

When telephoning, please ask for: Democratic Services
Direct dial 0115 914 8511
Email democraticservices@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Our reference:
Your reference:
Date: Wednesday, 10 September 2025

To all Members of the Council

Dear Councillor

A Meeting of the Council will be held on Thursday, 18 September 2025 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



Sara Pregon
Monitoring Officer

AGENDA

Opening Prayer

1. Apologies for absence
2. Declarations of Interest

[Link to further information in the Council's Constitution](#)

3. Minutes of the Meeting held on 17 July 2025 (Pages 1 - 14)

To receive as a correct record the minutes of the Meeting of the Council held on Thursday, 17 July 2025.

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

Email:
customerservices
@rushcliffe.gov.uk

Telephone:
0115 981 9911

www.rushcliffe.gov.uk

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

7. Citizens' Questions

[To answer questions submitted by Citizens on the Council or its services.](#)

8. Rushcliffe Sport and Tourism Charter (Pages 15 - 20)

The report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth is attached.

9. Councillors' Learning and Development Policy 2026-2029 (Pages 21 - 34)

The report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services is attached.

10. Notices of Motion

[To receive Notices of Motion](#)

a) Councillor Upton

In the last ten years, more new homes have been built in Rushcliffe than anywhere else in Nottinghamshire. This was achieved, in part, by the previous Government abolishing housing targets and giving more power back to local councils to determine where new housing should be built. The new Government has restored housing targets and is proposing planning reforms that will give more powers to house builders. We are concerned that Rushcliffe will be forced to take more housing than is planned for. With the current proposed Local Government Reform, we believe that the current housing target policy is no longer relevant.

We propose that this Council writes to the Secretary of State for Housing, Communities and Local Government and calls on the Government to:

1. abolish mandatory housing targets for District and Borough Councils;
2. safeguard Greenbelt and Greenfield land against future development, where an area has met its house building obligations in the last five years; and
3. create a new approach of identifying brownfield land and city centre sites for housing development and produce targets for them regardless of the current Local Government boundaries.

b) Councillor Clarke MBE

It is perceived that Rushcliffe is experiencing an increase in the number of Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs), particularly small

HMOs falling within Use Class C4 (occupation by between three and six unrelated people, sharing basic amenities, as more than one household). HMOs play an important role in housing provision across the Borough; however, this can lead to issues associated with parking pressure, noise, and have a detrimental impact on community cohesion and local amenity.

Under the current planning framework, the change of use from a dwelling house (Class C3) to a small HMO (Class C4) is classed as permitted development under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015, such that planning permission is automatically granted without a planning application having to be made. Under Article 4 of that Order, local planning authorities have the ability to make Direction, after preparing an evidence base. This includes mapping current HMOs, identifying any recent increase in the creation rate of new HMOs, and assessing local impacts, including amenity, parking, waste, and housing balance, and where the operation of specific permitted development rights is resulting in harmful impacts, removing those rights in defined areas, so that an application for planning permission would then be required.

This Council therefore resolves to:

1. Investigate and collate an evidence base to look at whether there is a case for introducing an Article 4 Direction across Rushcliffe, to enable this Council to assess proposals for HMOs on a case-by-case basis through the planning process. This will allow local residents and Councillors to be consulted and consider the impacts of such proposals.
2. Bring a formal report to Cabinet by the end of February 2026, to enable it to consider the evidence (subject to it being available and the completion of public consultation) and, if justified, recommend that a Direction be made.

11. Questions from Councillors

[To answer questions submitted by Councillors](#)

Membership

Chair: Councillor J Cottee

Vice-Chair: Councillor R Butler

Councillors: M Barney, J Billin, T Birch, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, N Clarke, T Combellack, 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

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

National legislation permits 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.



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

THURSDAY, 17 JULY 2025

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 J Cottee (Chair), R Butler (Vice-Chair), M Barney, J Billin, T Birch, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, N Clarke, T Combellack, 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, 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
R Clack	Deputy Monitoring Officer
A Hill	Chief Executive
P Linfield	Director of Finance and Corporate Services
E Richardson	Democratic Services Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager

APOLOGIES:

Councillor A Phillips

12 Declarations of Interest

The following declarations of interest were made in respect of Item 11: Local Government Reorganisation Update.

Councillor Gaunt declared a non-pecuniary interest as a secondary school teacher in the city.

Councillor Parekh as an employee of Nottinghamshire County Council.

Councillor Grocock, as an employee at Futures, a company jointly owned by Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council.

Councillor S Mallender, as an employee of Nottingham City Council.

13 Minutes of the Meeting held on 22 May 2025

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 22 May 2025 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

14 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor informed Council that his year had begun well, attending eight very enjoyable events. Highlights included the Soar Boating Club birthday celebrations, laying a wreath at Crich, attending Southwell Minster for the King's birthday celebrations, the Radcliffe on Trent Carnival, and Proms in the Park. He reminded Councillors about his Civic Service on Sunday, 20 July in Keyworth.

15 Leader's Announcements

The Leader referred to the very successful Proms in the Park, as well as the recent Film and Food Festival, which highlighted how well Rushcliffe organised such large scale events. Council was informed that earlier in the week some Travellers had moved onto Bridgford Park, and he went on to thank the Police and officers for promptly dealing with the situation. The Leader confirmed that Rushcliffe had again been awarded three Green Flags, which highlighted how well regarded those services were.

16 Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no Chief Executive's Announcements.

17 Citizens' Questions

The Mayor invited Mr Gaff to read his question as submitted.

"Can this Council, Councillors and its officers categorically assure the residents of Tollerton Park estate that it is safe to continue to live on Tollerton Park estate, and to continue to grow and consume the fruit and vegetables, which we produce on the land of the former RAF Tollerton site?"

Councillor Inglis thanked Mr Gaff for his question and advised that the Council's position on those points was set out in a letter and detailed briefing note that was hand delivered to all the Tollerton Park Home residents on 7 July 2025, as an expedited response to residents in relation to this question. The Council hoped that residents found the information helpful and of some assurance and that residents would follow the good practice advice contained in the correspondence.

18 Petitions

No petitions were presented at this meeting.

19 Approval of the Scrutiny Annual Reports 2024/25

The Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership, Councillor Clarke MBE 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 2024/25.

The Leader informed Council that he had great pleasure in presenting the Annual Scrutiny Reports for approval and referred to the importance of scrutiny in helping to develop policy and provide the appropriate checks and balances. After Councillor Brennan had been given the opportunity to second the report, he asked that each of the scrutiny Chairs be invited to deliver a brief summary of the year.

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

Councillor Combellack, Chair of the Corporate Overview Group for 2024/25, reported that the Group had allocated many scrutiny requests, helping to guide and formulate them, even redirecting them where appropriate, which had led to both interesting and productive debate. Scrutiny of performance figures confirmed that Rushcliffe continued to deliver high level services, with good customer feedback. As the new Chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group, Councillor Combellack stated that she was looking forward to scrutinising work at the "coalface". She thanked officers and members for their time and dedication, in particular the Head of Corporate Services and the Director – Finance and Corporate Services and concluded by looking forward to being involved in further successful scrutiny work.

