



**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COUNCIL**

**THURSDAY, 4 MARCH 2021**

Held virtually at 7.00 pm and livestreamed on the  
Rushcliffe Borough Council's YouTube channel

**PRESENT:**

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

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

L Ashmore	Executive Manager - Transformation
D Banks	Executive Manager - Neighbourhoods
C Caven-Atack	Service Manager - Finance and Corporate Services
T Coop	Democratic Services Officer
P Linfield	Executive Manager - Finance and Corporate Services
K Marriott	Chief Executive
S Sull	Monitoring Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager
L Webb	Democratic Services Officer
S Whittaker	Financial Services Manager

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillors Mrs C Jeffreys and G Moore

**42 Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest.

**43 Minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2020**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 3 December 2020, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

**44 Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor informed Council that not much had occurred since the last meeting in December 2020, due to the further Covid-19 lockdown. However, she was aware that the Council's tree planting scheme, as part of the Climate Change

Action Plan, had continued. She informed Councillors that she would be presenting an award at the weekend to a plastic-free business in Keyworth, and that she had started walking the Borough Boundary to raise funding for her charities – The Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, Music Works and Trent District Community First Responders – she hoped that some of her fellow Councillors would join her for a socially distanced walk as she passed through their wards. The Mayor also mentioned that she had instigated a toilet twinning exercise for the toilets at Rushcliffe Arena to aid development of clean sanitation in poorer countries. She congratulated Rushcliffe resident Jeanie Richardson on reaching her 108th birthday recently and also wished Councillor Christine Jeffreys a swift and full recovery from her present illness. On a more positive note, the Mayor concluded by informing Council that she had been for her Covid vaccine earlier that day at the vaccination centre at Gamston Community Hall; the process was very smooth and she thanked all of the staff and volunteers rolling out the vaccine programme.

**45 Leader's Announcements**

The Leader also praised the efforts of staff at the Gamston vaccination centre, and informed Council that Rushcliffe had been recognised as the top district council across the whole country for delivering grants to businesses during the pandemic. He thanked officers for their commitment and perseverance in delivering multiple different grants as quickly as they could to support local businesses. The Leader summarised further Covid-related support announced by the Government as part of the recent budget for both individuals as well as businesses. Next, he referred Councillors to a potential expression of interest being considered to explore the use of fusion technology at the site of Ratcliffe-on-Soar power station, as part of the Government's STEP project. This was to be the subject of a Cabinet paper next week and could be part of the Government's bid to tackle climate change. Finally, the Leader was delighted to update Council on the announcement, as part of the national budget, of a Freeport for the East Midlands which was expected to create an additional 60,000 jobs in the area.

**46 Chief Executive's Announcements**

There were no Chief Executive's announcements.

**47 Citizens' Questions**

There were no questions.

**48 Leave of Absence for Councillor Christine Jeffreys**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Monitoring Officer, outlining the reasons behind the request for an authorised Leave of Absence for Councillor Christine Jeffreys due to ill health. He invited all Councillors to join together in wishing Councillor Jeffreys a speedy recovery.

Councillor Gray seconded the recommendation and added his best wishes to those of the Leader.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- a) the requirements of Section 85 (1) of the Local Government Act 1972 be waived for a period of up to six months from 24 March – 24 September 2021 for Councillor Christine Jeffreys; and
- b) payment of the Councillor allowance continues for the duration of the authorised absence.

49 **East Midlands Development Corporation**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Chief Executive providing an update on the current position with regard to the East Midlands Development Corporation.

Councillor Robinson referred Council to the earlier paper on this matter discussed at the previous meeting. The current paper presented an update on the proposals and spending plan for the East Midlands Development Corporation, including a request for the first tranche of funding to support development. The update also provided information about how the Council would be represented on the Interim Vehicle and confirmed the appointment of the Leader as a shareholder and the Chief Executive to the non-executive board.

Councillor Edyvean seconded the recommendations and called the Development Corporation a very important step forward for prosperity in Rushcliffe.

Councillor Gray reminded Council that the East Midlands Development Corporation was vital for the economic health of the region and stated that he would be happy to support the recommendations. He went on to say that councils, businesses and universities were coming together to create jobs and attract new businesses to the region. Unfortunately, compared to other regions, the East Midlands had not fared well in terms of external investment and he considered that the Council must play its part in ensuring the region received its fair share of public funding to attract high quality businesses and graduates to the area.

Councillor Major highlighted that the Development Corporation had been discussed at length previously and thanked the Chief Executive for the update which demonstrated that momentum was being maintained in this exciting project. She expressed concern that the Council might lose sight of existing towns and villages within the Borough and that they would require the Council's support, especially in terms of recovery following the pandemic.

Councillor R Mallender expressed concerns about the newly announced Freeport and the potential development of nuclear fusion technology at the site but also recognised the joint aims of the Development Corporation to attract funding and new jobs to the region.

Councillor Thomas expressed her misgivings in regard to this project and asked the Chief Executive to ensure a number of review points were included in the project plans, to enable the Council to withdraw in the future if the initiative was no longer beneficial to the Borough.

Councillor R Walker reminded Council that local communities needed to be involved in the development of the area to ensure they were kept informed and engaged.

Councillor Edyvean responded to a number of questions raised by Councillors and Councillor Robinson addressed the misgivings expressed by some Councillors and highlighted the extensive scrutiny that development in this area was likely to be exposed to over the coming years including regular community forums, a member working group and the oversight of significant planning issues within this area of the Borough.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- a) the first year of funding for the Development Corporation (£167,000) be paid over in advance of Government financial contributions being confirmed, in order that the work of the Development Corporation can be progressed in a timely manner;
- b) the Chief Executive be nominated to be the Council's Non-Executive Director on the Board of the Non-statutory Interim Vehicle, and the Leader be the Council's Shareholder Representative on the Oversight Authority; and
- c) the Monitoring Officer be authorised to amend the Council's Constitution to incorporate the roles of the Non-Executive Director and the Council's Shareholder Representative.

