Councillor Birch stated that it would be essential to achieve step free access to the adjacent railway platform, to liaise with the County Council to improve on-street parking and enforcement, with a deadline set to send a clear signal of intent to residents. Councillor Birch asked that East Midlands Railway (EMR) and Network Rail (NR) be formally written to seeking clarification as to why they opposed the project, with the letter and reply to be made public. Councillor Birch concluded by asking Rushcliffe Council to take this project from Bingham Town Council, as despite its excellent staff and councillors, it was not set up to deal with a project of this scale and complexity.

Councillor Chewings seconded the motion and reserved his right to speak.

Councillor Inglis recommended that the motion be rejected as it was not necessary. He advised that the Council's holistic approach to working with its key partners, to better understand the car parking situation in Bingham and explore solutions through the development of a Car Parking Strategy had been approved by Cabinet on 12 September 2023. He felt that the motion also contained a number of personal opinions, which could be considered inaccurate and misleading. Councillor Inglis advised that it was not clear that Bingham had inadequate parking, as the Cabinet report had identified that the spaces to resident ratio was twice that of West Bridgford and greater than other major villages in the Borough, hence the need for a detailed survey. Council noted that Bingham Town Council had also been leading on developing a long stay car parking project since its Masterplan was published in 2018. In respect of new housing developments, Councillor Inglis stated that there was now an increased emphasis on 'active travel' including walking and cycling from those developments to the Town Centre. Councillor Inglis advised that the motion also contained some elements which the Council's statutory officers could not support, for example making a pledge to break new ground on a long stay car park without the appropriate business case, due diligence and decision making by the Council.

Councillor Birch made a Point of Personal Explanation and stated that his motion was not asking for a definitive date, it was asking to aim for a date.

Councillor Inglis resumed by advising that a commitment to purchase contaminated land, without knowledge of remediation costs, for a potential car park would not be the actions of a responsible council. In respect of the step free access, Council was reminded that this was a matter for EMR in conjunction with NR; however, notwithstanding that point, the Council had liaised with both operators and NR had provided written confirmation of its willingness to improve step free access, subject to a further successful funding bid. Councillor Inglis stated that having been Chair of the Bingham Town

Council Car Parking Sub-committee, Councillor Birch knew of the difficulties and challenges that had to be overcome, especially with stakeholders. Councillor Inglis referred to the ongoing work taking place between Rushcliffe Borough Council and Bingham Town Council and the project partnership developed last year, referred to the importance of all Councillors working together and asked that the motion be rejected to allow the Strategic Group to progress the project.

Councillor Grocock stated that the Labour Group recognised that car parking was a long standing issue in Bingham, which had to be addressed as the expansion of the town, combined with the services it provided to surrounding villages only exacerbated it. Nevertheless, he stated that the Group was deeply concerned about this motion, which was not democratic nor environmentally friendly, and most importantly it failed to address the fundamental challenge of developing a car park. Councillor Grocock referred to the recent Town Council meeting, which had considered the proposal set out by Cabinet, and referred to the recent positive changes that had taken place at the Town Council. He stated that in this context, it was disappointing that this motion was being moved by a Councillor, who although living in Bingham, had not chosen to stand for election for the Bingham wards this year, and he questioned why one of Borough Council's elected representatives for Bingham had not brought a motion forward. If passed, this motion would commit Rushcliffe Borough Council to purchase a parcel of land, which was a Town Council asset; however, no one had discussed this matter with the Town Council, nor did it acknowledge that the local elected representatives might wish to be involved. Councillor Grocock stated that it was unfortunate that Councillor Birch had resigned from the Town Council, as he would have had an opportunity to contribute to the work being undertaken. Whilst Councillor Birch's good intentions were not questioned, Councillor Grocock believed that by bringing this motion forward the correct democratic process between different tiers of local government had not been followed. Councillor Grocock stated that the motion failed to consider sustainable transport solutions and the involvement of the County Council in restoring regular bus routes and advised that the Labour Group would only support plans which encouraged further car usage if they were mitigated by a Sustainable Transport Plan. Councillor Grocock referred to the complexity of the issue and advised that the parcel of land identified as a potential parking site was in the wrong location, and currently NR has stated that it would object to any planning application for a car park on that site on safety grounds. Councillor Grocock stated that it was his understanding that both the Borough and Town Council had met with NR to seek a solution to this complex issue, which would take time and that was why the Town Council was keen to work with the Borough Council to explore alternatives. In summary, Councillor Grocock advised that the Labour Group considered the motion to be ill-considered, ill-advised and passing it would represent a failure of democracy.

