

**MINUTES
OF THE MEETING OF THE
COUNCIL
THURSDAY, 11 JULY 2019**

Held at 7.00 pm in the Council Chamber, Rushcliffe Arena, Rugby Road, West
Bridgford

PRESENT:

Councillors Mrs C Jeffreys (Chairman), S Mallender (Vice-Chairman), R Adair, K Beardsall, N Begum, B Buschman, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, G Dickman, A Edyvean, M Gaunt, B Gray, L Healy, R Hetherington, L Howitt, R Inglis, A Brennan, R Jones, A Major, R Mallender, D Mason, J Murray, A Phillips, S J Robinson, K Shaw, Mrs M Stockwood, C Thomas, R Upton, D Viridi, J Walker, R Walker, L Way, G Wheeler, J Wheeler and G Williams

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:

P Linfield	Executive Manager - Finance and Corporate Services
K Marriott	Chief Executive
D Mitchell	Executive Manager - Communities
S Sull	Monitoring Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager
L Webb	Democratic Services Officer

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE

20 members of the public

APOLOGIES:

Councillors S Bailey, B Bansal, P Gowland, G Moore, F Purdue-Horan, D Simms and J Stockwood

L Ashmore and D Banks, Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods

Opening Prayer

The Meeting was led in prayer by the Mayor's Chaplain, Reverend Michael Lees.

12 Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

13 Minutes of the Meeting held on 21 May 2019

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 21 May 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

14 Mayor's Announcements

The Mayor reported that she had spent both a busy and enjoyable start to her Mayoral year, attending many varied engagements, including events for her two chosen charities, Headway and the Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire Air Ambulance.

The Mayor also referred to the following engagements she had attended:

- Opening the Skate Park at Lady Bay;
- Soar Boating Club 66th Birthday Celebrations;
- ICC Cricket World Cup;
- Tollerton Village Fete;
- Bingham Summer Fayre;
- Queen's Birthday Service;
- Lord Lieutenants Summer Garden Party;
- Notts County Council Civic Service;
- Armed Forces Day Flag Raising;
- Memorial unveiling at Victoria Embankment;
- Proms in the Park;
- Gedling Civic Service;
- Lady Bay Open Gardens; and
- Annual Pilgrimage to Crich.

The Mayor referred to the very poignant memorial ceremony at Victoria Embankment and to the importance of remembering and honouring all of those who had given their lives in the First World War. The memorial would be a fitting reminder of their sacrifice.

The Mayor also announced that her cadet for 2019/20 was Sergeant Peter Wallace and presented him with a certificate to mark the start of his year as the Mayor's Cadet.

15 **Leader's Announcements**

The Leader welcomed the Chief Executive to her first Council meeting following her appointment and the Executive Manager – Transformation, who had recently been appointed.

The Leader confirmed that he and the Chief Executive had attended the Local Government Association (LGA) conference in Bournemouth. The conference had considered Government policy going forward and discussed and passed a motion to call upon the Government to explore supporting the domestic implementation of sustainable development goals through funded partnership roles within each local authority area. Following the Conference, the LGA had confirmed that there would be on going engagement with the Government regarding this motion, with a list of associated actions. The aim was to share best practice rather than be insular and it was encouraging to note that the environmental groups in attendance were interested in the Council's electric car charging points scheme and the free tree scheme, which had proved very successful, with over 1,000 applications for trees in four days. It was pleasing to see the Council taking the lead in environmental issues.

The Leader referred to the recent success of a local primary school, St Edmund Campion in winning the Europa Cup, a football tournament, with the final held at the world famous Nou Camp stadium in Barcelona.

The Leader commented on the success of the recent 'Proms in the Park' event, with over 7,500 people attending and stated that such events optimised what Rushcliffe stood for and he hoped that the 'Taste of Rushcliffe' event this weekend would be equally well attended. That event included the YouNG's Summer Market that would feature youth-based enterprise and should be equally celebrated and supported.