Councillor Edyvean, Chair of the Governance Scrutiny Group, thanked members of the Group for their involvement in sometimes lively debate on a range of topics. He stated that the Group had considered the Redmond Review, which had resulted in the appointment of an Independent Person, which had proved a very positive step and thanked officers and external presenters for their involvement and support.

Councillor Williams, Chair of the Communities Scrutiny Group, referred to the wide range and interesting subjects the Group had considered, which were detailed in the report and thanked officers, in particular the Head of Environment and Communities, the Democratic Services Team and members of the Group, especially the Vice-chair, Councillor Plant.

Councillors Matthews, Chair of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group, referred to the varied and interesting topics that the Group had reviewed, which were detailed in the report, including the joint meeting with Communities Scrutiny Group, to consider accessible housing. He thanked all members of the Group, in particular the Vice-chair, Councillor Way and officers.

Councillor Plant, Vice-chair of Communities Scrutiny Group, thanked Councillor Williams and reflected on the interesting subjects covered during the year. She felt it was important that Councillors were appropriately informed about scrutiny topics and that recommendations agreed by scrutiny groups were actioned. Councillor Plant stated that the joint scrutiny group had been extremely informative, raising concerns, with many excellent recommendations, which, if implemented could make a real difference. She also felt that it would be good practice for Vice-chairs to see the draft Annual Scrutiny Report before it was published and she hoped that further scrutiny training would be provided, as agreed last year.

Councillor Polenta, the Vice-chair of Governance Scrutiny Group, thanked the

Chair, members of the Group and officers for their contributions and support. She referred to the importance of scrutiny in the democratic process, ensuring rigour and accountability, by challenging assumptions, regardless of political affiliations. It was important that the Council ensured that all information was accessible, with an accessible scrutiny process to residents. Councillor Polenta reiterated her concerns regarding the Constitutional changes agreed earlier this year, which she felt constricted debate.

In noting the comprehensive report, Councillor Way, the Vice-chair of Growth and Development Scrutiny Group thanked all those involved and felt that a great deal had been achieved. Councillor Way went onto agree with comments made by Councillor Plant and requested that going forward, any document that included a Councillor's name should be sent to that Councillor before being published. Councillor Way was pleased to note that the scrutiny process was to be reviewed, as suggested in the Peer Review, and hoped that this would address ongoing concerns.

Councillor R Mallender referred to the importance of having a robust scrutiny function, looked forward to seeing the outcome of the review, and was pleased that the Communities Scrutiny Group had undertaken important work in relation to Climate Change.

Councillor Birch thanked all Councillors and officers for their hard work in the scrutiny process.

The Leader confirmed that the request from Councillor Plant and Way would be actioned going forward.

It was **RESOLVED** that the work undertaken by the four Scrutiny Groups during 2024/25 be endorsed.

20 **Appointment of Independent Persons**

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Finance, Transformation and Governance, Councillor Virdi presented the report of the Monitoring Officer, outlining appointment of Independent Persons to the Standards Committee.

Councillor Virdi advised that it was a requirement of the Localism Act 2011 that the Council should have access to at least one Independent Person to consult on Member Code of Conduct matters, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer. Councillor Virdi advised that given the uncertainties around Local Government Reorganisation, it was not considered cost effective to commence a recruitment process to appoint new individuals, and it was recommended that the appointment of the two current Independent Persons be extended as detailed in the report.

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

Councillor J Walker thanked the two current Independent Persons for their professionalism over the past two years and fully endorsed the recommendation.

It was **RESOLVED** that the appointment of Mr Christopher Richards and Ms Helen Richardson as its Independent Persons for standards matters under Section 28(7) of the Localism Act 2011 be extended for a period of two years, with authority for the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Chair of the Standards Committee, to extend the appointment up to an additional two years.

21 **Local Government Reorganisation Update**

The Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership, Councillor Clarke MBE presented the report of the Chief Executive, which provided an overview of the Government's requirement for plans for Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) to be developed in Nottingham and Nottinghamshire and to update on the work undertaken to respond to the requirements.

In formally moving the recommendations detailed in the report, the Leader stated that LGR was the most important issue for Rushcliffe in years and summarised the actions taken since the publication of the Government's White Paper in December 2024. He confirmed that in March, councils in Nottinghamshire had submitted three core options, all of which proposed two unitary councils, with Rushcliffe advancing a fourth option of three unitary councils. He confirmed that Rushcliffe's position remained that no part of it should be part of a newly expanded City area, as Rushcliffe was well run, financially stable, delivering first class services, in contrast to the City Council. The Leader advised that the original proposal had now been reduced to two options, 1b and 1e as detailed in Appendix D to the report, and Council noted that as Rushcliffe's option had received little support from other authorities, the report was recommending supporting option 1b. The Leader reminded Council that this was not a final decision, it was an update, with work on the Council's third option being paused; however, if circumstances changed it would be revisited. The Leader referred to evidence gained from the ongoing petition, with over 15,000 cross-party signatures, all against Rushcliffe joining any expanded City area. The Leader concluded by reiterating that this report was supporting an interim approach, working towards a final submission in November, and he thanked officers involved in this time consuming work.

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

Councillor J Walker advised that the Labour Group had submitted an amendment, as it believed the proposal to be unbalanced and potentially damaging; however, as it could not be accepted, the Labour Group would not be supporting the recommendations. She felt that Rushcliffe would not have an open mind during the consultation process, with the proposed recommendations failing to serve the needs of local communities. Councillor Walker stated that all useful debate had been replaced by political rhetoric and that the proposals had been put forward without properly investigating all other options, as there were alternative ways to improve efficiencies and service delivery. Councillor Walker questioned why there had been no serious evaluation of the boundary review and what evidence there was in favour of option 1b rather than 1e. The Labour Group was demanding a better process, where all options were carefully considered, as residents deserved that.

Councillor Thomas referred to the most cost effective option of a single unitary authority, questioned why it had been discounted for political reasons and felt that it should be reconsidered, because if implemented with a commitment to running local area committees, it could deliver for everyone. Councillor Thomas was concerned that recommendations e) and f) would limit Rushcliffe's ability to have any influence over any possible alternative options put forward, with the river as a hard boundary, and if boundaries were to change, options which used the river for an expanded City could be considered. Councillor Thomas referred to a changing storyline to emphasise that new councils would be formed, rather than saying that some districts would be added into the City, with the County Council taking the rest. She stated that it was vital going forward that the new councils were formed from the ground up, and it should be added to the recommendations.

Councillor Thomas proposed the following amendment, to add a further clause at the end, which was seconded by Councillor Way, who reserved the right to speak.