Councillor Thomas advised that despite having an additional 1,400 houses in East Leake, the Parish Council had received no financial assistance from Rushcliffe, and it also paid business rates on the car parks it owned, plus the one it maintained and managed on Rushcliffe's land and was responsible for ongoing repairs. Councillor Thomas compared this with West Bridgford, where Rushcliffe took full responsibility for the car parks and she reminded Council

that it was not just West Bridgford that acted a centre, and that East Leake, Bingham, and the other larger villages all equally acted as centres for their surrounding villages. Councillor Thomas referred to the report submitted to the last Cabinet meeting and the setting up of the Bingham Car Park Strategy Group and hoped that this would take things forward. Whilst having sympathy with Councillor Birch's frustration, Councillor Thomas stated that the Leake Independents could not support the motion. She asked instead that Rushcliffe worked with the Town and Parish councils to undertake a full review of all aspects of car parking across all local centres, to devise a policy that was fair to all residents.

Councillor Clarke advised that if the motion was passed there would be no opportunity to look at options and drive the project forward as the motion was asking for things to be done, which in certain aspects were impossible. Council was reminded that last week Cabinet approved the establishment of a working group, which had also been approved by the Town Council, and he questioned why Councillor Birch had left both the Cabinet and Town Council meetings rather than staying to listen to the debates. Councillor Clarke stated that land ownership was a major issue and stated that the working group would not be a talking shop. He advised that the group would be meeting in the next few weeks to ensure that the project was driven forward. As previously mentioned this was a complex issue, and if there was an easy solution it would have been dealt with already; however, he was confident that all parties, at every level would be working together and the only way to proceed with that was to vote against the motion.

Councillor Bird agreed with a number of points raised in the motion; however, he felt that the suggested time was wrong and there were many organisations that needed to make positive contributions and commitments before many of the actions would become possible, especially NR. Councillor Bird hoped that all parties would work together, and he considered that this was the best way forward, and he invited Councillor Birch and other Councillors whose wards were close to Bingham to share their requests and concerns.

Councillor Regan thanked Councillor Birch for raising the issue and for his passion in doing so; however, he considered that it would have been appropriate to raise this issue with Bingham Councillors. Councillor Regan welcomed all input on this issue as it added weight to the debate, and he confirmed that during the election campaign, parking had been the number one issue for residents and having lived in the town for 11 years he was also keenly aware of this serious issue. Councillor Regan reiterated that if Councillor Birch had stayed at both the Cabinet and Town Council meetings he would have been further forward in his understanding of the situation. Councillor Regan advised that work was already actively taking place within the community and encouraged Councillor Birch to join Bingham Councillors. He reiterated previous comments that currently it would be strategically inadvisable to be tied into buying the suggested piece of land, and although there were points in the motion that were acceptable, more work was required with partners to find a more holistic plan, driven by the working group.

Councillor Williams was saddened that the motion had come to Council in this way and stated that he hoped that he was approachable, and yet tonight a

resident of Bingham had submitted this motion without speaking with him first. He considered the motion very subjective and was concerned that removing the Town Council from control of the project would erode democracy. Councillor Williams felt that with such an important issue everyone should work together, including various stakeholders and confirmed that today NR had been engaging with local residents about the crossing. Councillor Williams also questioned the appropriateness of buying the land from the Town Council and was concerned that this would limit other possible options and that focusing on one piece of land was not an holistic approach. Councillor Williams reiterated that this was a very complex issue and could not be solved by simply building a new car park and he could not support the motion.

