



**MINUTES  
OF THE MEETING OF THE  
COUNCIL**

**THURSDAY, 5 MARCH 2020**

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

**PRESENT:**

Councillors Mrs C Jeffreys (Chairman), S Mallender (Vice-Chairman), R Adair, S Bailey, B Bansal, K Beardsall, N Begum, A Brennan, B Buschman, R Butler, N Clarke, T Combellack, J Cottee, G Dickman, A Edyvean, M Gaunt, P Gowland, B Gray, L Healy, R Hetherington, L Howitt, R Inglis, R Jones, A Major, R Mallender, D Mason, G Moore, 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

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:**

15 members of the public

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:**

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

**APOLOGIES:**

Councillors J Murray

**48 Declarations of Interest**

The Chief Executive declared an interest in Item 8 and advised that she would leave the room during the debate on this item.

**49 Minutes of the meeting 5 December 2019**

The minutes of the meeting held on Thursday, 5 December 2019 were approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

**50 Mayor's Announcements**

The Mayor informed Councillors that, despite problems with road closures and

many guests being delayed, her Civic Dinner had been a success this year and she thanked everyone involved in its organisation. She reported that she had been to many enjoyable events and met many people but given the magnitude of the evening's business she would not elaborate further on those events; however, she did encourage her fellow Councillors to join her on Monday morning at the Arena for the raising of the Commonwealth Flag.

#### **51 Leader's Announcements**

The Leader thanked officers for their hard work and dedication during the recent flooding. Along with Ward Councillors, it had been wonderful to see the community spirit of officers from Rushcliffe and the County Council helping members of the community protect their properties and businesses.

The Leader also announced the launch of 'Reach', a new project to target loneliness in the Borough, and informed Council of the excellent progress that was being made to bring the civilian side of the DNRC at Stanford Hall to fruition.

The Leader also personally thanked the Mayor for hosting an exceptional Civic Dinner.

#### **52 Chief Executive's Announcements**

The Chief Executive informed Council of the work officers were undertaking to support Public Health England to protect the public against Coronavirus – Covid-19 – including sharing the national action plan with Councillors via email today. Officers were also reviewing business continuity plans to take into account potential staff shortages due to illness and caring responsibilities; should this situation arise then essential services including refuse collection and benefit payments would be prioritised. Weekly regional meetings were being attended and the Chief Executive assured Councillors they would be kept informed.

#### **53 Citizens' Questions**

A Citizens' Question was received from Mr Steve Cook who asked his question in person:

"Following the invitation from the Council for Expressions of Interest regarding Lutterell Hall, will the Council be considering the Partnership Proposal submitted by the Friends of Lutterell Hall which was delivered to Kath Marriott and subsequently circulated to all Councillors by email?"

Councillor Edyvean confirmed that on 6 September 2019, the Council had issued a press release inviting expressions of interest from groups and organisations interested in the management of Lutterell Hall, with a closing date for applications of 29 November 2019. Interviews were subsequently held on 15 January 2020. On 16 January 2020, the Council received a document from the Friends of Lutterell Hall, 'Vision for Lutterell Hall'. As that document was received seven weeks after the closing date, it was not considered as a formal expression of interest.

A Citizens' Question was received from Mr Simon Middlecote who asked his question in person:

"We assume the Council are aware of the affection that the people of WB have for the former Pumping Station on the Abbey Road Depot site and the growing calls for it to be retained as part of the proposed development of the site? In light of this, as well as the recent research which has been undertaken by local residents into the history of the site, can the Council tell us what they understand to be its historical significance to the development of the town?"

Councillor Edyvean confirmed that the Council acknowledged the local interest and history of the building to people in West Bridgford. To reflect the history of the building, the Council had prepared an extensive Building Record, which included photographs and plans. Plans that had recently been shared with the Council by a local resident would also be incorporated with the report to provide an essential record of the building.

#### 54 **Appointment of the Chief Executive**

*Having declared an interest, the Chief Executive left the room.*

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented his report concerning the appointment of the Chief Executive.