The Leader confirmed that Rushcliffe Borough Council was a finalist for the Council of the Year award at the recent Municipal Journal (MJ) Awards in London. The Council was the top District/Borough Council in the country. That recognition, following on from other recent awards, including Entrepreneurial Council of the Year and Commercial Council of the Year was testament to the dedication of officers and Councillors.

16 Chief Executive's Announcements

There were no announcements.

17 Citizens' Questions

There were no questions.

18 Approval of the Scrutiny Annual Reports 2018/19

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services that provided a review of the work undertaken by the Council's four Scrutiny Groups during 2018/19. The Portfolio Holder invited the Scrutiny Group Chairmen to deliver a brief summary of the work of each Group over the year.

The Chairman of the Community Development Group, Councillor Combella referred to the breadth of the work undertaken by the Group and highlighted key issues. Tree protection and promotion continued as a priority, with a proposal to plant ten trees per parish for the three years of the project and the ongoing success of the free tree scheme. Sporadic broadband coverage remained an issue, in particular for rural areas and ongoing scrutiny was both challenging and vital. The draft Empty Homes Strategy should result in serviceable accommodation being brought back into use to help alleviate housing shortages. The Armed Forces Community Covenant was an enduring record of the community's gratitude to military personnel and their families and the role they played locally. Following significant scrutiny of the Borough's art collection in previous years, it was pleasing to see the installation at the Arena of the engraved bench commemorating the history of Rushcliffe, the parishes and those who have given their lives during conflict. Councillor Combella thanked members of the Group and officers for their work and support over the past year.

The Chairman of the Corporate Governance Group, Councillor Beardsall confirmed that the Group had scrutinised various issues highlighted in the report. The Group specifically scrutinised finance and risk matters and he thanked the members of the Group for their rigorous scrutiny and officers for their advice and support.

The Chairman of the Partnership Delivery Group, Councillor Cottee referred to the importance of fostering mutually beneficial partnerships through good working relationships, which in turn provided better outcomes for local residents and value for money. The work of the Group throughout the year had further enhanced those partnerships and benefits and the report highlighted the issues covered. Councillor Cottee thanked the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Bailey and members of the Group and officers for their advice and support.

The Chairman of the Performance Management Board, Councillor Clarke referred to the Community Grant Scheme and noted that last year some funding had not been used and reminded Councillors that the funding was available to support community groups and it was hoped that it would all be awarded this year. Councillor Clarke advised that the Group had reviewed car-parking regimes to support the vitality of local communities. A Planning Enforcement Workshop was also planned, with a date to be agreed. Representatives from Parkwood had been invited to a meeting, with the reduction in the use of the bowls club flagged as an issue that would require continued monitoring. In respect of Environmental Health, a number of successful fly-tipping prosecutions had taken place and with 818 food premises in the Borough, the Group had called for future mandatory food inspections. Councillor Clarke thanked the Vice-Chairman, former Councillor Thurman and members of the Group for their incisive questioning and scrutiny.

Councillor Robinson thanked all the Chairmen, members of the Groups and officers for their hard work throughout the year, reiterated the important role that scrutiny played and its achievements, and looked forward to going forward with the new scrutiny arrangements.

The report was moved by Councillor Robinson and seconded by Councillor Mason.

Councillor Gray confirmed that the Labour Group had read the report with interest and looked forward to taking an active role in scrutiny during the coming year and thanked all Councillors, past and present for their hard work.

Councillor Jones echoed the comments of Councillor Gray.

Councillor R Mallender thanked the Scrutiny Groups for their hard work and highlighted a number of key points. It was pleasing to note the work being undertaken to reduce the use of single-use plastics. The move towards the Council becoming a dementia friendly Borough was encouraging, particularly as it affected so many people. The work on the Empty Homes Strategy was very positive and would benefit all communities, as was the tree protection and promotion schemes. The partnership delivery work in relation to the scrutiny of the Grantham Canal Partnership should also be acknowledged.

Councillor Thomas thanked everyone who had been involved and stated that

the scrutiny training would be helpful to Councillors in the future.

Councillor Butler stated that the report was very useful and highlighted the serious issues covered and how much involvement the Council had in serving local residents and through internal scrutiny of the Council's own services. It was pleasing to note that broadband provision continued to be scrutinised.