Councillor Polenta endorsed the comments made by Councillor Grocock and stated that Point 1 of the motion eroded the different tiers of local government and structures closest to the local community. The role of Council was not only to pass progressive policies but to open up institutions and encourage participation; however, this motion did the exact opposite. Councillor Polenta did not consider that the end justified the means and felt that this motion only looked at cars and motorists, rather than pedestrians, and urged people to think outside of the box and of different ways to improve accessibility using a sustainable transport model.

Councillor Simms stated that as a Councillor from a neighbouring ward, he would never present an issue from that ward to a Council meeting before speaking to those Councillors first, and he questioned why the motion had been brought forward, when clear due process and professionalism was expected between Councillors. Councillor Simms considered the motion unrealistic and referred to the due processes that needed to be followed to ensure the democratic process was maintained.

Councillor Thomas proposed to proceed to the next business without a vote, and this was seconded by Councillor Way.

On being put to the vote the motion was lost and the debate continued.

Councillor Chewings advised that car parking issue in Bingham affected many residents from surrounding villages, and Rushcliffe as a whole. He stated that some Councillors had called the motion undemocratic by taking the rights away from the Town Council; however, he stated that the wording in the motion referred to a formal written offer being made to the Town Council, which it could refuse, this was simply an offer of a way forward. Assertions had also been made that plans were being rushed through without a business case; however, the motion stated that it would be subject to a business case being approved, so checks would be in place to ensure that it was a viable option. Councillor Chewings concluded by reiterating that there had been 10 years of inaction, and although a report had recently come to Cabinet, the aspiration of completing the work by 2027 seemed too long.

Councillor Birch confirmed that he was a member of Bingham Town Council last year, including the Car Parking Sub-committee, and this would have been his proposed way forward if he had not resigned. He thanked Councillor Regan, who he knew did a great deal for the local community for his

constructive comments. Councillor Birch suggested that the land should be bought for a nominal fee, or simply transferred over, if that was possible. He clarified his previous comment about the working group, stating that previous groups had been talking shops, and he expected this one to be the same. Councillor Birch stated that when he was elected to the Town Council it was because he talked about car parking issues and he felt that he had used his initiative by bringing this motion forward, held Councillors to account and advocated for his residents, many of whom worked and used amenities in Bingham. Councillor Birch concluded by stating that he hoped to be proved wrong, but he was sure that this situation would continue for many years to come.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, a recorded vote was taken for this item as follows:

FOR: Councillors T Birch and K Chewings

AGAINST: Councillors M Barney, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, J Chaplain, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, A Edyvean, S Ellis, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Inglis, R Mallender, S Mallender, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, L Plant, D Polenta, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, R Upton, D Viridi, J Walker, R Walker, L Way, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler, and G Williams

ABSTENTION: J Billin, R Bird, S Dellar, E Georgiou and C Thomas

The motion was lost.

- c) The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Combellack and seconded by Councillor Wells.

The Mayor informed Council that Councillor Combellack had advised that she wished to make an alteration under Standing Order Paragraph 4.58 (highlighted in italics below as Point 3). After outlining the alteration, consent was given by Council and Councillor Combellack proceeded to move the motion.