- h) it be recognised that after the reorganisation all councils in the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire area will be completely new organisations.

The Leader confirmed that he accepted the amendment, which then became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Birch stated that he would like to propose the following amendment to g), which would be seconded by Councillor Chewings, who reserved the right to speak.

- g) to ensure the final proposal is informed by the views of local communities, Rushcliffe Borough Council will actively engage Town and Parish Councils, local community organisations, and businesses as part of a broader Engagement Strategy. In addition, to provide Central Government with an accurate reflection of residents' views, the Council will undertake a Borough-wide Engagement Survey, to ensure the voices of Rushcliffe constituents are clearly heard.

Councillor Birch was concerned that the issue had been heavily politicised and felt that opposition Councillors had not been kept appropriately informed about LGR, with very little communication throughout the process, which failed to promote transparency and openness. Councillor Birch stated that the petition was not verifiable and was unreliable, and the amendment was calling for more engagement, with a public survey.

The Leader advised that most of the work referred to had already been done and was contained in the documents, and confirmed that he accepted the amendment, which then became part of the substantive motion.

Councillor Polenta stated that LGR should be an opportunity to rethink how Council's governed and funded services, with collective decision making for all. She agreed that the petition was flawed and that an element of fear was

stopping proper debate on this issue. LGR should create financially sustainable authorities by rebuilding a broken system, with a unitary structure simplifying decision making and improving services for all. A new vision was required and should be reflected in LGR, which put people before profit, with democratic devolutionary powers.

Councillor Calvert was concerned that Rushcliffe was acting in self interest in relation to the rural parts of the Borough, by refusing to consider the best interests of West Bridgford, which was closely connected to the City. He reiterated previous concerns regarding the petition and the insulting remarks it contained about the City and for that reason he would not be supporting recommendation f). He also advised that he could not accept recommendations c) and d), as he felt that the analysis and scoring was very questionable. In respect of increases to Council Tax, Councillor Calvert stated that the report came to a different view compared to figures in the petition, with it stating that there would be very little difference annually.

Councillor Soloman stated that she would be supporting option 1b as it was the only one to ensure that Rushcliffe would not be absorbed by the City, as it should not be expected to underwrite the City's past mistakes, nor any authority that had failed its residents and mismanaged its finances. However, due to LGR this was the situation being faced and option 1b offered the best outcome for Rushcliffe, which should be the primary objective of every Councillor here. Option 1b would create two viable authorities, avoiding the risks and costs associated with more complex options, and had been appraised by independent, expert analysis. Councillor Soloman stated that any Councillor not supporting option 1b was failing to put Rushcliffe residents first, as it was largely rural and entirely incompatible with a city based unitary merger.

Councillor R Mallender agreed that local government was about local representation, which everyone tried to achieve. He noted the arguments raised that LGR would simplify things and improve efficiency; however, he felt that it would be better to give local authorities more effective control over their budgets and called for a sensible redistribution of wealth around the UK. In reality LGR would still consist of at least two tiers, but by removing the lowest tier, it would impact the lowest level of democracy, and Councillor Mallender also called for voting reform, as the first past the post system was no longer fit for purpose.

Councillor Gowland stated that she was in favour of having a single unitary authority; however, it would only work if all areas had strong town and parish councils. She was concerned that money had been spent investigating an unviable option, and whilst acknowledging that the City had financial problems, she felt that there were valid reasons for this, including the low Council Tax raised per household. Councillor Gowland also questioned how Council Tax was distributed around the County and stated that many Rushcliffe residents used services provided by the City. Under option 1b, West Bridgford, would be the only urban area, and she reminded Council that 40% of Rushcliffe's population lived there and that it was part of the City. She felt that given the current boundaries, it made sense for Rushcliffe, the City and County Councils to talk to each other, to address joint concerns and she also called for a

complete review of local government finances.

Councillor Grocock was concerned that the recommendations failed to take into account the reality of the situation across the nine local authorities, with all of them forming positions, and whilst there was some support from other authorities for option 1b, he did not believe that any other authority would support recommendation f). Having previously spoken in favour of boundary review, Central Government had indicated that it was more open to this; however, despite other authorities considering it, Rushcliffe was refusing to do so and he questioned how Rushcliffe could share affinity with areas in the northern most part of the County. Councillor Grocock felt that if the other councils favoured option 1e, the best approach would be for Rushcliffe to support a boundary review, which other councils would also support.

Councillor Gaunt was concerned that the recommendations were based on inaccurate data and questioned the inclusion of data from the petition as that was unreliable, signatures could not be verified and he felt that many questions had to be answered before that data could be accepted as valid. Councillor Gaunt advised that he could not accept recommendation c) as he did not believe that the three unitary option would ever pass Central Government's criteria regarding sustainability and work on this had already cost a great deal and would cost more if looked at further. Councillor Gaunt stated that by supporting recommendation f) Rushcliffe would be unable to negotiate going forward, even if circumstances changed.

Councillor Chewings felt that LGR was not fit for purpose, and whilst he did not agree that 1b was the best option, he stated that he would be voting for the recommendations. He was pleased that the Group's amendment had been accepted, as the original recommendations did not allow for fair, impartial engagement, and was concerned that the high scores in the report, paid for by the Council were based on the unverified petition. Councillor Chewings stated that if the recommendations were passed, he would hold the Council to account to ensure that a Borough-wide engagement survey would be undertaken.

Councillor J Wheeler felt that the money spent on the report for the Council's extra option had been well used, as the option had been independently appraised and shown to be viable, if circumstances changed. He reiterated that LGR had been imposed by Central Government and had to be funded by the tax payer and advised that other councils were spending far more money than Rushcliffe. He agreed that work on consultation was already taking place and felt that the City Council had caused its own problems by making poor political choices about its housing. In respect of the petition, he felt that it did echo the concerns raised by residents that he had spoken to, and he stated that a boundary review was not feasible as it would take too long.

Councillor Simms stated that he represented one of the most rural areas of the Borough, and no one that he had spoken to wanted to join the City and referred to the City's history of poor financial management

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Brennan referred to the energy, time, expertise and money being spent on this process, which she failed to see

would benefit anyone in Rushcliffe. The process had been imposed, with councils working together to try and come to an agreement, and even if everyone could agree that single tiers might be the most efficient option, the process had been rushed through and set up in a way which ensured politicisation. Councillor Brennan confirmed that 1b was already one of the recommendations agreed by all authorities and submitted to Government and was based on research by the commissioned experts. Councillor Brennan stated that the City had not put forward any option for new boundaries; however, Rushcliffe had worked hard to put an alternative option forward, which was being paused, whilst Rushcliffe looked at another option agreed by other authorities. This report was trying to narrow down options, finding the best one for Rushcliffe, whilst still engaging with all other authorities, and given the uncertainty ahead she felt that it was best to keep doors open. Councillor Brennan confirmed that there would be appropriate engagement going forward and she reiterated that 1b was the best option for Rushcliffe.