It was RESOLVED that the work undertaken by the four Scrutiny Groups during 2018/19 be endorsed.

19 **Review of Public Speaking at Cabinet and Council**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services outlining the use of the public speaking protocol over the past twelve months.

Councillor Robinson confirmed that the Council was keen to ensure that it was transparent in its operations and decision-making processes. In March 2018, Council had approved the introduction of Citizens' Questions at both Cabinet and Council, and Opposition Group Leaders' Questions at Cabinet, for a trial period of 12 months. The trial period had proved successful and it was hoped going forward it would continue to be used. Cabinet welcomed scrutiny and it was important that questions were asked and challenges made by both the public and the opposition. The Council was asked to adopt formally the public speaking protocol, Citizens' Questions and Opposition Group Leaders' Questions. Councillor Robinson advised that one amendment was proposed, in respect of the deadline relating to the submission of Citizens' Questions, to revise the deadline to mirror that of Opposition Leaders' Questions so that both deadlines came after the agenda had been published.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Edyvean.

Councillor Gray confirmed that the Labour Group had read the report with interest and were in agreement with the proposal to amend the deadline for the submission of Citizens' Questions.

Councillor Thomas stated that before becoming a Councillor she had spoken using the Citizens' Questions procedure and stressed the importance of having that opportunity. The Independent Group welcomed the adoption of the procedure and she thanked officers for the support and guidance she had received when she had submitted questions and stressed the importance of maintaining that support in the future.

It is RESOLVED that:

- a) Council adopts formally the public speaking protocol, Citizens' Questions and Opposition Group Leaders' Questions, and instructs the Monitoring Officer to amend the Constitution accordingly.

The deadlines relating to the submission of Citizens' Questions be revised to mirror those of Opposition Leaders' Questions and be reflective of those in place for Planning Committee.

20 **Review of the Council's Constitution**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Monitoring Officer outlining the revisions to the Constitution following the Scrutiny Review and seeking approval for those proposed revisions and the adoption of a revised Scrutiny structure.

Councillor Robinson referred to the three recommendations in the report, including proposed revisions to the Constitution in relation to new Scrutiny arrangements, following the Scrutiny Review between September and December 2018. This independent review by the Centre for Public Scrutiny had looked at ways the Council could adopt best practice and challenge working practices. The format of the new Scrutiny Groups had been based on the recommendations from that review and was proposed for adoption. The second recommendation was covered by a report that was issued by the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL) regarding ethics in Local Government. The Standards Committee had considered the report and had suggested that the recommendations be adopted. The third recommendation was to grant the Monitoring Officer delegated authority to make any further minor amendments to the Constitution.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Mason.

Councillor Gray confirmed that the Labour Group had read the report with interest and welcomed the changes to the Scrutiny Groups as it brought proportionality to the leadership of those groups.

Councillor Jones supported the report and recognised the improvements made to the document and acknowledged the time taken to amend it and he welcomed the improvements to the clarity of responsibilities and clarification on the use of reserve members on specific committees. Councillor Jones raised a concern regarding the definition of 'Key Decisions' which included reference to decisions which were likely to be significant in terms of its effect on communities as well as financial matters and he considered that such decisions should not be made by the Leader or Cabinet alone, as it was a mechanism by which Scrutiny and the Call-In process could be avoided by the subjective views of the Cabinet on its own decisions, as to what was significant to the community. Councillor Jones requested amendments to the wording of the document.

Councillor Robinson raised a point of order and stated that the report was not recommending updates to the Constitution on a detailed basis; the recommendations were clearly set out in the report.

Councillor Jones stated that he could no longer support the report, as there were a number of amendments required.

The Monitoring Officer advised that any requests to propose amendments to the Constitution should be made through the Chairman of the Governance Scrutiny Group and any proposed amendments would be considered by the Group.

Councillor Robinson reiterated that the recommendations related specifically to the revisions to Scrutiny, best practice/code of conduct and the delegation to the Monitoring Officer regarding minor updates with any detailed examination by the Governance Scrutiny Group.