## 50 **Budget and Financial Strategy 2021/22**

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 Council's Financial Strategy and Budget for 2020/21.

Councillor Robinson reflected on his presentation of the 2020/21 budget twelve months ago. It had been a sound budget and he had been optimistic about the year ahead – no one could have predicted the national lockdown that had been enforced ten days later and the year that had followed. The budget picture this year was very different. The Council's income had been decimated, and the pandemic had significantly increased expenditure. However, he wanted to focus on three principles underpinning the budget for the coming year – consolidation, ambition and recovery.

Councillor Robinson drew Council's attention to the 20% and 10% reduction in the Council's projected income (such as that from car parking and community hall bookings) as the community recovered from the Covid-19 pandemic and the two year pay freeze for all Council officers. He highlighted the anticipated

budget deficit of approximately £1.5m over the next two years as a result of Covid-19, which would be funded by Council reserves built up over the last few years, before the Council moved into a surplus position in 2023/24, allowing reserves to be replenished.

Councillor Robinson recognised that additional Government grants had helped significantly in managing the cost of the pandemic, before outlining the Council's ambitious Capital Investment Projects amounting to £38m over the next five years, delivering a new leisure centre, community facility and office complex in Bingham, as well as a Crematorium for the Borough in Stragglethorpe; he reminded Council that the Capital Programme was also used to improve and maintain existing assets, to protect investment and respond to market demands. He went on to focus on the green credentials of all new capital projects within the Borough, linking into the Council's climate change commitments. Good news was balanced with risk analysis, Councillor Robinson mentioned both the Fairer Funding Review and the much anticipated Business Rates Review, which were both outstanding. Both were areas of uncertainty for the Council, but must be seen in the context of other projects the Council was able to influence, such as the creation of new jobs through investment in the Development Corporation. He concluded by recognising that the outlook remained challenging, but the budget was robust, affordable, deliverable and ambitious before asking the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services to pass on his sincere thanks to the Finance Team for their efforts in bringing forward a balanced budget.

Councillor Edyvean thanked the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services and his team for presenting a prudent and balanced budget, despite the difficulties faced by the Council this year.

Councillor Gray reported that, as usual, the proposed budget had been the source of much debate within the Labour Group. The Council had weathered the pandemic well, but the full effects have not yet been realised. He was pleased to see that the ambitious capital and climate change budgets remained and noted the inclusion of replacement refuse vehicles with those that were more environmentally friendly. He also thanked the Finance Team for their hard work but noted that the loss of the New Homes Budget loomed large in the near future. He noted the financial plans outlined in the Medium term Financial Strategy and Transformation Strategy designed to mitigate the £3.25m loss of the Revenue Support Grant, and stated that whilst he understood the reasons behind the need to increase Council Tax he felt uneasy about the hardship this imposed upon the poorest in Rushcliffe's communities.

Councillor Jones recognised that putting forward a firm and balanced budget was difficult in the current circumstances and thanked staff for their efforts in this respect. He went on to comment upon the complexity and depth of the budget report in highlighting the current financial position and future risks. He highlighted his concerns relating to the growing disparity between rich and poor communities in the Borough, especially given the Council's ability to draw in a larger fund as a result of the high proportion of larger properties in the Borough than in other areas. Councillor Jones drew Council's attention to the increase in the West Bridgford Special Expense and questioned whether this was as a result of internal accounting changes putting the full cost of events that

attracted visitors from across the Borough, and beyond, to the town and whether this was a just change. He also questioned the Council's investment in two out of town office developments over the last few months in light of plans to take on debt related to the development of a new leisure centre in Bingham.

Councillor R Mallender recognised that officers had done an excellent job in attempting to mitigate the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic but informed Council that the true impact of the virus was probably yet to be seen. He commented on the size and complexity of the budget report and expressed the hope that there may be time next year to present the budget in terms the lay person could understand. Councillor Mallender was very pleased to see that the climate change fund had been protected, that greener refuse vehicles were being purchased, and that the environment was being taken into account in the Council's new developments despite the additional costs involved in the build stage.

Councillor Thomas expressed her thanks for the effort of the Finance Team in bringing forward a balanced budget but expressed significant concerns about the West Bridgford Special Expense given that other areas of the Borough received much less. She suggested that activities in West Bridgford were being subsidised by the rest of the Borough.

Councillor Purdue-Horan echoed the comments of other Councillors especially in relation to the efforts of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services and Financial Services Manager. As Chairman of the Governance Scrutiny Group, he had the pleasure of scrutinising the budget position throughout the year and informed Council that he was always impressed with the quick, comprehensive and understandable responses the Group received to their queries. He informed Councillors that, unlike other councils, the focus on investing in our communities and building for the future would continue despite the financial difficulties caused by the Covid-19 pandemic because it was important to plan for a more stable and prosperous future.

Councillor Edyvean responded to a number of concerns raised by councillors including the green credentials of the Development Corporation, the future of the New Homes Bonus, and the level of the West Bridgford Special Expense which was lower now than it was in 2016/17. He also clarified that the Transformation Strategy outlined a vision of smarter and better operations and was not a by-word for cuts.

Councillor Robinson also reflected upon the comments made by fellow Councillors and reminded them that a few years ago the Council was recognised nationally as Commercial Council of the Year for its approach to asset investment and income generation such as that demonstrated by recent purchases. He informed Councillors that the budget supported the aspirations of the Council and that officers would continue to be guided by Councillors to take advantage of opportunities, delivering future financial stability for the Council.

