

**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COUNCIL**

**THURSDAY, 13 JULY 2023**

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

**PRESENT:**

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

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

L Ashmore	Director of Development and Economic Growth
D Banks	Director of Neighbourhoods
C Caven-Atack	Service Manager - Corporate Services
G Dennis	Monitoring Officer
K Marriott	Chief Executive
E Richardson	Democratic Services Officer
H Tambini	Democratic Services Manager
S Whittaker	Service Manager – Finance

**13 Declarations of Interest**

The Mayor invited declarations of interest.

Two Councillors declared an interest in Item 10 Ratcliffe on Soar Local Development Order as follows:

Councillor R Walker stated that he was a director of the Strawberry Wood Gotham Community Interest Company, which was seeking to acquire an area of woodland for the benefit of the community. There was a possibility of sourcing funding for the purchase and/or future management of the woodland via biodiversity net gain obligations arising from the development and whilst that would not result in any financial gain to him personally, he would leave the room during the debate.

Councillor Barney stated that the company he worked for had expressed an interest in Freeports nationally, and although he could not see any direct relationship to this site, he would leave the room during the debate.

Councillor Parekh declared an interest in Item 13 a) Motion as she was the team manager at Nottinghamshire County Council in Children's Services and

believed that she would not have an open mind, as she had fixed notions about what should happen and had pre-conceived ideas and would leave the room during the debate.

Councillor Williams declared an interest in Item 9 Business from the last Council meeting – the Soil Motion, due to the company that he worked for and would leave the room during the debate.

#### **14 Minutes of the meeting held on 25 May 2023**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 25 May 2023, were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

#### **15 Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor made the first announcements of her Civic year and informed Council that she had been very busy over the last few weeks. She specifically mentioned a 100th birthday party, a flag raising to honour the Armed Forces, the outstanding Proms in the Park concert that was particularly well attended this year, and a small ceremony to commemorate one hundred years since Bridgford Park was opened. The Mayor also recalled the thrilling Red Devils performing at the DMRC, a very windy morning at the Mercian War Memorial in Crich, and a damp, in weather but not in spirit, carnival in Radcliffe. The Mayor invited members of the Council to join her at her Civic Service on 15 October and promoted the Taste of Rushcliffe food festival in West Bridgford next weekend.

#### **16 Leader's Announcements**

The Leader referred to the national Municipal Journal Awards held in London a few weeks ago, with the Council shortlisted for the highest award, Council of the Year, competing against five unitary authorities. Whilst the Council had not been successful, it was the only district council to be shortlisted and, therefore, he felt it was perfectly justified for the Council to claim Rushcliffe was District Council of the Year. This accolade was testament to the hard work of officers in delivering Councillors' ambitions and making the Borough a great place to live.

Secondly, the Leader mentioned that Saville's, the estate agent, recently announced West Bridgford as the 13th best town to live in, which was also the only place in the East Midlands in the top 50.

#### **17 Chief Executive's Announcements**

The Chief Executive made no announcements.

#### **18 Citizens' Questions**

The Mayor invited Ms Jejna to read her Citizen's Question as submitted:

"Why has Rushcliffe Borough Council signed up for 20 minute neighbourhoods in the Greater Nottingham Strategic Plan, without fully informing constituents what they are, how they will work and how it will affect and impact on day to

day life?”

Councillor Upton thanked Ms Jejna for her question and clarified that the Council had not signed up to a 20-minute neighbourhood concept and it might not do so. The Greater Nottinghamshire Strategic Plan was a joint document across four local authorities and although reference was made to 20-minute neighbourhoods in the draft, further consideration would be given as to whether it should be retained in the Plan, especially in light of the predominately rural nature of the Borough. The 20-minute neighbourhood was a concept that might achieve more sustainable development, but it needed a lot more debate, and a final draft of the Greater Nottinghamshire Strategic Plan was expected to be ready for further consultation in early 2024.

## 19 **Petitions**

No petitions had been submitted.

## 20 **Business from the last Council meeting**

Councillor Williams left the room for consideration of the item.

The following Notice of Motion was proposed by Councillor C Thomas and was seconded by Councillor S Mallender.

“Council recognises the importance of soil health in food production, combatting climate change, storing carbon, regulating water flow and quality, and as the basis for biodiversity. However, soil in Rushcliffe as elsewhere is under multiple threats including the ever-expanding built environment, flooding, contamination, industrial farming methods, and climate change.

Council will:

- Seek to strengthen policies that protect soil in the next round of the Local Plan, (in line with current National Planning Policy) including measures to minimise impermeable surfaces in development. Council will also call on the government to strengthen protection for soil in future planning policy and legislation.
- Review Rushcliffe’s own operations with determination to further improve soil health on the Council’s own land and land it manages in line with our Environmental Policy and planning policies and guidance.
- Where possible include soil health improvement as one of the criteria used to evaluate bids when distributing relevant external grants to Rushcliffe’s businesses and community groups.
- Within resource constraints, e.g. using social media and Rushcliffe Reports, engage and educate residents to promote small scale improvements in soil health in residential gardens e.g. using organic and permaculture techniques. Council will include nitrogen fixing plants in future free plant schemes.”

In moving the motion, Councillor Thomas stated that soil was the very stuff of life, a mixture of physical, chemical, and biological elements including minerals from rocks, organic matter from dead plants and animals, living organisms, air, and water. Councillor Thomas advised that soil held three times as much

carbon as the atmosphere, it reduced the risk of flooding by absorbing water and it delivered 95% of global food supplies; however, it was a limited resource under pressure from many factors.

Councillor Thomas referred to a 2019 report by the Environment Agency, which had highlighted that soil currently stored about ten billion tonnes of carbon, which was approximately equal to eighty years of annual UK greenhouse gas emissions. Councillor Thomas stated that intensive agriculture had caused arable soils to lose about 40% to 60% of their organic carbon, and in England and Wales almost four million hectares of soil was at risk of compaction, over two million hectares of soil was at risk of erosion and the spread of some materials could give rise to 300,000 hectares being contaminated in the UK.