It is RESOLVED that Council:

- a) Consider and approve the revisions to the Constitution in relation to Scrutiny to adopt the recommendations of the March 2019 Council report.
- b) Adopt the Best Practice Principles and recommendations of the Committee on Standards in Public Life (CSPL).
- c) Consider and approve the revisions to the Constitution made by the Monitoring Officer under delegated authority.

21 Notices of Motion

- a) The following motion was moved by Councillor Edyvean and seconded by Councillor J Wheeler

“Rushcliffe Borough Council is proud of its record in delivering high quality services to its residents in conjunction with prudent financial management to deliver those services with value for money and efficient use of all of its resources.

As a responsible Council it is important to regularly review all of our assets in order to ensure that they:

- Deliver value for money
- Meet the ever changing requirements of our Communities
- Optimise the best use of the Asset

This Council agrees that regular review of its property portfolio is necessary and responsible for the benefit of Rushcliffe residents.

This Council also agrees that all Members should support these review processes and do their utmost to uphold the reputation of the Council for delivering good service to its residents.”

Councillor Edyvean, in moving the motion confirmed that the proposal was self-explanatory and required no further clarification.

In seconding the motion, Councillor J Wheeler stated that the Council should not hesitate to let residents know that it understood its responsibility to manage public finances and the expectations of the public to deliver services. By regularly reviewing and scrutinising the Council’s property portfolio, the Council could ensure that assets were delivering the priorities referred to in the motion and reassure the public that the Council did not take its responsibilities lightly.

Councillor Gray proposed the following amendment.

“Rushcliffe Borough Council is proud of its record in delivering high quality services to its residents in conjunction with prudent financial management to deliver those services with value for money and efficient use of all of its resources.

As a responsible Council it is important to regularly review all of our assets in order to ensure that they:

- Deliver value for money and benefits to the community
- Meet the ever changing requirements of our Communities
- Optimise the best use of the Asset
- Retain sufficient land in public ownership to provide future services and facilities

This Council agrees that regular review of its property portfolio is necessary and responsible and that such reviews should be transparent and involve consultation with the community for the benefit of Rushcliffe residents.

This Council also agrees that all Members should support these review processes and do their utmost to uphold the reputation of the Council for delivering good service to its residents.”

Councillor Gray, in moving the amendment to the motion stated that he hoped the additional wording would improve the original motion and underline the Council’s priorities as a modern, progressive, open and transparent organisation. In referring to the first point of the amendment, Councillor Gray referred to the irreplaceable assets the Council had responsibility for and their importance to the community. Any loss would be profound and it was essential that assets were not only judged on financial return or market price at a given time but on the social and cultural benefits to the community. On the second point of the amendment, the importance of ensuring that the Council planned appropriately, whilst retaining sufficient land in public ownership to provide services and facilities as communities grew was vital. The final point of the amendment was perhaps the most important as it related to the first line of the Constitution, which referred to the Council being ‘committed to openness in how it operates.’ With that in mind, the Council had to be as open and transparent as possible and ensure that during any evaluation of an asset used by the community, that community should be the first to be consulted. Councillors should be the enablers of the community and in turn, the community could help to scrutinise and utilise assets. If the amended motion was passed, it would take into account the nature of the wider benefits of the Council’s assets, the scope of planning and the Council’s commitment to the highest standards of openness and transparency.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Thomas who reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Thomas requested a recorded vote on the amendment.

Councillor Edyvean confirmed that the Conservative Group did not accept the amendment as proposed, as it did not consider that the proposed amendment

improved the original motion.

Councillor Jones stated that the original motion sought to tie Councillors to represent the financial decisions of the Council whilst the amended motion appeared more balanced. Many residents in West Bridgford were concerned that the Council had sold off too many assets and gained considerable capital from those sales. Residents remained very protective of the remaining assets in the area, including the two community halls with nearby parks and playing fields.