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

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

AGAINST: Councillor C Thomas

ABSTENTION: Councillors B Bansal, N Begum, M Gaunt, P Gowland, B Gray, L Howitt, S Mallender, J Murray, J Walker and L Way

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- a) the report of the Council's Responsible Financial Officer on the robustness of the Council's budget and the adequacy of reserves (as detailed at Annex A) be accepted;
- b) the budget setting report and associated financial strategies 2021/22 to 2025/26 (attached Annex B) including the Transformation Strategy and Efficiency Plan (Appendix 3) to deliver efficiencies over the five-year period be adopted;
- c) the Capital Programme as set out in Appendix 4 be adopted;
- d) the Capital and Investment Strategy at Appendix 5 be adopted;
- e) Rushcliffe's 2021/22 Council Tax for a Band D property at £147.36 (increase from 2020/21 of £4.62 or 3.24%) is set;
- f) the Special Expenses for West Bridgford, Ruddington and Keyworth, Appendix 1 are set, resulting in the following Band D Council tax levels for the Special Expense Areas:
  - i) West Bridgford £49.65 (£48.51 in 2020/21);
  - ii) Keyworth £3.41 (£3.76 in 2020/21);
  - iii) Ruddington £4.00 (£4.12 in 2020/21);
- g) With regards to recommendations e) and f), the associated Bands in accordance with the formula in section 36(1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 are set; and
- h) the Pay Policy Statement at Appendix 7 is adopted.

## 51 **Council Tax Resolution 2021/22**

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 Council's position on Council Tax for the year 2021/22.

Councillor Robinson confirmed that this was a statutory duty to approve the

Council Tax for 2021/22, and this resolution reflected the consolidation of all the precepts for Nottinghamshire County Council, Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner, Nottinghamshire Fire Authority, parish and town councils and Rushcliffe Borough Council. Rushcliffe's Council Tax remained the lowest in Nottinghamshire and within the lowest quartile nationally. Councillor Robinson also thanked all Councillors who had participated in the Budget Workshops before Christmas which had helped to shape the difficult decisions that had needed to be made this year.

Councillor J Walker raised concerns regarding the proposed rise in Council Tax for this year and saw it as a further burden on the poorest in the Borough. She reminded Council that the Council Tax system was long overdue reform and criticised the Council for further increasing the chasm between the Borough's wealthiest and poorest residents especially at a time when the poorest in the Borough's communities were already significantly disadvantaged as a result of the pandemic.

Councillor Jones agreed that the Council Tax system did not adequately reflect disparities in wealth of both individuals and geographic areas and stated that the Liberal Democrat Party would be supporting the Council Tax rise reluctantly.

Councillor R Mallender agreed that the Council Tax system was outdated and imperfect but reminded Council that it was the only system at the moment. He called on national Government to find a fairer and more equitable way to fund local government.

Councillor Edyvean responded to the points raised by Councillors and reminded them that town and parish councils set their own precepts to fund local development projects, those funds were not used to subsidise the Borough. He expressed the view that the Council's finances were robust and healthy as a result of effective budget management over a number of years not because of over-taxation.

Councillor Robinson reminded Council that people wanted to live in Rushcliffe and, as a result, the Council was a victim of its own success. The Council needed to support a growing community, attract new business and create jobs for local people; and to do that the Council had to levy a Council Tax, as required by national policy. He reminded Councillors that it was illegal not to set the Council Tax and that by refusing to support the recommendations, Councillors would not be acting responsibly or in the best interests of local residents.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Council Tax Resolution for 2021/22 as detailed at Appendix A be approved.



## OFFICIAL

Table 1

<b>Band</b>	<b>Rushcliffe Borough Council</b>	<b>Nottinghamshire County Council</b>	<b>Nottinghamshire Police &amp; Crime Commissioner</b>	<b>Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Fire Authority</b>	<b>Total</b>
	£	£	£	£	£
A	98.24	1053.90	162.84	55.30	1370.28
B	114.61	1229.55	189.98	64.52	1598.66
C	130.99	1405.20	217.12	73.73	1827.04
<b>D</b>	147.36	1580.85	244.26	82.95	2055.42
E	180.11	1932.15	298.54	101.38	2512.18
F	212.85	2283.45	352.82	119.82	2968.94
G	245.60	2634.75	407.10	138.25	3425.70
H	294.72	3161.70	488.52	165.90	4110.84

## OFFICIAL

Appendix A (i)

Council Tax to be Levied Within the Borough for the Year Ending 31 March 2022

2021/22 PARISH/AREA	TAX BASE	PRECEPT	SPECIAL CHARGES	TAX RATE PARISH AREA	MAJOR PRECEPTS	COUNCIL TAX BAND D
ASLOCKTON	430.5	14,372	0	33.38	2,055.42	2,088.80
BARTON-IN-FABIS	210.1	5,446	0	25.92	2,055.42	2,081.34
BINGHAM	3,647.0	318,237	0	87.26	2,055.42	2,142.68
BRADMORE	169.0	3,400	0	20.12	2,055.42	2,075.54
BUNNY	293.7	22,350	0	76.10	2,055.42	2,131.52
CAR COLSTON	84.2	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
CLIPSTON	31.1	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
COLSTON BASSETT	125.6	11,200	0	89.17	2,055.42	2,144.59
COSTOCK	300.5	18,000	0	59.90	2,055.42	2,115.32
COTGRAVE	2,431.9	230,225	0	94.67	2,055.42	2,150.09
CROPWELL BISHOP	661.2	96,508	0	145.96	2,055.42	2,201.38
CROPWELL BUTLER	337.8	12,420	0	36.77	2,055.42	2,092.19
EAST BRIDGFORD	854.9	42,144	0	49.30	2,055.42	2,104.72
EAST LEAKE	3,193.7	313,686	0	98.22	2,055.42	2,153.64
ELTON-ON-THE-HILL	45.8	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
FLAWBOROUGH	27.0	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
FLINTHAM	220.4	15,000	0	68.06	2,055.42	2,123.48
GOTHAM	615.2	38,260	0	62.19	2,055.42	2,117.61
GRANBY-CUM-BUTTON	176.9	10,280	0	58.11	2,055.42	2,113.53
HAWKSWORTH	66.9	10,400	0	155.46	2,055.42	2,210.88
HICKLING	252.6	8,134	0	32.20	2,055.42	2,087.62
HOLME PIERREPONT & GAMSTON	1,086.1	37,250	0	34.30	2,055.42	2,089.72
KEYWORTH	2,700.6	190,135	9,200	73.81	2,055.42	2,129.23
KINGSTON-ON-SOAR	136.5	4,600	0	33.70	2,055.42	2,089.12
KINOULTON	422.7	6,500	0	15.38	2,055.42	2,070.80
KNEETON	22.7	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
LANGAR-CUM-BARNSTONE	356.0	39,516	0	111.00	2,055.42	2,166.42
NEWTON	322.9	19,300	0	59.77	2,055.42	2,115.19
NORMANTON-ON-SOAR	187.5	14,208	0	75.78	2,055.42	2,131.20
NORMANTON-ON-THE-WOLDS	154.8	8,500	0	54.91	2,055.42	2,110.33
ORSTON	220.3	9,500	0	43.12	2,055.42	2,098.54