The Leader agreed with Councillor Brennan's comments and with other Councillors that LGR had been imposed with impossible timescales. He advised that not all councils had expressed views yet on the options and stated that given the tight timescales, a boundary review would not be feasible. In answer to the criticism that money had been spent on looking at an alternative option, the Leader felt that exploring other options was a positive thing to do. Council was reminded that discussion on a single unitary authority had taken place over 50 years ago, there was no easy solution and in order to progress the work the recommendations should be supported. The Leader stated that it would be difficult to engage with the public effectively, given the short timescales and that timing would be key, given that this was not the final decision. The Leader advised that all information had been shared with Councillors as soon as it had been made available and he requested that a recorded vote be taken, which was agreed by four Councillors.

In accordance with Standing Order Paragraph 4.23, a recorded vote was taken for this item as follows:

FOR: Councillors M Barney, T Birch, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, K Chewings, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottey, S Dellar, A Edyvean, S Ellis, E Georgiou, R Inglis, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, R Upton, D Viridi, R Walker, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler, and G Williams

AGAINST: Councillors J Billin, S Calvert, J Chaplain, G Fletcher, M Gaunt P Gowland, C Grocock, L Plant, D Polenta and J Walker

ABSTENSIONS: Councillors R Mallender, S Mallender, Thomas and Way

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- a) the update be noted;
- b) continuing to work collaboratively with the other local authorities across Nottingham and Nottinghamshire with a view to developing a final unitary proposal for submission to Government by 28 November 2025

be endorsed;

- c) any further work focusing on the Council's own three unitary option where Rushcliffe is joined with Newark and Sherwood and Gedling Borough Councils be temporarily paused until clarity is obtained on options being taken forward as part of the all Nottinghamshire and Nottingham councils joint work;
- d) it be endorsed that if further support materialises for a three unitary option from other councils, this option will be pursued further to a potential 'final bid' stage and further partnership working explored with other councils;
- e) the development of option 1(b) One unitary council covering Broxtowe, Gedling and Nottingham City and one unitary council covering the remaining County including Ashfield, Bassetlaw, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood and Rushcliffe be supported;
- f) the Council continues to ensure any proposal does not include any part of the current Rushcliffe Borough being absorbed into any new or expand city area;
- g) to ensure the final proposal is informed by the views of local communities, Rushcliffe Borough Council will actively engage Town and Parish Councils, local community organisations, and businesses as part of a broader Engagement Strategy. In addition, to provide Central Government with an accurate reflection of residents' views, the Council will undertake a Borough-wide Engagement Survey, to ensure the voices of Rushcliffe constituents are clearly heard; and
- h) it be recognised that after the reorganisation all councils in the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire area will be completely new organisations.

22 **Notices of Motion**

The following notice of motion was proposed by Councillor J Wheeler and seconded by Councillor Brown.

"This Council resolves to:

- Re-affirm this Council's support to for the Armed Forces Covenant by signing up again for the Armed Forces Covenant.
- Welcome Rushcliffe Borough Council being re-awarded of the Gold Award for the Armed Forces Covenant Employer Scheme.
- Place on record our thanks for all those who serve in the Armed Forces, their family and friends and all of our veterans.
- Encourage all employers in Rushcliffe to sign up to the Employer Recognition Scheme Award.

In moving the motion, Councillor Wheeler advised that a great deal had happened since the Armed Forces Covenant was first signed in 2015, including

the opening of the Defence Medical Rehabilitation Centre (DMRC) at Stanford Hall, with its first class facilities making a huge difference to the treatment and recovery of so many. The Council's showcase events celebrated the armed forces, including Prom in the Park, which had won an award at the Boots and Berets awards in 2024. The Council was re-awarded the Employers Scheme Gold Award in 2024, the highest honour for organisations that signed the Armed Forces Covenant and a testament to the work of the Council, and Councillor Wheeler thanked the Team Manager Community Development in particular for her work on this. Councillor Wheeler stated that by re-signing the Covenant, the Council was reaffirming its commitment to the armed forces and veterans, to ensure that they knew how grateful Rushcliffe was for their service. He concluded by encouraging any member of the armed forces or veterans who needed support to contact the Council.

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

Councillor Fletcher stated that as an ex service member, he had a strong belief in supporting the armed forces and veterans and felt that the difficulties faced when returning to civilian life were not always obvious. Schemes such as the Armed Forces Covenant provided vital support and the Labour Group was passionate about supporting the armed forces and would be supporting the motion.

The Leader felt and hoped that everyone would support the motion and agreed that it was important that the Council reaffirmed its support for the armed forces, advising that Rushcliffe was previously home to several RAF stations and an Ordnance Depot. The Leader referred to the significance of the DMRC to the Borough, with the important work it did.

Councillor Gaunt referred to the current political situation in the country and the significant attacks on diversity and inclusion measures and felt that this was an excellent example of diversity inclusion in operation. He asked if the Council could engage more with local businesses to improve awareness of the scheme.

Councillor Birch thanked Councillor Fletcher for his service, advised that he had family members who were veterans and was aware of the challenges veterans faced daily. He felt that as a country, veterans should be given far more respect, thanked officers and confirmed that his Group would be supporting the motion.

In seconding the motion, Councillor Brown was delighted to reaffirm the Council's support for the armed forces and stated that Rushcliffe should be proud that it was chosen for the location of the DMRC, a first class rehabilitation centre, which he had had the pleasure of visiting, as well as Norton House in Stanford on Soar. Councillor Brown stated that during his Mayoral Year he had met three veterans seeking help, and with the help of officers, fellow Councillors and his Charity SSAFA, one had been found supervised accommodation, which highlighted why it was important to support the armed forces.

Councillor Wheeler thanked everyone for their comments and Councillor

Fletcher for his service. He confirmed that the Council already worked with businesses and would be happy to work with any other organisations that wished to sign up.

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

23 Questions from Councillors

a) Question from Councillor Gowland to Councillor Inglis.

“Can the Council explain how residents are made aware of reports of land contamination and related warnings from RBC Environmental Health? For instance, are the reports available in a way that will be found on land searches or public searches? Does the Planning Committee advise developers or utilities of any reports on land they are likely to work on?”

Councillor Inglis advised that similar to all district and borough councils, this Council had a public register of land that has been determined as contaminated under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, which provided a risk based approach to the identification of land where contamination posed an unacceptable risk to health, and could be easily accessed via the Council's website. The Council also held a range of information on its GIS system covering historical land usage, which was used to respond to public enquiries, particularly in relation to land searches when purchasing a property. In addition to the standard land search information, some purchasers decided to undertake a Con29 enquiry, which contained a standard list of questions and some optional queries that related to land contamination, which the Council would provide a response to, based upon the information that it held. It was not the role of the Planning Committee to advise developers or utility companies of any contamination, and when determining a planning application, Environmental Health was a statutory consultee and would raise any appropriate known matters in relation to a site.