Councillor Robinson confirmed that he could not support the amendment, as he did not consider that it improved the original motion. Optimising the best use of an asset was one factor for consideration as were finance and meeting the changing requirements of communities. There were numerous examples throughout the Borough of where the Council had consulted and listened to local communities and invested in its assets and made improvements for the benefit of those communities, including Bridgford Hall. In Cotgrave over £10m of public money had been spent on providing first class community assets. The Council had a very proud record in delivering value for money and where assets had been sold, the revenue had been put into frontline services. The Rushcliffe Arena itself was the most incredible community asset and well used by numerous local residents. The Council ensured financial prudence to deliver those community assets.

Councillor Clarke endorsed the comments of Councillor Robinson and stated that the amendment lacked clarity and did not relate to specific quantities or values. The Council continued to review its assets and make the best use of them.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor Thomas confirmed that the suggested amendment did not relate specifically to money. Value for money was important; however, other issues were as important and the amendment added balance. Publically owned open spaces at the heart of any community were rare and if sold, it was unlikely that land could be replaced for the same affordable market price for public facilities. As a new Councillor, there had already been two proposals for projects involving the disposal of such assets. Was it the Council's policy to sell off all of its assets for short-term gain or was consideration given to keeping land in public ownership? A balance had to be struck between the future use of an asset and any financial gain from a sale and the amendment covered that issue.

Councillor Combellack advised that the original motion covered the points raised by the earlier speakers regarding meeting the changing requirements of local communities.

Councillor Butler commented that the Council had a significant history of investment and the wording in the amendment was unnecessary. The Council was well respected and had recently won several awards.

Councillor Gaunt stated that the community would be most alarmed if the amendment was rejected, as it would appear that certain Councillors were refusing to accept the need for transparency and consultation with the community.

Councillor Begum stated that since becoming a Councillor, she had been made aware by many local residents of the importance of consultation and the amendment emphasised that.

In response to comments made regarding the amendment to the motion, Councillor Gray thanked all Councillors who had taken part in the debate and reiterated the view that reviews should be transparent and involve consultation with the community. Moving the original motion would emphasise the financial value rather than the societal value of the process.

Councillor Edyvean stated that the Council had an excellent record of purchasing land and was investing in its assets rather than selling them. Some of the Council's assets were commercial making public consultation on them impractical. The Council had a robust Commercial Strategy of investment in assets that helped to maintain low Council Tax rates for residents.

In accordance with Standing Orders – Council 16.4, a recorded vote was taken for the amended motion as follows:

FOR: Councillors N Begum, M Gaunt, B Gray, L Howitt, R Jones, A Major, R Mallender, J Murray, K Shaw, C Thomas, J Walker and L Way.

AGAINST: Councillors R Adair, K Beardsall, B Buschman, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, G Dickman, A Edyvean, L Healy, R Hetherington, R Inglis, A Brennan, D Mason, A Phillips, S Robinson, Mrs M Stockwood, R Upton, D Viridi, R Walker, D Wheeler, J Wheeler and G Williams.

ABSTENTION: Councillors Mrs C Jeffreys and S Mallender.

The amended motion was declared as lost.

In debating the original motion, Councillor Edyvean confirmed that there had been no recent proposals through Cabinet to sell any assets. The Council was reviewing and evaluating its assets but at no time had it specified that it was planning to sell any. The Council's commercial assets were highly important and land had been purchased to provide community facilities, including land for the construction of the new leisure centre in Bingham. The motion covered the points regarding community involvement. Value for money involved the delivery of both value for money and optimising the best use of assets. The Council could not undertake public consultation every time it involved a commercial asset and the wording of the motion was appropriate.

There was no further debate. After being put to the vote, the motion was declared as carried.

b) The following motion was moved by Councillor Jones and seconded by Councillor R Mallender who reserved the right to speak.

“Rushcliffe is receiving a significant number of housing applications as a result of which house building is underway in the Borough at an expedited rate. Following the Motion considered at this Council in March 2019 relating to Climate Emergency, this Council calls upon the Government to

change planning policy to reflect the resolve to recognise the Climate Emergency and asks that a report be brought to the next meeting of the Council detailing what can be achieved locally now and by Government or other policy changes in the future.”