## OFFICIAL

2021/22 PARISH/AREA	TAX BASE	PRECEPT	SPECIAL CHARGES	TAX RATE PARISH AREA	MAJOR PRECEPTS	COUNCIL TAX BAND D
OWTHORPE	49.7	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
PLUMTREE	123.5	5,105	0	41.34	2,055.42	2,096.76
RADCLIFFE-ON-TRENT	3,280.2	308,798	0	94.14	2,055.42	2,149.56
RATCLIFFE-ON-SOAR	53.2	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
REMPSTONE	202.8	5,350	0	26.38	2,055.42	2,081.80
RUDDINGTON	2,777.5	314,274	11,100	117.15	2,055.42	2,172.57
SAXONDALE	15.0	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
SCARRINGTON	84.6	750	0	8.87	2,055.42	2,064.29
SCREVEYTON	78.3	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
SHELFORD	116.0	10,000	0	86.21	2,055.42	2,141.63
SHELTON	62.3	750	0	12.04	2,055.42	2,067.46
SIBTHORPE	58.5	1,800	0	30.77	2,055.42	2,086.19
STANFORD-ON-SOAR	64.2	4,000	0	62.31	2,055.42	2,117.73
STANTON-ON-THE-WOLDS	213.7	7,240	0	33.88	2,055.42	2,089.30
SUTTON BONINGTON	652.2	33,500	0	51.36	2,055.42	2,106.78
THOROTON	71.3	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
THRUMPTON	73.7	3,680	0	49.93	2,055.42	2,105.35
TOLLERTON	812.8	65,824	0	80.98	2,055.42	2,136.40
UPPER BROUGHTON	161.9	8,500	0	52.50	2,055.42	2,107.92
WEST BRIDGFORD	14,353.8	0	712,600	49.65	2,055.42	2,105.07
WEST LEAKE	68.4	2,100	0	30.70	2,055.42	2,086.12
WHATTON-IN-THE-VALE	379.5	15,832	0	41.72	2,055.42	2,097.14
WIDMERPOOL	170.2	6,500	0	38.19	2,055.42	2,093.61
WILLOUGHBY-ON-WOLDS	289.6	10,836	0	37.42	2,055.42	2,092.84
WIVERTON & TITHBY	53.3	0	0	-	2,055.42	2,055.42
WYSALL & THORPE IN THE GLEBE	207.3	15,200	0	73.32	2,055.42	2,128.74
TOTAL RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL	44,259.6	2,319,610	732,900	68.97		

OFFICIAL

RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL – COUNCIL TAX BANDS – 2021/22

Appendix A (II)

At its meeting on 4 March 2021, Rushcliffe Borough Council, in accordance with section 30 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, set the amounts shown below as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2021/2022 for each of the categories of dwellings and areas indicated.