The Mayor asked Councillor Gowland if she had a supplementary question.

In talking about levels of acceptable risk, if a report referred to the change of use of land, in particular excavations, which required further investigation works, would that then be picked up by any of these reports?”

Councillor Inglis confirmed that Environmental Health, as the statutory nominee would pick that up on the planning application, and the stringent conditions in place would not be discharged until they were passed.

b) Question from Councillor Plant to Councillor Brennan.

“Please can the Cabinet Member responsible for economic development clarify if they are aware of any factors that may change the planned uses of the site at Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station site?”

Councillor Brennan stated that she was not aware of any factors and confirmed that the Council worked closely with all partners, meeting

recently to discuss plans and progress on the site. It was her understanding that all partners remained committed to bringing the site forward for green energy, innovative businesses and to address the motorway junction capacity.

The Mayor asked Councillor Plant if she had a supplementary question.

The power station was the largest commercial development site in Rushcliffe, and of great importance, particularly as part of the only inland Freeport. It was nearly two years since the Local Development Order was put in place and the issue had been discussed by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group last night, and she asked when and how Councillors would be updated?

Councillor Brennan confirmed that the scrutiny group would continue to review this and she expected Cabinet to be considering an update and would confirm that date in writing.

c) Question from Councillor G Wheeler to the Leader, Councillor Clarke MBE

“Can the Leader tell me what engagement the Government undertook with this Council before starting its new dispersal model to house asylum seekers?”

The Leader advised that the Government’s Full Asylum Dispersal Model was first imposed in April 2023, with a number of revisions taking place since then, which had seen Contingency Hotel Accommodation close and the Government’s contractor SERCO increase its search for accommodation in the private rented sector. This was particularly concerning given the existing pressure in this sector in Rushcliffe, with it being such a popular place to live. The latest revision to the Policy had seen SERCO switch to a property specific approval process; however, it only allowed five days for the Council to respond with three options; to accept, limit with conditions or decline. When deciding which option to take, the Council had to have regard to the Home Office Dispersal Accommodation Adjudication Process. Whilst the document referred to risks to both asylum seekers and a community risk, the latter was very difficult for the Council to provide evidence for, since it was impossible to know who would be placed in the accommodation. This put the Council in a very difficult position to try and limit or decline such requests, which were being received in high numbers.

The Mayor asked Councillor Wheeler if he had a supplementary question.

Whilst it was right that the Council supported genuine asylum seekers, would the Leader agree that SERCO and the Government should ensure that proper housing was sourced in consultation with the community and that local councils were fully consulted and funded?

The Leader felt that it would be preferable to amend the Home Office document to give better consideration to the demographics of a local area, to enable a ‘good fit’ and agreed that there should be better consultation

and information to ensure that local councillors were aware of the circumstances of the Policy.

d) Question from Councillor Chewings to Councillor Upton

“In recent months, I have become increasingly concerned by a pattern of delayed responses, missed determination deadlines, and a lack of timely communication from the planning department, both to applicants and to Councillors seeking updates on behalf of residents. Can the Portfolio Holder confirm what steps are being taken to improve service standards within the Planning department, ensure that statutory and internal response times are met, and restore public and member confidence in the service?”

Councillor Upton advised that Planning Service was experiencing difficulties due to an unusually high number of applications and staff resources, which was recently communicated by email to Councillors, applicants and agents. It was due to proposed changes to the planning system, including a fees increase in April, which had resulted in a significant increase in pre-application and applications since December. Recently four team members had left, with another on extended leave, and there had also been several major, complex applications, which required significant staff resources. The Planning Manager had responded to the situation by filling vacant posts, and whilst Councillor Upton appreciated that delays were frustrating, he felt that the team had responded to the challenges and was working hard under pressure to maintain the service. If the number of applications returned to normal, as appeared to be happening, and the team became fully staffed, Councillor Upton was confident that performance would continue to improve.

The Mayor asked Councillor Chewings if he had a supplementary question.

Given the persistent and continual issues, would Councillor Upton commit to initiating a full review of Planning Services’ processes and performance, with the aim of ensuring that lessons were learned, service standards improved and that residents and elected members finally received a timely and meaningful response?

Councillor Upton felt that this would not be necessary as he believed that Planning Services had turned the corner, expressing confidence in the team that with the arrival of new staff, the issues would be resolved.

The meeting closed at 9.57 pm.

CHAIR



Council

Thursday, 18 September 2025

Rushcliffe Sport and Tourism Charter

Report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth

**Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership,
Councillor N Clarke**

1. Purpose of report

- 1.1. The purpose of this report is to highlight the partnership working and collaboration between Rushcliffe Borough Council and sporting stakeholders Nottingham Forest Football Club, Trent Bridge Cricket, Holme Pierrepont National Water Sports Centre and Nottingham Rugby, to promote tourism and the visitor economy in Rushcliffe: The Home of Sport.
- 1.2. The Leader of the Council has hosted two meetings with the sports stakeholders to create a shared objective for collaboration linked to economic growth and tourism. It is through this joint approach that the Council and sports clubs have agreed a set of principles to capture how working together can elevate the economic vitality and visitor experience and promote a thriving community.
- 1.3. The draft Charter sets out agreed principles for the stakeholders, with the intention of the Council and Sports Clubs signing up to and adopting the Rushcliffe: Together in Sport Charter, as set out in Appendix A.

2. Recommendation

It is **RECOMMENDED** that Council approves the adoption of the draft Rushcliffe: Together in Sport Charter as set out in Appendix A, with final amendments delegated to the Director – Development and Economic Growth.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1. To strengthen the collective reputation of Rushcliffe: Home of Sport and a prime destination for sports and wider tourism.
- 3.2. Build strong and positive relationships through continued collaboration with the major sporting stakeholders.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. The Leader of Rushcliffe Borough Council invited the major Sports Clubs to attend a visioning meeting to explore collaboration to elevate the promotional opportunities for local economic growth, tourism and a vibrant community. This led to the creation of a Sports Charter outlining shared objectives and agreed principles to enhance the overall experience for sporting tourists, ensuring a unified regional approach that benefits Rushcliffe and surrounding areas.
- 4.2. The group aims to leverage major sporting events—such as European football and Test Matches at Trent Bridge—to boost local businesses and community benefits through coordinated efforts.
- 4.3. The Charter also highlights the importance of grassroots sports to boost wider community and wellbeing benefits, promoting inclusivity at all levels.
- 4.4. Rushcliffe is leading the way in putting sport at the centre of tourism and community in the wider West Bridgford area and this report seeks the support of the Council for the draft Charter included in the Appendix. The broad principles and objectives of the Charter are supported by each of the Clubs listed in paragraph 1.1, with each Club seeking to adopt the Charter through their own governance processes as soon as practicable. Any changes as a result of this process will be delegated to the Director of Development and Economic Growth to enable the Charter to be adopted.
- 4.5. Initial actions arising from the collaboration are:
 - 4.5.1. To create a new brand for the partnership, which can be used to promote Rushcliffe: Home of Sport, locally, nationally and internationally.
 - 4.5.2. To have a shared events calendar across the stakeholders, opening up opportunities to maximise the visitor experience and link in with new initiatives and cross-promotional campaigns.
- 4.6. Next steps are to connect with the wider sporting offer in the local area across Nottingham and Nottinghamshire and seek support from the East Midlands Mayor, linking into wider Nottinghamshire tourism and the Destination Management Plan.

5. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

The alternative could be to not work collaboratively, but this will lead to missed opportunities for local economy and tourism.

6. Risks and Uncertainties

- 6.1. No risks to the reputation or services Council have been identified from this piece of work.

7. Implications

7.1. Financial Implications

No financial implications to the Council have been identified.

7.2. Legal Implications

No legal implications to the Council have been identified. The Sports Charter is not a legally binding document.

7.3. Equalities Implications

There are no equality implications identified.

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

No community safety implications are identified.

7.5. Biodiversity Net Gain Implications

There are no Biodiversity Net Gain implications identified.

8. Link to Corporate Priorities

The Environment	There are no environmental implications
Quality of Life	A thriving high street which benefits from the collaborative working of the major sports clubs in the area benefits the quality of life for local residents
Efficient Services	There are no efficient services implications
Sustainable Growth	Maximising the economic benefit of major sporting events through consistent collaboration could contribute to the growth of the local economy

9. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council approves the adoption of the draft Rushcliffe: Together in Sport Charter as set out in Appendix A, with final amendments delegated to the Director – Development and Economic Growth.

For more information contact:	Leanne Ashmore Director Development & Economic Growth 0115 914 8578 lashmore@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	
List of appendices:	Appendix A - Sports Club Charter

This page is intentionally left blank

DRAFT

Together in Sport Charter Rushcliffe: The Home of Sport

This Charter brings together Sports Clubs from across The Home of Sport and Rushcliffe Borough Council to harness sport's potential for community wellbeing and a thriving visitor economy.

Our Vision

We want healthier, more connected communities while attracting visitors from across the UK and beyond. By pairing sporting events with local culture, hospitality and attractions, we will drive economic growth, support local businesses and elevate the visitor experience across Rushcliffe and the wider area.

How We Will Work Together across Rushcliffe Borough

- Strengthen our reputation as the Home of Sport and a prime destination for sports and wider tourism
- Promote the achievements of professional clubs and grassroots teams to celebrate our sporting heritage
- Partner with tourism organisations to feature sports events in visitor programmes
- Launch integrated marketing campaigns that target both sports fans and leisure travellers
- Use major and minor events to spotlight and encourage visits to local attractions, use local accommodation, dining and retail
- Jointly build a year-round calendar of sporting and cultural activities to sustain visitor interest and develop Rushcliffe as a destination
- Support small businesses and community groups in delivering visitor-focused services
- Invest in sport-led regeneration to improve public spaces and visitor facilities
- Have meaningful engagement with our residents to enhance the local community
- Forge links with neighbouring partners, Councils and the East Midlands Combined County Authority to enhance collaboration in achieving Our Vision

Collaboration

This Charter highlights where joint effort delivers the greatest value; how shared actions enhance the local economy and experiences for residents and visitors alike.

We, the undersigned, commit to this “Rushcliffe: Together in Sport” Charter to leverage sport at all levels, from elite to grassroots, to boost community health, sustainability and the visitor economy.

Signed by:





Council

Thursday, 18 September 2025

Councillors' Learning and Development Policy 2026-2029

Report of the Director – Finance and Corporate Services

Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Wellbeing, ICT and Member Development, Cllr J Wheeler

1. Purpose of report

The Councillors' Learning and Development Policy was first written in 2014 and subsequently reviewed (and adopted) by the Council in 2021. The current Policy expires in 2025 and has been reviewed again by the Member Development Group prior to it being submitted to Council for adoption.

2. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council adopts the 2026-2029 Councillors' Learning and Development Policy.

3. Reasons for Recommendation

To ensure that Councillors are adequately trained and supported to deliver effective decision making within the Borough. A key component of maintaining excellent standards of governance.

4. Supporting Information

- 4.1. The Councillors' Learning and Development Policy (see Appendix One) aims to help develop Councillors so that they have the necessary knowledge, skills and attributes to significantly improve the Council's decision making, the quality of its services and the work Councillors do to benefit their communities.
- 4.2. Every Councillor has the right to access learning activities that will provide them with the necessary knowledge and skills to be able to effectively perform their duties as elected representatives.
- 4.3. The Councillors' Learning and Development Policy recognises the need for different forms of development, both in content and method of delivery. It addresses developmental needs in skills and knowledge, having regard to the context of local government in a rapidly changing society.

- 4.4. The Councillors' Learning and Development Policy sets out agreed Learning and Development Principles including commitment to learning and self-development, as well as the parameters for organising and holding training.
- 4.5. The Council provides a range of development opportunities through the Councillors' Learning and Development Policy. However, ultimate responsibility for participating in learning rests with individual Councillors.
- 4.6. All Councillors are expected to undertake mandatory training (as outlined within the Policy) within 12 months of becoming a Councillor (a timespan we are well past). Completion rates currently stand at 65% for face-to-face training and 40% for e-learning modules, which are lower than we would expect. To address this concern, the revised Policy now includes a requirement that Standards Committee receive reports on the progress of Councillor training including training participation rates, particularly in relation to mandatory training. These will be reported on an annual basis. In the first instance, those who have not completed all mandatory training will receive an individual letter from the Chair of Standards Committee, and if individual Councillor's respective training is not brought up to date before the next meeting (usually annually), then individuals will be named in the report. It is hoped that participation in mandatory training is sufficiently improved for this to be unnecessary.

5. Alternative options considered and reasons for rejection

The Policy has been subject to Member scrutiny, when alternative options were considered.

6. Risks and Uncertainties

There is a risk that if Councillors are insufficiently trained to carry out their roles, then decisions that they make may be ultra vires or they may advise residents incorrectly which could lead to reputational or financial damage. The Policy also balances resources for the Council and flexibility for Councillors so some training can be undertaken at home and some is offered in person.

7. Implications

7.1. Financial Implications

There is a Councillors' training budget of £6,500 in a standard year (this is increased to £8,000 in an election year).

7.2. Legal Implications

There are no direct legal implications arising from this report.

7.3. Equalities Implications

Councillor training is accessible to all through a variety of training methods.

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

There are no direct Section 17 implications arising from this report.

7.5. Biodiversity Net Gain Implications

There are no direct biodiversity net gain implications arising from this report.