Councillor Combellack informed Council, in moving the motion, that water and flooding were becoming increasingly worrying for residents, hence her request to join the Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board (TVIDB), and it was a concern shared by her fellow Councillors who were also Board members. Assurances were needed that any new housing developments, large or small impacting water courses and infrastructure, did not alter water flow or inadvertently overload the drainage systems which, in many cases, were very old. Currently minor wind fall sites were not commented upon by the water agencies as they were considered too small; however, several small sites could have considerable impact upon drainage. Councillor Combellack stated that Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDs) were designed to manage storm water as close to its source as possible to maintain natural drainage and encourage its infiltration and attenuation. Council was advised that in 2024, SUDs should become mandatory for most new construction in England and would require

approval by the SUDs Approval Body (SAB). Councillor Combellack stated that farming practice had become increasingly mechanised and whilst farmers should be supported, the impact of modern practice was compounding flooding issues. The removal of trees and hedges meant fields were less well protected, there was less water uptake by established trees and the loss of tree cover meant dry friable soil was blown away leaving, often, barren soil which could not absorb water in heavy rainfall. Heavy machinery compacted the soil and broke underlying field drains and the practice of no plough, seed drilling, meant the soil was no longer broken up to absorb excess rainfall. Existing dew ponds in fields had been filled in, removing the natural attenuation. Machinery now flayed hedgerows leaving the arisings to block ditches and heavy machinery on verges destroyed the grips carrying water from the road to the ditches.

“Therefore this Council resolves to address these issues by:

1. Strengthening consultation with appointed ‘water agencies’ – the Local Lead Flood Authority, Severn Trent, Trent Valley Drainage Board and the Environment Agency – by requesting the Secretary of State ensures they are all Statutory Planning Consultees and formally asks, that full and informative comments on every application impacting water supply and drainage, are provided to the Planning Authority at planning application stage, addressing all potential consequences, particularly in the light of climate change.
2. Requesting DEFRA produce more informed guidance on water attenuation and dispersal and farming practices. Current practice no longer allows for aeration and soil percolation and leads to destruction of field ponds, hedges and trees, consequently adding to flooding.
3. *Requesting Government to implement Schedule 3 to the Flood and Water Management Act 2010, reviewed by DEFRA in January 2023, making mandatory the appointment of a SUDS Approval Body by 2024.*

Both requests to be copied to the Local MPs.”

The Mayor advised that given the time, she considered it appropriate to ask Councillors to keep their questions and responses to three minutes.

Councillor Wells seconded the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Gaunt proposed an amendment to the motion. He confirmed that whilst the Labour Group was broadly in favour of this motion it felt that a small amendment was required to strengthen it, to ensure that the work could be carried out. He referred to a previous Council meeting in 2019, when he had requested that a planning application to build 175 houses on floodplain in Ruddington be removed from the Local Plan, and he had also asked for the application to be refused at Planning Committee and that failed as the hydrological data at the time was out of date and suggested a low risk of flooding in that area. He believed that this motion was focused on the same

issue, that old data failed to show the impact of hundreds of new buildings, and there was little testing, and in fact flooding did occur on the site of the proposed development in Ruddington. The development was subsequently built, but at a higher level, and no impact survey had been undertaken to identify how this development could affect existing local houses. Councillor Gaunt stated that unfortunately the motion was not strong enough as it was impossible to achieve those things without funding and the Labour Group was proposing the following amendment to Point 1:

“Therefore this Council resolves to address these issues by:

1. Strengthening consultation with appointed ‘water agencies’ – the Local Lead Flood Authority, Severn Trent, Trent Valley Drainage Board and the Environment Agency – by requesting the Secretary of State ensures that they are fully funded to fulfil the role of Statutory Consultees and formally asks, that full and informative comments on every application impacting water supply and drainage, are provided to the Planning Authority at planning application stage, addressing all potential consequences, particularly in the light of climate change.

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

The Mayor asked Councillor Combella if she accepted the amendment and she confirmed that she would not.

The Mayor asked if anyone wished to speak on the amendment.

Councillor Thomas sought clarification regarding the wording of the motion, as it now differed slightly from that published in the agenda.