<u>PARISH/AREA</u>	<u>A</u>	<u>B</u>	<u>C</u>	<u>D</u>	<u>E</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>G</u>	<u>H</u>
	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>	<u>£</u>
Aslockton	1,392.53	1,624.62	1,856.71	2,088.80	2,552.98	3,017.16	3,481.33	4,177.60
Barton-in-Fabis	1,387.56	1,618.82	1,850.08	2,081.34	2,543.86	3,006.38	3,468.90	4,162.68
Bingham	1,428.45	1,666.53	1,904.60	2,142.68	2,618.83	3,094.98	3,571.13	4,285.36
Bradmore	1,383.69	1,614.31	1,844.92	2,075.54	2,536.77	2,998.00	3,459.23	4,151.08
Bunny	1,421.01	1,657.85	1,894.68	2,131.52	2,605.19	3,078.86	3,552.53	4,263.04
Car Colston	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Cipston	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Colston Bassett	1,429.73	1,668.01	1,906.30	2,144.59	2,621.17	3,097.74	3,574.32	4,289.18
Costock	1,410.21	1,645.25	1,880.28	2,115.32	2,585.39	3,055.46	3,525.53	4,230.64
Cotgrave	1,433.39	1,672.29	1,911.19	2,150.09	2,627.89	3,105.69	3,583.48	4,300.18
Cropwell Bishop	1,467.59	1,712.18	1,956.78	2,201.38	2,690.58	3,179.77	3,668.97	4,402.76
Cropwell Butler	1,394.79	1,627.26	1,859.72	2,092.19	2,557.12	3,022.05	3,486.98	4,184.38
East Bridgford	1,403.15	1,637.00	1,870.86	2,104.72	2,572.44	3,040.15	3,507.87	4,209.44
East Leake	1,435.76	1,675.05	1,914.35	2,153.64	2,632.23	3,110.81	3,589.40	4,307.28
Elton	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Flaxborough	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Flintham	1,415.65	1,651.60	1,887.54	2,123.48	2,595.36	3,067.25	3,539.13	4,246.96
Gotham	1,411.74	1,647.03	1,882.32	2,117.61	2,588.19	3,058.77	3,529.35	4,235.22
Granby	1,409.02	1,643.86	1,878.69	2,113.53	2,583.20	3,052.88	3,522.55	4,227.06
Hawksworth	1,473.92	1,719.57	1,965.23	2,210.88	2,702.19	3,193.49	3,684.80	4,421.76
Hickling	1,391.75	1,623.70	1,855.66	2,087.62	2,551.54	3,015.45	3,479.37	4,175.24
Holme Pierrepont & Gamston	1,393.15	1,625.34	1,857.53	2,089.72	2,554.10	3,018.48	3,482.87	4,179.44
Keyworth	1,419.48	1,656.07	1,892.65	2,129.23	2,602.39	3,075.56	3,548.71	4,258.46
Kingston-on-Soar	1,392.75	1,624.87	1,857.00	2,089.12	2,553.37	3,017.62	3,481.87	4,178.24
Kinoulton	1,380.53	1,610.62	1,840.70	2,070.80	2,530.98	2,991.16	3,451.33	4,141.60
Kneeton	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Langar cum Bamstone	1,444.28	1,684.99	1,925.71	2,166.42	2,647.85	3,129.27	3,610.70	4,332.84
Newton	1,410.13	1,645.15	1,880.17	2,115.19	2,585.23	3,055.27	3,525.32	4,230.38
Normanton-on-Soar	1,420.80	1,657.60	1,894.40	2,131.20	2,604.80	3,078.40	3,552.00	4,262.40
Normanton-on-the-Wolds	1,406.89	1,641.37	1,875.85	2,110.33	2,579.29	3,048.25	3,517.22	4,220.66
Orston	1,399.03	1,632.20	1,865.37	2,098.54	2,564.88	3,031.22	3,497.57	4,197.08
Owthorpe	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Plumtree	1,397.84	1,630.81	1,863.79	2,096.76	2,562.71	3,028.65	3,494.60	4,193.52
Radcliffe-on-Trent	1,433.04	1,671.88	1,910.72	2,149.56	2,627.24	3,104.92	3,582.60	4,299.12
Ratcliffe-on-Soar	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Rempstone	1,387.87	1,619.18	1,850.49	2,081.80	2,544.42	3,007.04	3,469.67	4,163.60
Ruddington	1,448.38	1,689.78	1,931.18	2,172.57	2,655.36	3,138.16	3,620.95	4,345.14
Saxondale	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Scarrington	1,376.19	1,605.56	1,834.92	2,064.29	2,523.02	2,981.75	3,440.48	4,128.58
Screveton	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Shefford	1,427.75	1,665.71	1,903.67	2,141.63	2,617.55	3,093.47	3,569.38	4,283.26
Shelton	1,378.31	1,608.02	1,837.74	2,067.46	2,526.90	2,986.33	3,445.77	4,134.92
Sibthorpe	1,390.79	1,622.59	1,854.39	2,085.19	2,549.79	3,013.39	3,476.98	4,172.38
Stamford-on-Soar	1,411.82	1,647.12	1,882.43	2,117.73	2,588.34	3,058.94	3,529.55	4,235.46
Stanton-on-the-Wolds	1,392.87	1,625.01	1,857.16	2,089.30	2,553.59	3,017.88	3,482.17	4,178.60
Sutton Bonington	1,404.52	1,638.61	1,872.69	2,106.78	2,574.95	3,043.13	3,511.30	4,213.56
Thornton	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Thrumpton	1,403.57	1,637.49	1,871.42	2,105.35	2,573.21	3,041.06	3,508.92	4,210.70
Tollerton	1,424.27	1,661.64	1,899.02	2,136.40	2,611.16	3,085.91	3,560.67	4,272.80
Upper Broughton	1,405.28	1,639.49	1,873.71	2,107.92	2,576.35	3,044.77	3,513.20	4,215.84
West Bridgford	1,403.38	1,637.28	1,871.17	2,105.07	2,572.85	3,040.66	3,508.45	4,210.14
West Leake	1,390.75	1,622.54	1,854.33	2,086.12	2,549.70	3,013.28	3,476.87	4,172.24
Whatton	1,398.09	1,631.11	1,864.12	2,097.14	2,563.17	3,029.20	3,495.23	4,194.28
Widmerpool	1,395.74	1,628.36	1,860.99	2,093.61	2,558.86	3,024.10	3,489.35	4,187.22
Willoughby-on-the-Wolds	1,395.23	1,627.76	1,860.30	2,092.84	2,557.92	3,022.99	3,488.07	4,185.68
Wiverton & Tibby	1,370.28	1,598.66	1,827.04	2,055.42	2,512.18	2,968.94	3,425.70	4,110.84
Wysall & Thorpe in the Glebe	1,419.16	1,655.69	1,892.21	2,128.74	2,601.79	3,074.85	3,547.90	4,257.48

**52 Electoral Review of Rushcliffe**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Chief Executive outlining the proposed electoral review of Rushcliffe.

Councillor Robinson informed Council that the review had been requested by the Local Government Boundary Commission for England to address electoral inequality in certain wards across the Borough now and in the future.

Councillor Robinson highlighted the key parts of the report including the anticipated 18% growth across the Borough between 2020 and 2027, taking the average number of electors per Councillor from 2,058 to 2,509. He summarised the content of the main areas of the review document for Council including strategic leadership, accountability and community involvement, and thanked Councillors for participating in the review process. To ensure local democracy was protected despite the anticipated growth in the Borough, the review recommended an increase of two Councillors at an additional cost to the Council of approximately £11,000.

Councillor Gray reported that the Labour Group had taken part in the review and read the report with interest. They noted the substantial growth expected in the Borough and believed that two additional councillors would assist with the delivery of the additional workload.

Councillor Howitt welcomed the positive step the Council was proposing to ensure appropriate representation in areas that were predicted to grow in coming years.

Councillor R Mallender considered that the recommendation was reasonable given the predicted growth the Borough was expecting.

Councillor Thomas reported that she would have preferred to see no increase in Councillor numbers but was more interested in the next stage of the process where she hoped the opportunity to influence the drawing of ward boundaries that better respected community identity would be offered.