Councillor Thomas outlined the four actions set out in the motion and confirmed that the motion asked the Council to collectively recognise the importance of soil, the threat that it was under and to identify actions that could be taken.

Councillor Inglis stated that the Council had a strong record of promoting the protection of soil health and this motion helped to ensure, where possible and within Council resources, that practices were embedded within the relevant Council policies and operational activities, whilst also promoting soil health to local residents and land owners in the Borough.

Councillor Inglis recognised the collaboration between Councillors Thomas and S Mallender in bringing forward this motion, which served the interests of the Borough and was deliverable. Councillor Inglis advised that the Conservative Group supported the motion, and he recommended that Councillors read the information available through the links listed on the agenda.

In seconding the motion, Councillor S Mallender advised that looking after soil involved also looking after worms, as worm casts could contain five times more nitrogen, seven times more phosphorus and 1000 times more beneficial bacteria than soil without worms. Councillor Mallender stated that worms loosened, mixed and oxygenated soil, they improved the structure and water drainage capacity and helped to clean up contaminated land. Councillor S Mallender stated that worms were very important in combatting climate change, as soil with worms was 90% more efficient than soil without.

Councillor Mallender confirmed that a quarter of the earth's species lived in soil and one gram of soil contained ten billion organisms. Unfortunately, every minute, the equivalent of thirty football pitches of fertile soil was lost and she hoped that the Council would do something to prevent that happening and would support this motion.

The substantive motion was carried.

Councillor Williams returned to his seat.

Question for Councillor S Mallender to Councillor Inglis

"In the spring I received my "Rushcliffe Gardener" magazine and although

there are some messages about climate change and the free tree scheme etc., I was disappointed to see suggestions to residents in the seasonal jobs section which are not supportive of the Council's environmental policies, such as using weedkiller, artificial fertiliser, and frequent mowing, instead of no mow. Why were these suggestions allowed to be printed?"

Councillor Inglis responded by stating that the Council strived to set the standard and provide residents with the information they needed to change their behaviours and habits if they choose to. That was in line with striking a balance, being pragmatic and proportionate to what realistically they could achieve with their own garden and for smaller plots for example, it might be impractical to leave a grassed area of a typical home, fully un-mowed for a whole year or remove weeds without assistance. Smaller scale residential gardening might mean some residents understandably struggled to match the greener, more environmentally friendly methods the Council adopted for its larger publicly owned sites. The magazine was written internally and with all good intentions and the Council would continue to endeavour to influence residents with updates to make a greener choices, including practical tips as gardening habits evolved.

Supplementary Question

Councillor S Mallender asked if future editions of the Rushcliffe Gardener would cover practical information for residents about ways of improving soil health within their own gardens.

Councillor Inglis responded that would not be a problem.

## 21 **Ratcliffe on Soar Local Development Order**

Councillors Barney and R Walker left the meeting for consideration of the item.

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Planning and Housing, Councillor Upton presented the report of the Director – Development and Economic Growth, which outlined the Ratcliffe on Soar Local Development Order (LDO) and sought Council's approval to adopt the LDO.

Councillor Upton advised that this major decision would affect future generations and asked Councillors to make an open and objective decision, with no pre-determinations. Councillors were thanked for their engagement with this very detailed report and officers for their hard work in preparing it.

Councillor Upton reminded Council that Ratcliffe on Soar Power Station would be closing in September 2024 and so far going forward, the only approved use would be for the Emerge Waste to Energy Project. This was a unique, strategic site of national importance, with excellent transport links, excellent connectivity to the National Grid and was a highly visible gateway to Rushcliffe and Nottingham. The site was close to the urban conurbations of Nottingham, Derby, Leicester, and Loughborough, with their associated universities and high tech industries, with most of the site being within the East Midlands Freeport boundary, which came into operation in March 2023. Councillor Upton stated that the Government clearly expected this site to be rapidly

developed, as part of its levelling up agenda, and hopefully attracting international investment into the region. Council noted that the Freeport Business Case focused upon advanced manufacturing, decarbonised technology and renewable and low carbon energy generation and there was an urgency to get new businesses established by September 2026, being the final date to qualify for full Freeport benefits. Councillor Upton stated that any investors required clarity and certainty, and the current lack of any planning approval was a major issue, which the LDO would resolve. Council was reminded that the Freeport would generate significant income from retained Business Rates to invest into local projects.

Councillor Upton referred to the Cabinet decision in 2021 to prepare an LDO and to work collaboratively with Uniper, and since then detailed work had been ongoing to prepare this final draft. Council was advised that extensive consultation had taken place as detailed in the Statement of Community Involvement, it had been scrutinised numerous times by the cross party Local Development Forum (LDF) Group, and at its meeting in June, it had recommended adoption of the LDO. Councillor Upton stated that an LDO was an efficient planning application process, whereby proposals could be assessed against a specific set of criteria, giving the Council planning control over the redevelopment of the whole site. The use of LDOs was recommended in the National Planning Policy Guidance for simplifying and streamlining the planning process for large sites. The LDO would be valid for 25 years and could create certainty for investors, reduce risk and speed up the planning process, which Council was reminded would be needed to meet the tight three year deadline of September 2026.

Councillor Upton stated that there was a risk that without the LDO, and its Development Masterplan for the entire site, there would be piecemeal, speculative development through separate planning applications, which could be difficult to resist. Uniper was also not contractually required to demolish the cooling towers, and given the cost of their demolition, they could be left derelict, leading to a significant detrimental visual impact. It was likely that if adopted, some minor changes could be made to the LDO, given its flexibility, with review points at years three and five, and every five years thereafter, and Council was reminded that it could be modified or revoked at any time. The report gave significant information on key issues, most of the site was Brownfield land, with some areas used for agriculture and woodland and the site was in the Greenbelt; however, the conclusion was that very special circumstances did exist to justify the proposed development.

Councillor Upton referred to the Transport Assessment, which stated that Phase One could go ahead with some minor mitigation works, particularly to local roads, as the traffic flows should not be greater than from the existing power station, with a wider assessment required later on for Phases Two and Three. Council was advised that various conditions had been included, with further targeted highways investment required and Traffic Flow Caps would be monitored as the development progressed. Traffic modelling had shown that 96% of trips generated by the proposed development in peak hours would use the dual A453 and transport mitigation would need to be delivered, where and when required.