The Chief Executive explained that the wording on the screen was the altered motion that Council had voted to accept, and it was slightly different to what was published on the Council agenda. Point 3 had been accepted, and as referred to by Councillor Thomas, there was also an additional line at the end of Point 1 “particularly in the light of climate change”, and Council had voted to accept this as an altered motion.

Councillor Gowland considered the extra words to be quite useful. She advised that she had been a member of the TVIDB, which was a very small organisation, with limited finances and it could not do this without resources, and the proposed amendment would be a small, but meaningful change to provide funding from the Secretary of State, to enable organisations to do what was required of them.

Councillor J Walker reiterated that without funding the motion would become meaningless.

Councillor Combella advised that there were two reasons why she could not accept the amendment. Firstly, there were certain consultees that should be statutory consultees, and currently there was no engagement with them and that needed to take place. However, Councillor Combella felt that to

introduce funding into that request would detract from the thrust of the motion. Secondly, in respect of Point 3, following the review of Schedule 3 in January 2023, which had yet to be implemented, according to Government guidance, the SAB running costs would be part of the application process, with the developer providing a means of funding the SABs, which should result in a net zero cost to local authorities. Councillor Combellack confirmed that the motion had been submitted to get the Secretary of State to acknowledge that those consultees should be statutory.

Councillor Gaunt acknowledged the thrust of the motion; however, the Labour Group was concerned that it would not be achievable without funding and if the amendment was defeated, it was hoped that in future something could come forward requesting that funding.

On being put to the vote, the amendment to the motion was lost.

The Mayor asked if anyone wished to speak on the motion.

Councillor Thomas stated that whilst the Leake Independent Group supported the aspirations of this motion, it did not go far enough, she referred to the privatisation of the water industry in 1989 and to the resulting negative impact. Councillor Thomas considered that many of the problems described were a direct result of a lack of investment by those companies and stated that the Council should urgently be calling on the Government to renationalise them. She advised Council that forcing all those bodies to respond to all planning applications would change very little, as at best Severn Trent Water would send in its standard reply, as would the other groups, even when greater consideration of a particular application should take place. Councillor Thomas stated that as the Local Planning Authority, Rushcliffe should be more proactive at seeking informed individual responses, where needed and that Councillors should all be proactive in requesting this for applications where an existing problem was known about or where a cumulative impact was building up. Councillor Thomas referred to new housing estates and questioned what checks were in place for drainage ponds to ensure that they were built according to plans and functioning to specification, especially as after completion, they became the responsibility of unregulated estate management companies. She expressed concern that if they failed through lack of maintenance or old age any costs for repair or replacement would be carried by the residents. Councillor Thomas welcomed Councillor Combellack's action point on this; however, she was concerned that this would have no effect for many years, whilst the Government belatedly implemented Schedule 3, and even then it would not apply retrospectively and in the meantime every new development added to the problem. In respect of farming, Councillor Thomas felt that it was highly unlikely that any action would be taken against increasing industrialisation of that industry. She concluded by confirming that the Group would be supporting the motion.

It was proposed by Councillor Clarke, seconded by Councillor Brennan and **RESOLVED** that the meeting be extended and would finish no later than 10.30pm.

Councillor Chewings asked for a recorded vote and proposed an amendment

to the motion. Councillor Chewings thanked Councillor Combellack for her motion and stated that flooding and its impact was a very important issue and advised that Rushcliffe had been blighted with localised flooding over recent years, which was happening more frequently. Councillor Chewings referred to Ruth Edwards MP, and her report on Storm Dennis published in 2020, and questioned why no updates had been given since February 2021, as updates were important, to ensure that work was not duplicated. The first step in the report had been to engage with Rushcliffe Borough Council into what powers it needed with regards to development, which Councillor Chewings thought embodied part of this motion, and he therefore felt it was important to amend the motion with Point 4 to ask Ruth Edwards MP for an update as follows:

4. Asking Ruth Edwards MP for an update on her Storm Dennis 2019-20 Flood Report (published 2020), to include feedback on any progress on seeking additional powers from Ministers to mitigate flooding and its impact.