8. Link to Corporate Priorities

The Environment	Knowledgeable and efficient Councillors are better placed to make sound decisions supporting the environment in the Borough
Quality of Life	Knowledgeable and efficient Councillors are better placed to make sound decisions affecting the quality of life of residents in the Borough
Efficient Services	Knowledgeable and efficient Councillors are better placed to make sound decisions regarding the delivery of efficient services
Sustainable Growth	Knowledgeable and efficient Councillors are better placed to make sound decisions supporting sustainable growth in the Borough

9. Recommendation

It is RECOMMENDED that Council adopts the 2026-2029 Councillors' Learning and Development Policy.

For more information contact:	Charlotte Caven-Atack Head of Corporate Services Tel: 0115 9148278 ccaven-attack@rushcliffe.gov.uk
Background papers available for Inspection:	
List of appendices:	Appendix One – Draft Councillors' Learning and Development Policy

This page is intentionally left blank

Draft – Councillors’ Learning and Development Policy

Rushcliffe Borough Council

2026 - 2029

1. Introduction

Every member of Rushcliffe Borough Council strives to serve the communities they represent, and the Borough as a whole, to the best of their ability.

This Policy aims to help to develop Councillors so that they will have the necessary knowledge, skills and attributes to significantly improve the Council’s decision making, the quality of its services and the work Councillors do to benefit their communities. Councillors need a whole range of skills in order to embrace the increasing complexity of their individual roles. Every Councillor has the right to access learning activities that will provide them with the necessary knowledge and skills to be able to effectively perform their duties as elected representatives.

The Councillors’ Learning and Development Policy recognises the need for different forms of development, both in content and method of delivery. It addresses developmental needs in skills and knowledge, having regard to the context of local government in a rapidly changing society.

2. Why have a Policy?

The development of Councillors is an essential investment by Rushcliffe Borough Council in its own future. The Member Development Group recognises that Councillors have different skills and expertise gained through employment and life. The Group is keen to enable Councillors to access as many development opportunities as possible to make them effective in their ever-changing role as a Councillor. Councillor development can have a significant impact on the performance of the organisation. Well-equipped Councillors are better placed to make the decisions necessary to make the Borough a great place to live, work and play, and can deal with the challenges and changes faced by the organisation.

3. Key Principles

- Councillors will be offered opportunities to acquire the knowledge, skills and expertise they need to perform their roles effectively
- Development will be available to all Councillors irrespective of political allegiance
- Councillors will be encouraged to take responsibility for, and actively seek opportunities for, their own learning and development

- Ensure a consistent approach to Councillor development
- Creation of a learning culture for Councillors at Rushcliffe Borough Council that regards continuous Councillor development as vital to its success
- Councillors to have ownership of the development programme via the Member Development Group
- In line with the Councillor Training Principles
- Consistent with Equal Opportunity policies.

4. Implementation

This Policy will be implemented:

- By the Member Development Group with support from the Democratic Services team (following approval by Full Council)
- With the assistance of Group Leaders who will actively encourage their members to participate in development activities and give feedback on courses attended
- By monitoring on a regular basis to ensure the take up and effectiveness of development activity.

The following learning and development principles have been agreed by Councillors (and are expanded upon in Appendix One to this document):

- Some training is mandatory meaning that it is necessary to complete this training before taking up a seat on the Planning Committee, Licensing Committee, Standards Committee, Interviewing Committee, and Employment Appeals Committee – this includes as a substitute
- Some training is considered mandatory to keep you and the Council safe and up to date in terms of legislation, budgetary position and current good practice
- Some training is considered mandatory depending upon the role you have within the Council; examples include scrutiny or risk management
- All mandatory training should be completed within 12 months of becoming a Councillor
- Dispensations for mandatory training undertaken for other employers will be given on production of evidence such as a current certificate or written confirmation from another employer
- The Council also provides access to training it considers to be desirable to support Councillors being as effective as possible
- A training record will be held by the Democratic Services Team for every Councillor during their term of office.

The learning and development principles document also outlines minimum numbers which must be met to avoid the cancellation of training events.

The programme will incorporate the following:

- Induction for new Councillors and refresher training for re-elected Councillors following a Borough Council Election to ensure that all Councillors have the necessary skills to be an effective Councillor including information about how the Council works and how decisions are made

- An annual training programme incorporating:
 - Core competencies – skills that all Councillors will benefit from including personal safety, caseload management and public speaking
 - Specific skills – building on the core competencies to pick up on a specific skills set for certain roles including media training for Cabinet members, chairing skills and questioning for scrutiny members
 - Mandatory training necessary to carry out specific roles on regulatory committees such as Planning, Licensing, Interviewing and Employment Appeals reflecting the policy and statutory requirements which directly affect Councillors
- A suite of e-learning packages designed to offer a range of information and skills development that can be undertaken by Councillors at a time and in place that suits their busy lives.
- Access to externally provided training courses and briefing sessions held by East Midlands Councils, the Local Government Association or private individuals to increase Councillor skills and understanding.

Accessing training:

This Policy encourages use of a wide range of methods to meet learning and development needs for individuals and groups. When choosing learning and development methods, the focus will be on the outcomes in terms of improved performance. Training will be delivered:

- With sessions at different times of the day to meet demand where possible
- Using different methods, including presentations, interactive sessions, briefing sessions, workshops and electronic learning to meet a range of different learning styles
- A training request form can be found on the Councillors' Portal or Councillors can contact Democratic Services directly.

Supporting Councillor Development:

The Council is a member of East Midlands Councils, which shares ideas and training opportunities.

Evaluation of training opportunities:

A variety of different evaluation methods are used to measure the effectiveness of the Councillors' Learning and Development Programme. These include:

- Sample development events or briefings are assessed by using a simple SurveyMonkey evaluation form
- Councillors who attend externally provided courses will be encouraged to provide feedback to the Democratic Services Team to ensure value for money is obtained
- Member Development Group reviews training delivered including Councillors evaluation comments each time it meets

5. Methods of Delivery

These will include:

- Internal training courses, briefings and workshops
- Training courses held in-house but delivered by external providers
- Shared training courses with other authorities
- Written learning materials available via the Councillors' Portal
- E-learning packages available via the Councillors' Portal
- Occasional one-to-one training delivered by officers to meet a specific need.

6. Accessibility

It is recognised and understood that Councillors come from a variety of backgrounds, with different skills, experiences, knowledge and expertise in a wide range of subject areas, and that each Councillor may have different learning and development needs and different learning styles.

The objective is that all learning and development opportunities should be open to all Councillors. No Councillor should be disadvantaged by their previous work, life or learning experience in the way learning and development opportunities are offered and accessed. The Democratic Services Team will respond positively to reasonable requests from Councillors regarding how development opportunities can be made more accessible.

7. Member Development Group – Role and Remit

The Member Development Group is made up of representatives from the main political groups. Its role is to:

- Create an environment that encourages self-development and continuous learning
- Identify, deliver and evaluate learning and development opportunities for all Councillors
- Create an effective Councillor induction programme for delivery following a Borough Council Election
- Overseeing changes to the way Councillors work and deliver their role
- Evaluating and making changes to the Councillors' Community Grant Scheme as required.