In respect of biodiversity, Councillor Upton stated that there was a mechanism for securing a minimum gain of 10%, with careful consideration given to the balance of achieving significant economic and employment benefits, and the environmental impact of development. On the southern site, particular areas of woodland would be retained, and new areas of landscaping and tree planting provided.

In conclusion, Councillor Upton advised that the approval of the Freeport development for the majority of this site had been confirmed and development would take place, and the decision taken tonight would affect how it was managed, by whom and when.

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

Councillor J Walker stated that the Labour Group supported sustainable, well paid jobs in easily accessible locations, using public transport, and it was in favour of investment in the "Green" economy and was excited about the redevelopment opportunities of this site in a way that met future needs sustainably. However, Councillor Walker stated that the Labour Group was also in favour of democratic oversight, which saw local government and the public sector working in partnership, with other groups and local businesses, and would allow the Council to control the sustainable development of this land. Unfortunately the Labour Group was deeply concerned that this democratic oversight was being substantially reduced by this LDO. Councillor Walker considered that what was being presented tonight showed laudable intent; however, there was insufficient detail on how highly paid, green jobs would be secured, as the LDO was currently only a skeleton proposal. Council was being asked to approve the LDO as a way of making it easier for large businesses to develop the site for profit and the benefit of corporate interest, and in the process that democratic oversight would be reduced. Councillor Walker stated that the costs were high and the returns hypothetical, with promised jobs in exchange for control. Of greater concern was the imposition of the September 2026 deadline, which resulted in Council being advised that this LDO must be passed to avoid missing that deadline, and if approved it would not have a proper Traffic Feasibility Study in place, more ancient trees and Greenbelt would be lost. The LDO did not allow for specifics, and a valuable site would be given away as democratic control would be lost when it could be developed more positively for the benefit of local residents. Councillor Walker concluded by stating that there was no detail of what environmental or social improvement gains there would be, so despite being in favour of some stated terms, the Labour Group was unable to support the recommendation, due to the lack of concrete expectations around sustainability and to the reduction of the Council's democratic control of this strategic site.

Councillor Thomas requested that a recorded vote be taken on the proposed amendment she was about to make, any other amendments and the final vote, and confirmed that on Wednesday she had circulated to all Councillors the proposed amendment as follows:

It is RECOMMENDED that Council:

- a) notes the consultation representations received on the draft Local Development Order;
- b) notes the environmental information and the conclusions reached on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment as required by Regulation 26(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended);
- c) empowers the Director Development and Economic Growth to amend the Local Development Order Documents etc to:
  1. protect trees on the Southern site unless the applicant can demonstrate an absolute need for a contiguous building of a size that would require trees to be removed;
  2. bring forward the traffic study for local roads, decoupling this from the national highways traffic issues at J24 etc, so that no certificate of compliance may be issued until this study is complete, with any mitigation measures identified and costed.
- d) otherwise endorses the Ratcliffe on Soar Local Development Order Documents and Supporting Documents; and
- e) adopts the Ratcliffe on Soar Local Development Order (with amendment as above) in accordance with Schedule 4A(3) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Councillor Thomas stated that there was deep unease in Leake ward about the LDO. Council was advised that whilst there was support for redeveloping the northern site, once the power station had ceased operation, the southern site was very different, as it was an enormous Greenfield site, in the Greenbelt and development would cause a huge visual impact and loss of trees and habitat. Questions had been raised as to whether there had been sufficient detailed consideration, including other sites and it appeared that there was a huge rush to approve this due to the deadline for Freeport incentives. However, Councillor Thomas stated that the Government was likely to extend the deadline for the tax benefits and that it was more important that the right decision was made rather than making it quickly.

Councillor Thomas stated that ideally approval for the southern site should be deferred so that issues could be addressed; however, to be pragmatic she had suggested two amendments that would at least partly address two of the main issues, with officers being given delegated authority to make those changes, to avoid any long delay in approving the LDO.

The first amendment c) 1. would put weight behind officers' comments that trees would not be removed unless there was very strong justification, for example a giga-factory, which actually required a single huge building.

The second amendment c) 2. related to local roads. Councillor Thomas advised that unless there was a plan to deter traffic from using country roads,



village life would be impacted, with road safety compromised and that would include roads through West and East Leake and spreading much wider. Council was advised that bracketing this problem with the wider issue of congestion at J24 at peak times was not helpful and that due to the location of the site, country roads would be used whether or not the main roads were congested. Currently, the work to study this further, identify mitigation options, and obtain developer contributions would be left far too late and should be brought forward, given that with 7000 jobs expected those trips would materialise and would have an adverse impact at any time of day.

In conclusion, Councillor Thomas asked for support for the two amendments, and suggested that if some members wished to support one but not the other she would be happy for them to be voted on separately.

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

Councillor Upton advised that the Conservative Group would not be supporting the amendment and stated that whilst in theory amendments could be made to the LDO this evening, this was not the time or place to agree policy changes. Considerable time had been taken, many LDF Group meetings held, where significant revisions had been made, and Council was reminded that the LDO could be revised, and any suggestions made this evening should be taken to another meeting of the LDF Group following its approval this evening.

Councillor Clarke stated that the proposed amendment was laudable and agreed with the spirit and sentiment and stated that he was sure that everyone here wanted to protect the environment, trees, and limit traffic impact on local communities; however, as the original LDO had already gone out to public consultation, if the amendments were accepted, it would have to go out to consultation again. Councillor Clarke agreed that it would be more appropriate to submit the suggestions to the LDF Group for consideration and reminded Council that the LDO would be subject to regular reviews. The LDO in essence was an outline planning permission, with further detailed applications for each building coming forward, and at that stage those issues could be addressed, and Councillor Clarke hoped that everything that could be done to protect the environment would be.

Councillor R Mallender, in stating that the Green Group would be supporting the amendment felt that this was the forum to consider suggestions and decide what worked best for local residents, and in this case, given the impact of the site, the wider area, and if this required additional work, then this item should be brought to a future meeting.