Councillor Jones, in moving the motion advised that a significant number of recently built new homes were unfit for a carbon neutral future, with further developments yet to be approved. New dwellings should be carbon neutral and produce some energy, as converting existing buildings would prove extremely costly and would not be as efficient. The Council must encourage developers to construct better, more eco-friendly new builds with micro-generation. A report should be submitted to the next Council meeting to advise what could be achieved within the existing Core Strategy and National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and if policy changes within the Council could assist. Could greater weight be given to Core Strategy Policy 2 on Climate Change and the NPPF Core Planning Principles paragraph 17? Secondly, could the Council ask the Government to be more adventurous? Recent Government publications including a ‘Green Growth Strategy’ and ‘A Future Framework for Heat in Buildings’ contained laudable aims; however, any action still appeared to be far away, with developers reluctant to make any significant changes. Planning and building regulation policy guidance required urgent improvement by the Government. This motion recognised the motion submitted in March 2019; however, the subject was different. That motion related to long term planning and consideration of the Council’s own carbon plan. The current motion considered both current and pending developments and requested more immediate action.

Councillor J Wheeler confirmed that the Council’s Carbon Management Plan would be scrutinised by the Communities Scrutiny Group at its meeting in October 2019, with its recommendations then taken to Cabinet and Council. Councillors were asked to forward any ideas or suggestions on potential improvements to the Plan to reach the Council’s target of being carbon neutral.

Councillor Upton advised that the Council had ambitious targets and continued to remain proactive with ongoing scrutiny. It would be impractical to submit a report to the next Council meeting, before the Carbon Management Plan had been scrutinised in October 2019. The Council did not have the authority to amend national policy. It would now be impractical to change the Local Planning Policy Part 2 and he proposed the following amendment.

“Rushcliffe is receiving a significant number of housing applications as a result of which house building is underway in the Borough at an expedited rate. Following the Motion considered at this Council in March 2019 relating to Climate Emergency, this Council calls upon the Government to change planning policy to reflect the resolve to recognise the Climate Emergency.”

Councillor Robinson seconded the amendment and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Jones advised that he would abstain from voting as given the number of pending local developments it was important that action be taken immediately.

Councillor J Walker stated that to remove the request for the submission of a report to the next Council meeting it would detract from the urgency of the situation.

Councillor R Walker noted that if the timeframe for action was removed, it would detract from the motion and if it was too soon to submit a report to the next Council meeting, a compromise should be sought.

Councillor Gaunt echoed the comments of Councillor R Walker.

Councillor Clarke suggested that given the timescales involved it would be impractical to submit a report to the next Council Meeting.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor Robinson agreed that it was important to provide the most eco-friendly dwellings possible. The Council was working with the developers for both the Abbey Road and Fairham projects to ensure they provided the highest quality, most environmentally efficient housing that the whole Borough would be proud of. The UK was the first of the G7 nations to commit by law to becoming net zero carbon by 2050 and that would be achieved through actions rather than words. Environmental bodies including the Woodland Trust were working with the Government to bring through standards to be adopted by local authorities. Councillors needed to be realistic about what could be achieved within specific timescales and the Council had set a timescale of March 2020, when Cabinet and Council would consider the report from the Communities Scrutiny Group.

In response to the comments made regarding the amendment to the motion, Councillor Upton confirmed that the issue was complex and adequate time was required and September 2019 was an unrealistic target. Officers were working hard and it was hoped that the development at Abbey Road would become an exemplar of good development for the East Midlands.

Councillor Jones stated that he was aware of the work being undertaken for the Abbey Road and Fairham developments; however, he was concerned that there were many other sites currently being developed that failed to reflect the Council's aspirations and time was of the essence.

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

The Mayor read out the substantive motion.

“Rushcliffe is receiving a significant number of housing applications as a result of which house building is underway in the Borough at an expedited rate. Following the Motion considered at this Council in March 2019 relating to Climate Emergency, this Council calls upon the Government to change planning policy to reflect the resolve to recognise the Climate Emergency.”