Councillor Edyvean welcomed the review and its recommendation which he felt struck the right balance between the number of Councillors and the representation of a growing community.

Councillor Robinson thanked Group Leaders and Councillors for their participation in this important piece of work.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- a) the Review of Council Size which proposes an increase in the number of councillors for Rushcliffe Borough Council to 46 Councillors is endorsed; and
- b) the Chief Executive should make arrangements for the Review to be sent to the Commission completing the first part of the review process.

**53 Planning Enforcement Policy**

The Portfolio Holder for Housing, Councillor Upton presented the report of the Executive Manager – Communities outlining the Council's Planning Enforcement Policy.

Councillor Upton advised that the Council currently had a Planning Enforcement Code of Practice which was due for review and renewal in March 2021. Therefore, in line with the recommendations in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), a draft Planning Enforcement Policy had been produced, which was more detailed and would replace the Code of Practice. Councillor Upton noted that the draft Policy had been considered by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group and following amendments, the Group had resolved that the updated Planning Enforcement Policy be referred to Cabinet for approval. Councillor Upton informed the Council that Cabinet had resolved that the draft Planning Enforcement Policy be approved for the purposes of public consultation, prior to the Policy being referred to Council for adoption.

Councillor Upton noted that some changes had been made following public consultation but not all suggestions have been incorporated. However, it was hoped that the new Policy would reassure residents that the Council was willing to take a proactive and reactive approach to enforce planning controls despite the challenge of staffing resources and the financial costs of enforcing planning controls. Councillor Upton also highlighted that further planning enforcement issues such as planning enforcement controls in conservation areas would be discussed by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group in April 2021.

Councillor Inglis seconded the recommendations outlined in the report and informed the Council that the new Planning Enforcement Policy would be more effective and robust than the current Code of Practice. It was noted that the Planning Enforcement Policy would ensure that breeches of planning conditions would be investigated with timely resolutions. Councillor Inglis recognised that there were staffing and budget constraints but believed that the Planning Enforcement Policy would inform developers how the Council would carry out its enforcement functions and therefore, would set a strong precedent for the Council.

Councillor Gowland emphasised the stress and grief caused by developers and residents by not following approved plans and conditions and provided an example of the demolition of a dwelling on Bridgford Road, West Bridgford. It was noted that the integrity of the Council depended on residents knowing that the Council would act and enforce planning conditions if necessary. Councillor Gowland raised concerns that the Policy concentrated too much on planning enforcement being a discretionary service but noted that the Policy was a great step forward for the Council and would inform residents of its implementation.

Councillor Major endorsed the recommendations of the report and was pleased to see that the Council was willing to deliver an effective service for its residents. Councillor Major thanked the officers and those who had taken part

in the consultation process. It was hoped that the Planning Enforcement Policy would provide clarity and confidence to ensure that planning conditions were followed correctly.

Councillor R Mallender was pleased to note that this overdue Policy was recommended to be implemented. Councillor Mallender recommended that the Policy could be strengthened and improved overtime but was pleased that the Policy made it clear to residents that enforcement would be imposed if planning conditions were not followed.

Councillor Thomas welcomed the improved document but was disappointed that not all ward councillor responses to the draft document were included. Councillor Thomas also hoped that the Policy would be a living document which would eventually allow the proactive monitoring of housing developments of less than 50 houses. It was also suggested that the document should emphasise what the Council could do to impose enforcement rather than what the Council cannot do if a developer was not adhering to planning conditions.

Councillor Butler noted that planning enforcement was a big issue for Rushcliffe residents and so it was essential that developers/applicants would face consequences if permissions were not adhered to.

Councillor Clarke agreed with Councillor Butler and stated that the officers were reliant on residents to be informed if planning conditions were not being followed. Councillor Clarke also thanked the members of the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group for supporting the improved Policy.

In response to the Councillors' comments, Councillor Upton noted that the demolition of the dwelling on Bridgford Road had created an urgency for a Planning Enforcement Policy to be implemented. Additionally, despite it being a discretionary service, Councillor Upton was pleased to note that the Council had always had a Code of Practice and now a Policy in place. It was highlighted that the Council would like to be able to proactively monitor smaller developments but due to a lack of resources, encouraged residents to contact the Planning and Growth Team if they believed that planning conditions were being breached.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- a) the Planning Enforcement Policy be adopted; and
- b) the Executive Manager – Communities be delegated authority to make minor changes and updates to the Policy as required.

#### 54 **Notices of Motion**

- a) The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor J Walker and seconded by Councillor Gaunt.

“Rushcliffe Borough Council, along with the other district councils in the East Midlands, are on the precipice of change. We have made the initial

steps towards a more sustainable future by acknowledging the climate emergency; auditing our carbon footprint and committing to divestment away from fossil fuels; and these actions are welcomed. But Covid-19 has accelerated the need to for a rethink about whether our current economic models is environmentally, socially or even economically sustainable.

Community wealth building is a people-centred approach to local economic development. It reorganises local economies to be fairer and more democratic. It stops wealth flowing out of our communities, towns and cities. Instead, it places control of this wealth into the hands of local people, communities, businesses and organisations. Community wealth building promotes the progressive procurement of goods and services, as this spending power can be a means through which greater economic, social and environmental benefits can be achieved. By adapting their procurement processes and decision making, anchor institutions can anchor institutions can create dense local supply chains and ecosystems of businesses that are more likely to support local employment and have a greater tendency to recirculate wealth and surplus locally.

We call upon this Council:

- 1) To investigate Community Wealth Building as a means of ensuring that money is kept circulating in our local economies.
- 2) To support our local economy and businesses particularly SME's accepting procurement law and to engage with other anchor institutions in Rushcliffe to encourage them to procure locally wherever possible.
- 3) To investigate the possibility of establishing Community Land Trusts or working through Public-Commons Partnerships as a means of transforming the ownership of many under-utilised public assets by transferring decision making to citizens through common ownership."