In supporting the amendment, Councillor Way referred to the Transport Assessment and considered that it would not be a big issue to bring that forward given the major safety concerns and stated that the main local concerns related to the minor roads in the southern part of the Borough. Councillor Way questioned the comment made by Councillor Upton regarding the extensive consultation and stated that villages in the southern part of the Borough had been systematically ignored, with only one meeting in September 2022, and since then there had been no communication, and although there

was an existing Forum, the southern villages had never been part of that.

Councillor Birch supported the amendment, which he considered both reasonable and sensible, and stated that he agreed with the Freeport and that the LDO was the best way forward to create jobs and welcome innovation; however, not at any cost. There had been a great deal of information to digest since the agenda had been published and this process felt rushed. Councillor Birch was concerned about the significant impact on local villages and stated that it would be better to get it right first before approving it.

Councillor Billin referred to the Arboriculture Report, which detailed several areas of trees through the spine of the southern part of the site that were classified as A1, which meant that they were of value and a potential for habitat and carbon capture, and those would be removed. In respect of traffic, local roads were already used as rat runs, traffic would increase, with mitigation required, and waiting for a traffic study until later was unacceptable. Councillor Billin reiterated that new Councillors had not had the time to digest so much information, the process was being rushed and local residents deserved better.

Councillor Thomas thanked Councillors for their generally supportive comments and stated that although she understood the points raised about taking comments back to the LDF Group, which would be too late, and she had been raising the issue of local roads for the past two years at Group meetings. She advised that the traffic study was already referred to; however, it would not happen until after the first development phase, it would take years, and would be too late, with villages such as West Leake wrecked by the increased traffic. Councillor Thomas disagreed with the figures detailing the percentage of traffic that would use the A453 and stressed the need for an earlier traffic study to take place. In respect of trees on the southern site, although officers had advised that there was no intention to fell those trees unless they had to, it stated in the Arboriculture Report that those trees would be felled. Councillor Thomas confirmed that the Leake Independent Group had no wish to delay the LDO, and the two suggested small amendments would not delay that process.

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

FOR: Councillors J Billin, T Birch, R Bird, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, S Dellar, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, E Georgiou, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Mallender, S Mallender, L Plant, D Polenta, C Thomas, J Walker, and L Way

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

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

The Mayor asked if any Councillor wished to speak to the original motion.

Councillor Brown advised that the Gotham ward had taken a keen interest in

the redevelopment of the site and carefully considered the proposals. Five parish councils had worked collaboratively, with stated objectives that any development should ensure high quality jobs, be minimised to the south of the A453, should consider the Greenbelt, and the cumulative impact on communities. Councillor Brown stated that the LDO provided a framework that met the Council's vision and had allowed community input, both directly and through its elected representatives, and it was noted that this had led to a number of improvements to the LDO. Councillor Brown referred to the pressure from strategic distribution sites both locally and nationally and the potential attractiveness of the site for that use, and whilst the LDO did allocate such development on the northern site, Council was reminded that this could be much higher, if development came via other means. Residents in Gotham were more aware than anyone of the differing land characteristics between the northern and southern sites, together with the importance of the Greenbelt, and the increasing feeling of creeping industrialisation. Councillor Brown stated that it was crucial to his support that the acceptable land use characteristics for development on the southern site would be restricted to advanced manufacturing, decarbonised technology, and renewable and low carbon energy generation. Development on that southern site would be robustly scrutinised through the Certificate of Compliance process and Council was reminded that the LDO had been further improved to ensure that elected members would be involved in this process rather than just officers. In respect of traffic, Councillor Brown acknowledged the impact on local roads, and continued to advocate for further transport impact work to be undertaken and had received reassurance that that would be done.

Councillor Gaunt stated that yet again the Labour Group felt that they were being asked to vote for a proposal, which currently had very limited scope, with future promises being made, and a very quick deadline to make the decision. Councillor Gaunt referred to a previous Council meeting in October 2019, when the Local Plan Part 2 had been considered. At that meeting assurances had been given that all the concerns raised regarding transport and education associated with the hundreds of new houses would be addressed; however, that was not the case, with local villages now suffering the consequences of that decision, which Councillors were told had to be rushed through quickly. Councillor Gaunt expressed concern that Councillors were yet again being asked to vote for something, which made future promises, which he did not believe would be delivered.

Councillor Chewings stated that he was in support of the LDO, but not at any cost, and it was inappropriate to rush through an important policy decision because of the Freeport deadline, as that decision should be taken in a proper, balanced way. Significant concerns had been raised in the consultation regarding the loss of trees and habitat, and traffic impact, with Leicestershire County Council's Highway Authority still objecting and the National Highway Authority only recently removing its objection, based on future plans. Councillor Chewings stated that he disagreed with previous comments that further consultation would be required if the amendments were accepted, as this had not been required previously.

Councillor R Mallender advised that the closure of the power station was a necessary step in moving towards a low carbon future and it was for

Councillors to ensure that the next steps taken were the right ones. Although there was much to commend in the LDO, Councillor Mallender stated that significant areas of concern remained, which required further work, as already highlighted. In respect of biodiversity net gain, Councillor Mallender referred to the report being considered by the Growth and Development Scrutiny Group, which established a clear hierarchy for dealing with this, and as it currently stood, he considered that there was too little emphasis in the LDO on the avoidance of destruction of habitat and the retention of existing biodiversity. Councillor Mallender welcomed the redevelopment of the northern part of the site, including attempts to maintain the rail use; however, further work was required to improve both the access to and within the site. Councillor Mallender stated that he was concerned about the potential governance changes and the potential loss of influence for Rushcliffe going forward, towards a wider combined authority.

Councillor Grocock reiterated that as a new Councillor he also felt that the process had been rushed, and on reviewing the LDO, there appeared to be nothing in the proposal to prevent this site going the same way as many other post-industrial sites. The LDO was passive as it would rely on the market to take advantage of the site's acknowledged strategic advantages and Councillor Grocock considered that the Council had not gone far enough to mandate the appropriate types of usage. In respect of the Freeport deadline, Councillor Grocock questioned if a different, future government would have an alternative approach, and rather than taking this passive approach, the Council should work with all partners and parties to develop a clear and detailed masterplan.