8. Responsibilities

Democratic Services Team

- Develop a comprehensive Induction programme for new Councillors following a Borough Council Election
- Develop and resource an annual training programme for all Councillors

- Provide e-learning modules for Councillors to extend the variety of training opportunities available to them
- Promote training activities being run by other providers such as East Midlands Councils or the Local Government Association
- Evaluate the impact and outcomes of all learning activities and report these to the Member Development Group
- Actively promote learning and development events.

Portfolio Holder with responsibility for Councillor Development

- Actively promote learning and development events provided by the Council and external providers.

Member Development Group

- Contribute to the development of a comprehensive Induction programme for new Councillors following a Borough Council Election
- Agree an annual training programme for all Councillors
- Encourage participation in learning activities for all Councillors
- Note the training evaluation reports presented by the Democratic Services Team and take action if required.

All Councillors

- Participate in training opportunities, in person or electronically, to widen their experience and knowledge
- Provide feedback on the effectiveness and benefit of training undertaken to the Democratic Services Team
- Seek and identify training opportunities themselves and forward any such information to the Democratic Services Team
- Share what they have learnt with other Councillors especially if this learning has been access externally.

9. Communications

Successful communication is an important element of Councillor development. A weekly Councillors' Connections e-newsletter is used to highlight and remind Councillors about forthcoming training events.

Additionally, Group Leaders are asked on a regular basis to encourage their members to attend particular events.

There is a designated page on the Councillors' Portal containing information about member development.

10. Resources and Support

This Policy will be delivered by the Democratic Services team with the input of professional officers where appropriate. A dedicated budget is available for Councillor development covering all internal and external training events, materials and conferences.

11. How is the Policy Monitored?

The Member Development Group will monitor the progress of the work at its meetings. The feedback from the programme of Councillor development activities and how Councillors are developing as a result will be assessed. This will be used to make continuous improvements to the programme and ensure that Councillors are assisting the Borough in achieving its corporate priorities.

Following concerns about participation levels in training (and in particular take-up of mandatory training opportunities), a report will be submitted annually to Standards Committee outlining participation rates.

If necessary, the Chair of Standards Committee will write to individuals with mandatory training remaining undone more than 12 months after becoming a Councillor. Should this situation persist, then the Chair of Standards Committee reserves the right to identify individual Councillors not meeting the required standard.

Appendix One – Councillor Learning and Development Principles

Each year the Council creates a Training Programme, in conjunction with the Member Development Group.

The Training Programme consists of courses offered face-to-face, delivered by both internal and external speakers as appropriate, and via the Council's E-Learning platform. The provision of E-learning training is to provide greater flexibility for Councillors to undertake training in their own environment without the need to come into RBC offices.

In both cases, some courses are considered mandatory for all Councillors to understand their legal, legislative and community leadership responsibilities. Some courses are considered mandatory for certain groups, such as those on particular committees or with specific responsibilities. Others are desirable for the Councillors to choose whether or not the training would be helpful to them in undertaking their role as a Councillor.

The following Learning and Development principles sit behind the Training Programme:

- The Democratic Services Team will maintain a Training Record for each Councillor which is available to the Councillor at any point during their Term of Office
- Councillors must make every effort to attend face-to-face essential sessions such as Planning Committee training or the annual budget workshops when they are provided
- Councillors in specific positions of responsibility, or on certain committees, must make every effort to attend face-to-face training essential to their role, such as Licensing Committee training when it is provided (ideally prior to first meeting); and likewise encourage all members of the respective committee to attend.
- All essential training should be completed within 12 months (subject to exceptional circumstances such as illness). Where it has not been possible to complete training in this time, Councillors should seek advice from the Democratic Services Team to arrange completion
- Group Leaders will have access to records of attendance of their Group Councillors' attendance and will encourage attendance, particularly for essential training
- Continued failure to undertake essential training courses could be referred as a Standards issue to the Council's Monitoring Officer given the Councillors role 'to promote and support high standards of conduct in accordance with the principles within the Councillors' Code of Conduct
- Dispensations can be awarded for training undertaken for other organisations (such as a workplace or other community leadership role) by providing the Democratic Services Team with written evidence such as a certificate or email from another employer
- As well as the publication of an annual Training Programme booklet, the Democratic Services Team will publicise training events in the Councillors' Connections publication

- With regard to externally delivered face-to-face courses, if ten people are not signed up for the course eight weeks in advance then the course will be cancelled
- With regard to internally delivered face-to-face courses, if six people are not signed up for the course two weeks in advance then the course will be cancelled.

Mandatory Training – Councillors are not permitted to sit on these committees without the relevant training or briefing

- Planning Committee
- Licensing Committee
- Standards Committee
- Employment Appeals Committee
- Interviewing Committee

Mandatory Training – designed to keep you and the council safe and up to date with key budget, and legislative information and good practice.

- Planning for Ward Councillors – All (face to face)
- Understanding Scrutiny/Scrutiny Skills – All (face to face)
- Understanding Local Government Finance – All (face to face)
- Understanding your responsibilities GDPR and Cyber Crime – All (face to face)
- Understanding and making the most of Motions – All (face to face)
- Annual Budget Session – All (face to face)
- Treasury Management – All (face to face)
- Risk Management – All (face to face)
- Understanding the role of the officer and getting the best out of relationships with officers – All (face to face)
- Domestic Violence Awareness – All (face to face)
- Your role as a Councillor – All (e-learning)
- Equality and Diversity – All (e-learning)
- Disability and Discrimination – All (e-learning)
- Safeguarding Adults – All (e-learning)
- Safeguarding Children – All (e-learning)
- Section 17: Crime and Disorder – All (e-learning)

Desirable Training – to support you to be as effective as possible

- Chairing Skills (face to face)
- Getting tough (face to face)
- Emergency Planning (face to face)
- Cyber security (face to face)
- Dementia Awareness (face to face)
- Dyslexia, Autism and Sensory Issues (face to face)
- Retrospective Planning Applications (face to face)
- Personal safety and dealing with online abuse and intimidation (face to face/online)

- Understanding domestic violence and the Council's role in supporting victims (face to face)
- Effective Communication – Public Speaking (face to face)
- Debating skills for Councillors (face to face/online)
- Armed Forces Community Covenant (e-learning)
- Chairing Meetings (e-learning)
- Community Leadership (e-learning)
- Managing Information Effectively (e-learning)
- Public Speaking (e-learning)
- Working with the Media (e-learning)
- Hate Crime – All (e-learning)
- GDPR 1, 2 and 3 – All (e-learning)
- Cyber-crime, phishing, smishing and vishing – All (e-learning)
- Information Classification – All (e-learning)
- Display Screen Equipment – All (e-learning)
- Prevent – All (e-learning)

This page is intentionally left blank