In debating the substantive motion, Councillor R Mallender stated that it was correct that the Council should put this issue to the Government and ask it to act urgently on planning policy, as action was required. The Government still

had a long way to go to fulfil public expectations.

Councillor Thomas proposed the following amendment.

“Rushcliffe is receiving a significant number of housing applications as a result of which house building is underway in the Borough at an expedited rate. Following the Motion considered at this Council in March 2019 relating to Climate Emergency, this Council calls upon the Government to change planning policy to reflect the resolve to recognise the Climate Emergency and undertakes to include in the review of the Core Strategy, full consideration of energy efficient standards.”

The amendment was seconded by Councillor Shaw, who reserved the right to speak.

In moving the amendment, Councillor Thomas stated that if the Council was to change its policies, the Core Strategy was the place where energy efficiencies standards and considerations should be added and the wording added value to the motion.

Councillor Robinson confirmed that the Scrutiny Groups considered all those issues and the additional wording added nothing to the motion.

Councillor Jones queried the possibility of amending the Core Strategy.

Councillor Upton stated that Part 1 of the Core Strategy dated from December 2014, and the consultation for Part 2 had finished on 5 July 2019. The Strategy was now with the Government Inspector and it was hoped that the Plan would be brought to the Council meeting in September 2019. The Council currently had a 3.4-year housing supply that was problematic and the adoption of the Local Plan would give the Council the five-year supply it required. Any delay would therefore be seriously detrimental to the Council. Demand for further housing would continue past the life of the current Local Plan as the population and needs continued to grow and it was important that plans were in place to meet those needs.

Councillor Jones stated that whilst he fully understood the situation, would it be possible to convene the Local Development Framework (LDF) to produce a supplementary planning document that could be approved by the Council.

Councillor Upton confirmed that the LDF would be meeting in early September 2019, before the proposed adoption of the Local Plan Part 2 and it would be possible to discuss the issue at that meeting. He confirmed that the next Local Development Plan would contain Part 1 and Part 2 and it would be appropriate to consider amendments when Part 1 was being drafted.

In response to comments made regarding the amendment to the motion, Councillor Thomas confirmed that in her amendment she was requesting that a review take place during the next Local Plan process.

Councillor Upton agreed that the Council would look at those issues during the next review of the Local Plan Part 1.

There was no further debate. On being put to the vote, the amendment to the motion was declared as lost.

There was no further debate on the substantive motion. On being put to the vote, the substantive motion was carried.

22 Questions from Councillors

a) Question from Councillor Murray to Councillor Robinson

“If St Giles pre-school are forced to leave Lutterell Hall after nearly 50 years, can you guarantee that Rushcliffe Borough Council will find the pre-school alternative premises in Central West Bridgford, from where they can continue to provide early-years education for 2-5 year olds?”

In response to the question, Councillor Robinson stated that as Councillors were aware, the Cabinet had approved a review of Lutterell Hall in consultation with all the community groups who used the building and the outcome of that review could not be pre-determined.

Supplementary Question

Councillor Murray stated that as St Giles pre-school already had a waiting list for 2020/21, would the Council give its assurance that places would be available at either Lutterell Hall or in central West Bridgford?”

In response, Councillor Robinson stated that educational provision did not fall under the remit of the Borough Council and he reiterated that the Council would work with all community groups to ensure the right outcomes.

b) Question from Councillor Gaunt to Councillor Upton

"The proposed modifications to the Local Plan part 2 requires Ruddington to accept a doubling of its allocation from 250 to 525 homes. If the Council is serious about consulting the public about these proposed modifications, whilst being both transparent and democratic, would the Council take the opportunity to reconsider the opinions of Ruddington residents and look to remove one of the existing sites in Ruddington and reduce the housing to a more sustainable level?"

In response to the question, Councillor Upton stated that extensive consultation had taken place on the Local Plan and a very detailed external examination in public by the Inspector. Legally the only way in which any one of the proposed sites could be removed from the Local Plan was if the Inspector recommended that should happen and to date, there was no indication of that.

The meeting closed at 9.05 pm.

CHAIRMAN