Councillor Combellack stated that the LDO would ensure that the Council retained control of the planning process, it just simplified it, and once the LDO was approved, amendments could still be made to it. Having seen the site, Councillor Combellack felt that considerable thought had been taken regarding the preservation of trees and to the development of additional landscape habitats on the southern site, which she commended. The Council was reminded that the proposal would bring wonderful opportunities for Rushcliffe, and with the window of opportunity currently open, a decision had to be made. As the Chair of Corporate Overview Group, Councillor Combellack confirmed that she would ensure that scrutiny remained active in this area.

Councillor Gowland expressed concern that there was no guarantee of the site having low carbon, high tech, green jobs, and the implications if that happened. She questioned why there were plans to develop the southern site, which did not need to be developed, when there appeared to be empty units on the very large business park at Fairham and stated that it would be more appropriate to spread such development across the Borough, to reduce commuting by car to work.

Councillor Butler stated that difficult decisions had to be made, which at least gave the Council some control, and the LDF Group had been working on this for over 18 months. It was hoped that the significant details in the report would give Council the assurance that appropriate consideration had been given to all of the understandable concerns and to keep delaying things would put both the Council and local communities in a weaker position. In respect of employment, Councillor Butler felt that it was far better to have the LDO in place, rather than

to have no control. Nobody liked to see trees and vegetation lost; however, Councillor Butler stated that he felt assured through the report and meetings he had attended, that any losses would be handled very carefully. In acknowledging concerns raised over transport and traffic issues, Councillor Butler stated that the LDO once passed would still provide flexibility.

Councillor Brennan stated that in her own professional experience, historically the East Midlands had always missed out on large scale government and international investment for varying reasons and continued to do so. Regional Development Agencies had been set up to try and address those issues, unfortunately that hard work and vision had been undermined, most frequently due to local rivalries and parochial interests. Rushcliffe now had the opportunity to help redress that under investment, as the LDO was within the Council's gift to deliver high quality investment and skilled jobs on a site of regional, national, even international significance. Councillor Brennan talked of the opportunity to raise the bar on the type of development and employment that could be attracted to the Borough, and the importance of retaining graduates from the many local universities, together with the substantial Business Rates that could be generated and then reinvested. Talks were already underway with major investors, who required assurance of a clear route to achieve their corporate ambitions, and without that assurance they would invest elsewhere. If the LDO was not approved tonight, what was the future for such an important site, the gateway to the Borough? No Councillor wished to see woodland removed unnecessarily or neighbouring villages blighted by traffic and Councillor Brennan stated that she believed that those objectives could be achieved, whilst also approving the LDO this evening.

Councillor Simms stated that the process had not been rushed, he had attended LDF Group meetings and seen that checks and balances were in place and deadlines must be acknowledged. Everyone at the meeting wanted the best for Rushcliffe and it was important not to let ideology stop the Council from moving forward or think that making a profit was bad. Councillor Simms stated that the LDO needed to be agreed to stop the area missing out on investment, which was going elsewhere.

Councillor Thomas stated that there were many other issues that she could have raised and proposed more changes to the LDO, and all through the process she had made suggestions, which had helped to improve the document, and she would carry on doing that. Councillor Thomas stated that she was disappointed as she believed that her amendments would have given her a way to support the LDO, and that had not happened.

Councillor Parekh stated that the site benefitted from a number of unique characteristics and was distinctively well placed to meet government aspirations to progress the levelling up agenda and to address climate change. Following the planned closure in September 2024, the demolition and clearance of the site would potentially be a very lengthy process, so by accepting the development on the more open areas of the site, not only would the Freeport objectives be met, but an economically active environment would be retained. Council was reminded of other former power station sites around the country, now abandoned and derelict, and Councillor Parekh hoped that by bringing this LDO forward any chance of that happening would be minimised.

Councillor Polenta stated that a priority of local government was not only to implement good policy, it was also to allow Councillors the opportunity to debate, and that was meaningless if a decision had been pre-empted, and this was the place to discuss the amendment. Reference had been made to not voting based on ideology; however, Councillor Polenta felt that this was the case for many this evening and reiterated the importance of making decisions via the democratic process.

Councillor Birch agreed with Councillor Simms that making a profit was good and agreed with Councillor Gaunt's comments about developers not keeping promises and was concerned that this would happen again with the LDO. Councillor Birch stated that whilst being in support of the LDO in principle, and all the benefits it would bring, he could not support the LDO as it stood, not for ideological reasons, or because he was against investment in the region, rather it was because he wanted it to be done properly, with provisions in place to address the concerns raised.

Councillor Clarke referred to the huge investment, the generation of large numbers of highly skilled jobs and stated that the tax free status of the Freeport was important, and should not be put at risk, as that was how investment would come into the area. He reiterated the comments made by Councillor Brennan and reinforced the importance of working together to agree a way forward to attract investment and stated that this was a major opportunity to do that, in conjunction with all parties involved with the Freeport. Council was reminded that it was vital that Rushcliffe had control through the LDO, as without it, investment for high tech development could be lost, and the area would be left with logistics instead. Rushcliffe had an excellent reputation, and that would encourage investment, which would bring profit, and in turn wealth and better standards of living. Councillor Clarke reiterated that work on the LDO had been ongoing for over two years, and whilst ensuring that communities were protected, and all factors were considered, a decision needed to be made.

Councillor Upton reiterated the importance of the report and decision to be taken and noted comments made, including a reference to the consultation undertaken and referred to Appendix 7, the Statement of Community Involvement, which detailed the extensive consultation undertaken and listed the many comments received. Councillor Upton confirmed that the site owners, Uniper had worked collaboratively with the Council and through this LDO the Council would have control, for example to prohibit logistics on the southern site. Council was reminded that the Freeport had been signed off and would go ahead, including the redevelopment of the power station, and Councillor Upton stated that it was far better for the Council to be able to control what was built on the site. Concerns had been raised about a lack of democratic control; however, the process for dealing with Certificates of Compliance had been revised and enhanced, with final decisions being made by the Planning Committee. Councillor Upton questioned comments made regarding insufficient detail, and referred to the 400 plus pages of appendices, which he considered more than adequate and questioned the notion that the government might extend the deadline for Freeport benefits from September 2026, as there was no indication of that. Council was reminded that the reference to the giga-factory was simply an artist's impression of what would be

a worst case scenario, with actual detailed applications considered by officers and Councillors in the future. Councillor Upton reiterated that in respect of traffic, Phase 1 was all that was being immediately considered, and as the power station decommissioned and lost employment, the number of vehicle movements overall would not increase, and he agreed that he would not wish to see major development affecting local roads.