Councillor J Walker informed Council, in moving the motion, that community wealth building was the modern economic version of social responsibility. It was a people centred approach to economic development which stopped wealth flowing out of communities and placed financial control in the hands of local people, providing resilience and local economic security. In a post Brexit world, it also gave communities control over procurement where a preference for local supply chains could be prioritised. Councillor Walker also talked about the importance of anchor institutions, such as the Council, Trent Bridge Cricket Ground, Nottingham Forest and the larger academy chains, in showing smaller organisations the importance of local investment. In summary, Councillor Walker informed Council that corporate wealth building encouraged businesses to think about employment beyond the provision of jobs to the modern take on corporate social responsibility.

Councillor Gaunt seconded the motion and reminded Council that the UK was the sixth most unequal country in the world according to the OECD. He



referenced incomes below the poverty line, even though people were in work, and the profits of businesses being extracted by shareholders rather than being reinvested back into local communities. He felt this motion would rebuild the connection between people and the places they lived and worked in. He highlighted the benefit of community wealth being reinvested into socially minded local businesses, as well as progressive procurement processes which aimed to recirculate wealth within the community. Councillor Gaunt outlined a number of different models of community wealth building which could be considered by the Council and highlighted that a more diverse range of decision making criteria could be taken into account including environmental impact and local supply chains.

Councillor Edyvean acknowledged that not many people would not support keeping locally generated wealth within the community. He outlined the many initiatives the Council already ran or supported that already supported this idea including the Carbon Clever Big Business Club and seminars for local businesses. He also highlighted the more flexible procurement practices that the Council could now undertake allowing awards to local businesses, which were the most financially beneficial now that the country had exited the EU. Councillor Edyvean informed Council that he would find it difficult to support a motion which increased bureaucracy and costs when the Council already did so much to support and promote local businesses.

Councillor Jones commented upon the overly wordy motion but supported the spirit of the three recommendations. He felt that community land trusts were worth investigating so that the Council was more aware of alternative options should opportunities arise in the future.

Councillor R Mallender agreed that the motion presented some very interesting ideas that should be investigated further. He pointed out that the motion called for consideration not commitment and therefore he could see no harm in finding out more before deciding whether to take any action.

Councillor Thomas agreed that the subject was worth investigating.

Councillor Robinson was keen to highlight that the Council already undertook much of what this motion was calling for. Across the Borough, community groups were already looking after parcels of land, Lutterell Hall was run by the community, and the Council's new build facilities in Bingham and Stragglethorpe would create local jobs and use local suppliers.

Councillor Brennan agreed that the motion presented many good ideas but agreed with Councillor Robinson that the Council was already doing many of those in the Borough. She stated that public sector led economic growth was very successful and that leaving the EU would enable the Council to be much more creative and flexible.

Councillor J Walker was pleased to see so many open-minded attitudes to doing things differently. She went on to say that businesses needed help more than ever as they struggled to recover from the impact of the pandemic and that voting for this motion would show Councillors' support to people who were currently struggling.

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

- b) The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Gowland and seconded by Councillor Gray.

“Humans have already caused irreversible climate change, the impacts of which are being felt in Rushcliffe, the UK and around the world. Global temperatures have increased by 1 degree Celsius from pre-industrial levels. Atmospheric CO2 levels are above 400 parts per million (ppm) and continue to rise. This far exceeds the 350 ppm deemed to be a safe level for humanity. Without more significant and sustained action, the world is set to exceed the Paris Agreement’s 1.5°C limit between 2030 and 2040. Therefore, the current UK target of net zero by 2050 is not satisfactory. It is too little too late.

The increase in harm caused by a rise of 2°C rather than 1.5°C is significant. This is described by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5°C published in October 2018. According to the IPCC, limiting heating to 1.5°C may still be possible with ambitious action from national and sub-national authorities, civil society, the private sector and local communities. The costs of failing to address this crisis will far outstrip the investments required to prevent it. Investing now will bring many benefits in the form of good jobs, breathable cities and thriving communities.

Local authorities such as Devon County, Croydon Borough and Lancaster City have established Citizens’ Assemblies that are playing an important role in assisting them in their plans to achieve net zero by 2030 or before. A bill has been laid before Parliament—the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill (published as the “Climate and Ecology Bill”)—according to which the Government must develop an emergency strategy that:

- a. requires that the UK plays a fair and proper role in reducing greenhouse gas emissions consistent with limiting global temperature increase to 1.5 degrees C above pre-industrial temperatures;
- b. ensures that all the UK’s consumption emissions are accounted for;
- c. includes emissions from aviation and shipping;
- d. protects and restores biodiverse habitats along overseas supply chains;
- e. restores and regenerates the UK’s depleted soils, wildlife habitats and species populations to healthy and robust states, maximising their capacity to absorb CO2 and their resistance to climate heating;
- f. sets up an independent Citizens’ Assembly, representative of the UK’s population, to engage with Parliament and Government and help develop the emergency strategy.

Council therefore resolves to:

1. Support the Climate and Ecological Emergency Bill;
2. Set up a Citizens' Assembly to develop an emergency strategy for Rushcliffe as set out in the Bill;
3. Publicise its decision;
4. Write to local MPs, asking them to support the Bill; and
5. Write to the CEE Bill Alliance, the organisers of the campaign for the Bill, expressing its support (campaign@ceebill.uk)."

Councillor Gowland informed Council, in moving the motion, that Rushcliffe had clearly demonstrated over the years that it was taking climate change very seriously. She went on to give examples demonstrating that commitment nationally and in other local areas could be improved upon and asked the Council to lead the way by supporting this motion. It called for action now to change behaviour at a local level from the ground upwards as well as highlighting small actions that when undertaken across a community could have a cumulative effect contributing toward climate change. Councillor Gowland outlined the purpose of citizen's assemblies and highlighted a number of reasons why she felt they would be particularly successful in Rushcliffe.