Councillor Birch seconded the motion and reserved the right to speak.

The Mayor asked Councillor Combellack if she accepted the amendment and she confirmed that she would not.

The Mayor asked if anyone wished to speak on the amendment.

Councillor Clarke advised that Ruth Edwards MP could be contacted by any resident for an update and therefore the amendment was not required and including it would deflect from the focus of the motion and those thoughts were echoed by Councillor Matthews.

Councillor Birch endorsed the motion and referred to the impact of flooding, including on his ward and he felt that the amendment improved the motion.

Councillor Chewings reiterated that the amendment was asking for the local MP to provide an update on her report, which had specifically mentioned working with Rushcliffe, and given that there had been no reports back and the importance of the issue, he felt that the Council should be asking her for an update and then implementing that into its own work, through planning. Councillor Chewings questioned if this Council wanted to hold its MP to account.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, a recorded vote was taken for this item as follows:

FOR: Councillors J Billin, T Birch, J Chaplain, K Chewings, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, P Gowland, C Grocock, L Plant, D Polenta and J Walker

AGAINST: Councillors M Barney, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, S Dellar, A Edyvean, S Ellis, R Inglis, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, R Upton, D Viridi, R Walker, L Way, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler, and G Williams

ABSTENTION: E Georgiou, R Mallender, S Mallender and C Thomas

The amendment to the motion was lost.

The Mayor asked if anyone wished to speak on the motion.

Councillor R Mallender confirmed that he was happy to support the motion and agreed with previous comments made by Councillor Thomas regarding the state of water companies nationally. He agreed that it was worth strengthening the consultation process, although he was also concerned that nothing would actually change, but the Council needed to keep trying. He welcomed the idea of a SAB and felt that it would be appropriate to retrofit SUDs to existing developments. He referred to work being undertaken by Severn Trent in Mansfield, where they were retrofitting 'rain gardens' to existing urban areas and stated that this should be looked at in the larger settlements in Rushcliffe.

Councillor Wells considered that Planning Officers should take more consideration of the topography of the land, as it was very important when considering potential flood risk.

Councillor Combellack thanked Councillors for the interesting debate and reminded everyone of the importance of the motion and agreed with the comments made regarding the poor state of water management in the country. She stated that it was high time that consultees provided Planning Authorities with detailed and informed comments, as climate change, increasing industrialised farming practices, and developments which had not been fully considered were having untold consequences and the Council had to protect its residents.

In accordance with the Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) (Amendment) Regulations 2014, a recorded vote was taken for this item as follows:

FOR: Councillors M Barney, J Billin, T Birch, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, J Chaplain, K Chewings, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, S Dellar, A Edyvean, S Ellis, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, E Georgiou, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Inglis, R Mallender, S Mallender, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, L Plant, D Polenta, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, C Thomas, R Upton, D Viridi, J Walker, R Walker, L Way, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler, and G Williams

The motion was carried.

36 **Questions from Councillors**

Question from Councillor Thomas to Councillor Viridi:

"Please provide breakdown of expenditure and income for Rushcliffe-run events in the past year, including West Bridgford Christmas Lights, Proms, Lark in the Park, Taste of Rushcliffe, Cinema etc, Remembrance, Armed forces day, Civic Services etc including identification of any grant funding and recharge to

West Bridgford Special Expense.”

Councillor Virdi advised that due to the detailed nature of the request, a handout was being circulated to the meeting, and it showed that for a number of excellent events there was a net direct cost of £40k.

Councillor Thomas asked a supplementary question:

“Is providing free outdoor cinema in an affluent area of the country a reasonable use of public funds allocated to the so called Levelling Up Fund given the state of our hospitals and schools and the hardship being endured by many families?”

Councillor Virdi responded by stating that events referred to were for all residents, with Proms in the Park having over 8,000 attendees. He advised that the cinema event was actually funded by the UK Shared Prosperity Fund (UKSPF) rather than the Council.