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 Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, A Edyvean, S Ellis, E Georgiou, R Inglis, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, R Upton, D Viridi, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler, and G Williams

AGAINST: Councillors T Birch, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, S Dellar, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Mallender, S Mallender, L Plant, D Polenta, C Thomas, and J Walker

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors J Billin and L Way

On being put to the vote, the motion was carried, and it was **RESOLVED** that

- a) the consultation representations received on the draft Local Development Order be noted;
- b) the environmental information and the conclusions reached on the significant effects of the proposed development on the environment as required by Regulation 26(1) of the Town and Country Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (as amended) be noted;
- c) the Ratcliffe on Soar Local Development Order documents and supporting documents be endorsed; and
- d) the Ratcliffe on Soar Local Development Order be adopted in accordance with Schedule 4A(3) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended).

Councillors Barney and R Walker returned to their seats.

Councillor Gowland referred to Item 13 Motion a) and advised that as she had been made aware that an amendment would be submitted to amend key words in the motion, she would withdraw the motion, and bring a motion back in September, hopefully following negotiations with the administration.

## 22 **Revisions to the Council's Constitution**

The Leader and Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough-wide Leadership, Councillor Clarke presented the report of the Monitoring Officer outlining proposed revisions to the Council's Constitution.

Councillor Clarke explained that this was an administrative item proposing updates relating to changes within the Council following the May 2023 elections, staffing changes and other procedural amendments, which had been proposed to further clarify the Council's operating procedures. The Leader highlighted that the Constitution was a living document that was reviewed annually by Governance Scrutiny Group and changes were constantly being made to reflect changes in legislation, operation procedures and best practice.

Council noted that this year's changes had been considered by the Governance Scrutiny Group at its meeting on 29 June 2023, and Councillor Clarke thanked the Group for their deliberations. Whilst many of the proposed changes had been discussed and agreed, it was clear from the meeting that more time was required to consider detailed changes to the way Planning Committee operated, particularly the rules around the closure of that meeting. Therefore, a further opportunity would be taken to review those changes in more detail at the September Governance Scrutiny Group meeting before an additional report was brought back to Council.

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

Councillor J Walker thanked officers for the work they had undertaken on updating this complex document and welcomed the return of Planning Committee to the evening as this made it easier for both Councillors and members of the public to attend. Councillor Walker also welcomed the use of more modern, inclusive language giving Councillors the choice of Chair or Chairman when undertaking this role.

Councillor Calvert brought Council's attention to paragraph 3.3 of the report, which highlighted the intention to take changes proposed to the way Planning Committee operated back to the next Governance Scrutiny Group in September. He asked if an additional matter could be considered by the Group relating to the circumstances under which an application was considered by the Planning Committee. Councillor Calvert went on to appraise Council of an application in Keyworth recently approved under delegated powers in which the community had put forward significant objections but, as Ward Councillors had agreed with the planning officer recommendation, the opportunity for members of the public to outline their concerns to the Committee had been removed. Councillor Calvert called this a democratic deficit and a fundamental flaw in the arrangements for Planning Committee, which gave the impression that the application had not been considered openly or transparently.

Councillor Butler outlined, for the benefit of new Councillors, the reasons behind moving Planning Committee to its current afternoon slot but said that he was very supportive of a move back to 6pm. He also commented on the change of language in the Constitution and, whilst he was happy to be called Chairman, he appreciated that people now had a choice of language to use.

Councillor R Mallender thanked officers for putting forward such an extensive set of proposals and sought clarification on the requirement to submit comments on planning applications in writing, as he presumed this also meant by email.



Councillor Thomas appreciated that the proposals relating to Planning Committee were expected to return to Governance Scrutiny Group for further discussion but wished to point out that having no closure time for Planning Committee would separate it from every other committee the Council had and a cut off time was required.

Councillor Edyvean reassured Council that the finish time of Planning Committee had been considered by Governance Scrutiny Group, which had concluded that it would be for the Chairman of Planning Committee to manage the agenda appropriately.

Councillor S Mallender thanked officers for bringing the report forward and members of the Governance Scrutiny Group for reviewing the changes. She was pleased to see the change from Chairman to Chair throughout the document and welcomed the change in time for the Planning Committee, which would make it much easier for Councillors and members of the public to attend the Committee.

Councillor Way asked that Governance Scrutiny Group consider including neighbouring Ward Councillors when consulting on the Certificates of Compliance for the Local Development Order, as there might be times when a neighbouring ward was equally, or more, impacted on than the ward in which the development was taking place.

In summing up, Councillor Brennan reiterated that the Constitution was a living document, and it would continue to be updated to keep it relevant and ensure it maintained efficient and effective governance arrangements for the Council.

Councillor Clarke took the opportunity to address a number of points made by Councillors during the debate and encouraged those who had additional ideas to bring them forward to Governance Scrutiny Group for debate.

It was **RESOLVED** that the proposed revisions to the Constitution be adopted.

## 23 **LGA Debate Not Hate Campaign**

The Cabinet Portfolio Holder for Transformation, Leisure, and Wellbeing, Councillor J Wheeler, presented the report of the Monitoring Officer outlining the importance of the LGA Debate Not Hate campaign.

He went on to call upon Council to support the campaign, highlighting the unfortunate reality that too many Councillors received abuse whilst simply doing their job and acknowledged that everyone was entitled to their own views but recognised that those could be shared respectfully. He reminded Council about what happened if hate went unchecked and referred to the tragic deaths of MPs Jo Cox and Sir David Amess.