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

Councillor Brennan thanked Councillor Gowland for her motion and commended her passion for this subject. She recognised that the environment was a significant concern for everybody at Rushcliffe and went on to outline the many actions the Council had already undertaken or committed to in this area. Those included setting clear carbon neutral targets for the Borough, the investment in green technology at the new Crematorium, green building methods for the new leisure centre and investment in sustainable energy. She also highlighted the upcoming scrutiny of the Carbon Management Plan in April 2021. Councillor Brennan also asked Council why additional citizens' assemblies were needed when residents in the Borough had elected them as their representatives and that engagement with communities on topics of interest was a substantial part of being a local councillor.

Councillor Jones agreed that the Council was undertaking much to contribute to the climate emergency but could see the value of citizens' assemblies to engage residents within communities and foster a sense of responsibility at a local level.

Councillor R Mallender welcomed any contribution to the climate change debate as he recognised there was much still to be done. He felt that behavioural change at a community and household level were areas for development.

Councillor Thomas added her support for additional methods of bringing

about behavioural change at a local level.

Councillor Inglis informed Council that he felt Rushcliffe was following a very positive course of action regarding this subject and highlighted a number of additional examples such as the Abbey Road development, the free trees and wildflowers schemes, and the impressively low carbon footprint of the Arena. He went on to agree that Councillors were the voice of the community and that he felt there was little to be gained from adding an additional layer of complexity to the debate. He concluded by pointing out that he felt the motion was a distraction from the good work already being done by the Council.

Councillor Jones agreed that Rushcliffe was already making positive progress in this area but recognised that there were still areas in which the Council could improve as change was required at individual levels as well as organisational ones.

Councillor Robinson reiterated that Rushcliffe was considered to be leading the field in this area locally and that the Council already had structures in place to consult with the community.

Councillor Gray drew together the points made by other Councillors and concluded that there seemed to be a lot of agreement in terms of the principles of the motion but not so much agreement regarding the citizens assemblies. He pointed out that the Borough was full of well-educated residents that were sufficiently savvy to organise themselves and promote change from within, this did not need to entail additional officer time or Council resources.

Councillor Gowland was pleased with the support from other Councillors and heartened that much appeared to be happening already. However, she felt that community action, similar to that seen in relation to the Covid pandemic, would make a substantial difference to climate change and was worth investigating.

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

- c) The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor Upton and seconded by Councillor Butler.

“Back in 2014, Rushcliffe adopted its local plan for housing in the Borough. Despite numerous appeals to the Housing Minister, the plan had to include many thousands of additional homes, to meet the needs of Nottingham, because of the Duty To Co-operate policy.

Delivery of these additional homes has put an intolerable strain on infrastructure and local services across the Borough. Moreover, it has required the release of large swathes of our green belt and changed the nature and character of many of the rural settlements of the Borough.

As the Council prepares its legal obligation to agree the next Local Plan,

this Council calls on the Government to remove the Duty to Co-operate in the forthcoming Planning Bill and calls on Nottingham City Council to be more flexible and adaptable to deliver the new homes needed in the City going forward.”

Councillor Upton informed Council, before moving the motion, that Councillor Thomas had suggested a slight change to the wording of the preamble to the motion to which he had agreed prior to the meeting. The suggestion involved replacing the word ‘release’ with ‘development’ in the second paragraph of the preamble, and the words ‘green belt’ with ‘countryside’ in the same paragraph. The Mayor agreed that those changes did not affect the motion and that Councillor Upton could precede to present the motion.

Councillor Upton went on to say that it was the right time to lobby central Government to change part of the planning system as a new planning bill was expected later this year. He informed Council that he would be requesting the legal Duty to Cooperate be removed before explaining that he was not opposed to cooperation across boundaries where it was in the best interests of local residents rather than at their expense. During the approval of the last Local Plan, Rushcliffe had to include many thousands of additional houses to assist Nottingham City as a result of the legal Duty to Cooperate within the legislation. This legal duty needed to be removed otherwise history would repeat and Rushcliffe would end up building even more houses to supplement those that were not being built in the city. Estimates showed that Rushcliffe would have 3,800 more houses than it needed at the end of this Local Plan period, whereas the City would be in a deficit of 8,000 homes. The City Council should meet its own needs within the boundaries of the city.

Councillor Gaunt informed Council that he felt the motion was asking for wrong thing. He believed the city had no scope to expand to meet housing need without going outside its own boundaries but that it was wrong to look at the city as a separate entity to the Borough. He recognised that many Rushcliffe residents worked within the city, they used the universities, hospitals and extensive retail offering as well as social opportunities provided in the city. He asked Councillors to consider whether more homes in the Borough was a suitable price to pay for access to the excellent resources and opportunities provided by Rushcliffe’s close proximity to the city. Instead he asked Councillors to push for a change in the formula used to calculate how many houses an area required to meet demand.

Councillor Jones agreed with the points raised by Councillor Gaunt but recognised that the Council did not fare well as a result of this legislation during the approval of the last Local Plan and would very much like to see it changed before the next Plan needed to be approved.

Councillor R Mallender drew Council’s attention to the difference between a legal Duty to Cooperate and wanting to cooperate for the benefit of the local community. He was happy to cooperate but recognised that being required to cooperate was not always in the best interest of the Borough’s own residents.

Councillor Thomas reminded Council that her ward had been targeted by developers to meet the demand for additional housing to meet the city's need despite there being areas of the city that could be redeveloped for housing. She also highlighted the absurdity of building houses on established areas of countryside in order to develop greener inner-city areas from brownfield sites.

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

55 **Adjournment**

The Mayor announced that as it was now 10.00pm the meeting would conclude, and the remaining item would be carried forward to the next ordinary meeting of Council in July 2021. She thanked Councillors for their attention through such a long evening.

**It was RESOLVED** that in accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Mayor closed the meeting at 10.00pm and all remaining items were adjourned to the next ordinary Council meeting in July 2020.

The meeting closed at 10.00 pm.

CHAIRMAN