Question from Councillor Grocock to Councillor J Wheeler:

“I'd like to thank Councillor J Wheeler for his prompt and positive support in confirming to me that the Council continues to ban live animals being awarded as prizes at events on Council land in line with a national RSPCA campaign. Will the Council provide evidence to the RSPCA, perhaps the record of this meeting that we have such a ban in place and can be added to the list of councils that support their campaign to ban this inhumane practice?”

Councillor J Wheeler confirmed that in the Council's booking terms and conditions for any activities on its land, it was clear that live animals could not be given away as prizes, which he was very proud of and he stated that the Council would be contacting the RSPCA to ask it to update its records.

Councillor Grocock asked a supplementary question:

“Additionally, given our Town and Parish Council partners own and manage a number of parks, playing fields and open spaces in the borough, should we also encourage their adoption of this ban, perhaps at the forthcoming Town and Parish Forum on 10 November at the Bingham Arena, so we can fully eradicate this outdated practice in Rushcliffe?”

Councillor J Wheeler responded by agreeing that the Council should work in partnership with town and parish councils to ensure that this practice was banned, if they wished to do so, as it was a matter for individual councils. Councillor Wheeler advised that this issue would be raised in the next Town and Parish Councils Newsletter and encouraged all Councillors to raise this where appropriate in their wards.

Question from Councillor Grocock to Councillor Inglis.

“Given the fact that national legislation will soon legally require local authorities to collect and recycle food waste separately from general waste and recycling, should Rushcliffe Borough Council implement a similar pilot to the one

currently being delivered by Nottingham City Council and undertake a food waste collection trial in a ward within the Borough?”

Councillor Inglis informed Council that as the top recycling authority in the County, Rushcliffe was very proud of delivering a top-quality waste collection service for local residents. The idea for a pilot had previously been raised at Full Council in December 2022, when it was explained at the time that for the Council to unilaterally implement a food waste collection scheme even as a pilot would be premature, unwise and unaffordable. Importantly the Council had continued to work collaboratively on an externally funded project through the Nottinghamshire Joint Waste Management Committee (JWMC), which had developed a model for how food waste could be collected and disposed of across Nottinghamshire, as it was vital that this work was done as a system. This work would ensure that the Council and indeed the whole County were in a very good place to implement a weekly food waste collection service once the Government confirmed its requirements and funding arrangements for local authorities to deliver such a service. It was widely acknowledged by DEFRA that there had been slippages to the planned programme; however, the Council through the JWMC was continuing to press for clarity to be provided as soon as possible. In the meantime, the Council had secured a range of discounted deals on home composters that residents could use for the disposal of their food waste and those could be found on the recycling page of the Council's website.

Question from Councillor Williams to Councillor Clarke?

“Following the decision at Cabinet last week to move forward with a detailed Strategic Working Group to address parking issues in Bingham, could the leader please give an update on how this will progress?”

Councillor Clarke referred to the debate earlier this evening and reiterated that now Cabinet had agreed to establish a working group, that would be meeting in the next few weeks, with all parties involved, including stakeholders, and the three levels of Council, and it would consider all options to decide the most holistic approach and would canvass local opinion. He reiterated that the process was extremely important and that it would be driven forward, with regular meetings.

Question from Councillor Bird to Councillor Clarke.

“Would the Leader of the Council confirm that Rushcliffe Borough Council will continue to work with Bingham Town Council to improve the car parking provision in Bingham?”

Councillor Clarke confirmed that this would be the case and thanked Bingham Town Council for engaging with Rushcliffe and referred to the importance of all stakeholders working together, and he reiterated that it was absolutely vital that Rushcliffe worked closely with the Town Council to ensure that local opinions were included and that all possible options were looked at in the wider sense.

The meeting closed at 10.21 pm.

CHAIR