Councillor Inglis seconded the recommendation and informed Council that hate included everything from murder to snide comments in person or on social media. Derogatory comments could have a significant impact on an individual's mental well-being and the LGA campaign was an excellent step

forward in addressing unacceptable behaviour. Councillor Inglis called upon Councillors to take care when carrying out their duties especially if they were doing so alone.

Councillor Chaplain noted that Rushcliffe residents were predominately well mannered and respectful, but that this did not mean that the campaign was any less important here. She recognised that the debate in the Chamber this evening had covered very wide ranging views, but everyone had participated respectfully, and she encouraged her fellow Councillors to report any abuse experienced and get support.

Councillor S Mallender thanked the Monitoring Officer for bringing the campaign to Council's attention and hoped that all Councillors would support the recommendation to show that the abuse seen elsewhere had no place in Rushcliffe.

Councillor J Wheeler thanked Councillors for their support and reiterated that Councillors should be able to speak in the Chamber without fear and concluded by stressing that the Council was signing up to the campaign in support of Councillors here and across the country to show that hate would not be tolerated.

Councillor Brennan requested that a recorded vote be taken.

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

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

It was **RESOLVED** that the LGA campaign be endorsed and supported by signing the online Debate not Hate public statement.

## 24 Notices of Motion

The Mayor announced that unless the meeting was extended, there would not be enough time for the motion, and she suggested that the meeting moved to Item 14 Questions from Councillors.

Councillor Gaunt proposed that a vote to be taken to decide if the meeting should be extended and that was seconded by Councillor J Walker.

It was **RESOLVED** that the meeting be extended and would finish no later than 10.30pm.

The Mayor advised that in the interest of trying to complete this item, she

considered it appropriate to reduce the time for speeches from 10 minutes to five minutes for the mover of the motion, and three minutes for all other speeches.

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

“We propose that Rushcliffe Borough Council commits to implementing a comprehensive feasibility study into kerbside glass collection program for the residents of Rushcliffe Borough. This motion aims to promote environmental sustainability, reduce landfill waste, and encourage responsible waste management practices.

Rushcliffe Borough Council resolves to:

Evaluate the practical needs, expenses, and potential effects of introducing kerbside glass collection in Rushcliffe. This will be undertaken by a feasibility study overseen by the relevant Scrutiny group. The feasibility study has a target to present its findings to Cabinet by December 2023 for a decision to be made in time for the 2024/2025 budget.

The feasibility study in its entirety will be shared with the full council on being completed.”

In moving the motion, Councillor Chewings informed Council that this was an important issue, integral to the welfare of the Borough and society’s environmental future, as it embraced a more sustainable approach to life, and until now the urgent issue of introducing kerbside glass collection was waiting for Rushcliffe to address. Councillor Chewings called for change and demanded transparency moving forward, with glass often treated as a disposable entity, which was unacceptable. He stated that the current system, which merged glass waste and general household refuse was not just wasteful but an unfulfilled opportunity and questioned how burying or incinerating such a precious resource could be allowed, when that squandered natural resources and placed an undue strain on waste facilities. Councillor Chewings referred to the benefits of kerbside collection, including; promoting environmental sustainability, reducing the amount of waste sent to landfills, allowing glass to be effectively recycled into new products, the further growth of the recycling industry, together with potential long term financial savings with the reduction of waste management costs, and finally encouraging community engagement and empowering individuals to contribute to a more sustainable future.

Councillor Chewings referred to comments made by the previous Leader of the Council at the Council meeting in March committing Rushcliffe to remaining the number one authority for recycling in the county and questioned how this authority could claim to be the best when it was failing to collect and recycle such a common material, and that it was time to act and make a difference.

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

Councillor Inglis stated that all Councils shared the same frustrations over the time taken by the government to determine the details of the Environment Act,

and assured Council that work was already well underway to research the potential implications of what this motion proposed, and Councillor Inglis proposed an amendment to the motion to reflect that situation as follows:

“Rushcliffe Borough Council resolves to:

Work in partnership with the Nottinghamshire Joint Waste Management Committee (JWMC) to continue the study, which commenced in 2022 to evaluate the practical needs, expenses, and potential effects of introducing kerbside glass collection in Rushcliffe, subject to the implications and requirements of the Environment Act.

Any proposals from the JWMC study will be taken through the Council’s normal decision making and budget setting process before any implementations.”

Councillor Inglis confirmed that Rushcliffe already operated a very successful glass recycling scheme, which had drawn recent praise from the Joint Waste Management Committee (JWMC). The bring site scheme collected nearly 2,500 tons of colour separated glass each year, which was comparable to many other locally operated kerbside schemes, and that glass was recycled into new glass. The Council received an income from it, which helped to support the service in the form of recycling credits from the County Council of £200k and £30k for the sale of the glass. In respect of a Feasibility Study, Councillor Inglis confirmed that work was already underway with the JWMC, in conjunction with other Nottinghamshire councils, to prepare for the requirements of the Environment Act. Council noted that it was vital that this work was done through this forum to ensure a consistent approach, and if the Council was to move to kerbside collection, in advance of the Environment Act, a number of significant, negative impacts would arise, including substantial additional vehicle and staffing costs, no further government funding and loss of its current income. It was therefore important that officers continued to work with colleagues across the county to plan for the major changes proposed by the Act and residents were encouraged to continue using the excellent bring site network across the Borough.

Councillor Thomas raised a Point of Order and questioned if this was an acceptable amendment, as it completely changed the motion.

Councillor J Wheeler seconding the amendment to the motion and reserved the right to speak.

Councillor Chewings stated that he did not accept the amendment.

Councillor Clarke sought clarification regarding the Point of Order raised by Councillor Thomas and asked for confirmation that the amendment had been accepted by the Monitoring Officer. The Mayor confirmed that it had been accepted.

Councillor Chewings informed Council that he would be speaking against the amendment, as his motion wanted to change things that so far Rushcliffe had failed to do, and he went on to refer to numerous local councils in the county that ran successful kerbside glass collection. Council was reminded that this

issue had been previously discussed at Cabinet in December 2021, when Councillor Inglis had stated that he hoped for national clarity in the New Year, and yet it was now 2023, and Councillor Chewings asked if the Council had the vision to put society first and protect the environment. He concluded by stating that his motion simply asked for a business case to present options and could not understand why this was not acceptable.

Councillor Ellis advised that in his experience kerbside collection would be a retrograde step, with more material going to landfill compared to the current excellent scheme in Rushcliffe.

Councillor Simms stated that it was his understanding that glass recycling was not beneficial to the environment, as it was better to reuse rather than recycle, as happened in Germany. Council was reminded that kerbside collection was not new, and it was more expensive, Rushcliffe spent money carefully, and that was why it had the lowest Council Tax in the county. Councillor Simms felt that the bring site scheme also encouraged people to walk and keep fit and he did not think kerbside collection was forward thinking.

Councillor Grocock stated that both the original and amended motions talked about investigations and sought assurance that the scrutiny and level of investigation that the original motion was proposing would be assured through the amended motion.

Councillor Gowland confirmed that it was more efficient to recycle glass than throw it away, although it would be far better to reuse it.

Councillor S Mallender stated that she agreed with the original motion, whilst acknowledging that collecting glass as part of a single bin was not good, as it increased landfill, as the glass was not recycled, rather it was made into road surfacing. She agreed that reusing glass was far better and recycling glass into glass was to be encouraged, as it could continually be recycled and helped to cut water and air pollution. Councillor Mallender stated that she was concerned about the reference to budget setting and that it would be too expensive, and she agreed that there should be a Feasibility Study and called for glass to be sorted on the doorstep.

Councillor Birch advised that recycling glass consumed 40% less energy than producing new glass and stated that it was often difficult for the elderly and disabled to get to the recycling centres and considered that kerbside collection would improve the quality of life for many residents. He also questioned the assumption that most glass went into landfill. Councillor Birch stated that the motion was sensible, better for residents and did not commit to anything, whilst the amendment would mean that the Council would lose control and given the Council's record of failure with bringing this forward, he considered that it was time for kerbside collection to be implemented, as most other councils already offered this service.

Councillor Combellack expressed concern regarding anti-social behaviour (ASB) and the potential for glass to be used as a weapon if it was collected at the kerbside.

Councillor R Walker stated that he was in favour of glass recycling; however, not at any cost, the process should not be rushed, more time was required, and the amendment proposed that.

Councillor Clarke stated that kerbside collection was very expensive and hence the amendment talked about the implications and requirements of the Environment Act because it would be important to know what costs the Council would be committed to. It was noted that the councils previously referred to had various collection schemes, which resulted in glass being treated in different ways, which was why the Council had a bottle bank system, with separated glass, which could be sold. In answer to Councillor Grocock's question regarding assurance, Councillor Clarke confirmed that benefits and costs could be considered by the Communities Scrutiny Group. Concerns had been raised about ASB and safety issues with broken glass on pavements, and all that had to be considered, and Councillor Clarke stated that principally the cost had to be considered, as councils with kerbside collection did have much higher Council Tax.

Councillor Butler agreed that there were many bottle banks in the Borough, which were split to collect different coloured glass and they were well used. He assured Councillors that the amended motion would take the situation seriously and that Rushcliffe had a very good reputation in respect of recycling.

Councillor Chewings requested a recorded vote on the amendment.

Councillor J Wheeler felt that everyone agreed that there should be more recycling and that the key issue was how that was done, and the reasoning behind the amendment was that work had already started with the JWMC, and if Rushcliffe was to move to kerbside collection, then the County Council would be responsible for glass disposal. It was therefore vital that Rushcliffe worked with its partners, including the County Council to ensure that all options were considered, and any proposals would then go through the Council's scrutiny and decision making process and Council was reminded that although other councils did have kerbside collections, their recycling rates were lower than Rushcliffe.

Councillor Inglis reiterated that everyone was waiting for the Environment Act and the huge impact that would have on recycling with associated implications and stated that Rushcliffe had to work with its partners. Councillor Inglis hoped that a decision would come soon, potentially post September and advised that he was pushing to achieve this and once that decision had been made, Rushcliffe and its partners would be ready. It was not sensible for a prudent Council like Rushcliffe to start spending money on a different scheme before the government decision was made, and the Feasibility Study was already in place.

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

FOR: Councillors M Barney, J Billin, R Bird, A Brennan, A Brown, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, S Dellar, A Edyvean, S Ellis, E Georgiou, R

Inglis, D Mason, P Matthews, H Om, H Parekh, A Phillips, N Regan, D Simms, D Soloman, R Upton, D Viridi, R Walker, L Way, T Wells, G Wheeler, J Wheeler, and G Williams

AGAINST: Councillors T Birch, S Calvert, J Chaplain, K Chewings, G Fletcher, M Gaunt, P Gowland, C Grocock, R Mallender, S Mallender, L Plant, D Polenta, C Thomas, and J Walker.

The amended motion was carried and became the substantive motion.

Councillor R Mallender spoke on the substantive motion and stated that the Green Group would be supporting this, as it did want something taken forward, with residents wanting to see improvements to glass recycling and reference was made to the many times this issue had been raised. Councillor Mallender referred to the importance of separating glass, as mixed glass was crushed and used for road surfacing, which did not help with carbon reduction, or improve overall recycling rates. Council was reminded that as yet no regulations had been put in place for the Environment Act; however, it was important that the Council made a statement of intent that it wanted to see proper kerbside glass collection to allow it to be recycled. Councillor Mallender agreed that re-use was better and referred to the opportunities to do that, which should be supported.

Councillor Inglis concluded by reiterating that Rushcliffe wanted to be the best at recycling and that was the aim, and by working through the JWMC that would be achieved going forward.

No further Councillors wished to speak so the substantive motion was put to the vote and carried.

## 25 **Adjournment**

The Mayor announced that as it was nearly 10.30pm, the meeting would conclude, and the remaining item would be carried forward to the next meeting of Council in September 2023. 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 10.27pm and the remaining item was adjourned to the next Council meeting in September 2023.

The meeting closed at 10.27 pm.

CHAIR