Councillor Robinson referred to the appointment last year of Katherine Marriott as interim Chief Executive following the retirement of Allen Graham and reiterated the importance of continuity and sustainability within the Council. Since being appointed, Katherine Marriott's professionalism and commitment had been exemplary and all held her in very high regard. To ensure continuity going forward and the future progression of the Council, an Interviewing Committee had been convened to consider the formal recruitment process, and following a rigorous process, it had agreed unanimously by the Committee that the appointment of Katherine Marriott to the role be recommended to Council.

Councillor Robinson referred to the forthcoming retirement of the Strategic Human Resources Manager, Juli Hicks, and thanked her on behalf of the Council for her dedication and professionalism over the years, and wished her a happy retirement.

The report was moved by Councillor Robinson.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Mason reiterated the previous comments regarding the Chief Executive and the Strategic Human Resources Manager and stated that she looked forward to continuing working with Mrs Marriott and wished Juli Hicks a happy retirement.

Councillor Begum referred to Katherine Marriott's impressive presentation and interview at that the Interviewing Committee, and welcomed her appointment.

Councillor R Mallender confirmed that the Green Group was happy to support the appointment.

Councillor Way confirmed that the Independent Group was happy to support the recommendation and thanked Katherine Marriott for her hard work and looked forward to working with her in the future.

It was **RESOLVED** that Katherine Marriott be permanently appointed to the role of Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service with immediate effect.

*The Chief Executive returned to the meeting.*

#### 55 **Leave of Absence for Councillor Murray**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Monitoring Officer concerning a leave of absence for Councillor Jenny Murray.

Councillor Robinson stated that this item had been brought to Council as Councillor Jenny Murray was currently unwell; he sent his best wishes to her on behalf of the Council.

The report was moved by Councillor Robinson.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Gray referred to the importance of caring for a person's physical and mental wellbeing. He reported that Councillor Murray was hoping to be able to return to her role soon and he would pass on the Council's best wishes to her.

It was **RESOLVED** that, having regard to the circumstances of the absence of Councillor Jenny Murray from Council meetings, the requirements of Section 85 (1) of the Local Government Act 1972 for a period of up to 6 months from 19 March – 19 September 2020 be waived and for payment of the Councillor allowance to continue for the duration of the authorised absence.

#### 56 **Financial Strategy and Budget 2020/21**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services that outlined the Council's Financial Strategy and Budget for 2020/21.

Councillor Robinson stated that, over the last few years, the Budget report had been accompanied with news of financial struggles and difficulties, but this year was different. With a strong majority government and having finally left the EU, the situation was looking more stable, the threat of Coronavirus notwithstanding. The Budget funded the delivery of the Council's Corporate Strategy including enhancements to residents' Quality of Life, the sustainability of developments in the Borough, the efficiency of Council services, and the Council's new environmental priority; with those priorities clearly reflected in the Budget.

A number of current uncertainties for the Council were highlighted including: the level of business rates; the future uncertainty of Ratcliffe on Soar power station; potential changes in the future to the distribution of the New Homes

Bonus; and the Fairer Funding Review being further delayed by central Government.

Councillor Robinson referred to the choices, which had to be made by Council every year and stated that he was proud to report that year on year Rushcliffe had made brave and courageous decisions, which aimed to deliver the best outcomes to residents to the Borough. Councillors formed part of that process through their involvement in the annual Budget workshops where officers worked hard to present very complex decisions as simply as possible. This year Councillors had chosen to: freeze car parking charges across the Borough to boost business growth in towns and villages; increase the green bin charge by £5 for the first time in three years; and increased the Council Tax by 3.59%; maintaining it as the least expensive in the County and remaining in the lowest quartile nationally.

Councillors were reminded that the Council was financially self-sustaining because of choices made in line with the central Government reduction in Revenue Support Grant. Over the period of the current Medium Term Financial Strategy, the income received by the Council each year had risen to over £2million and this was set to continue funding: activities for young people via the Positive Futures Programme; the new Customer Contact Centre in West Bridgford; and additional affordable housing across the Borough including at Abbey Road.

Councillor Robinson drew Council's attention to the ambitious Capital Programme contained within the Budget. In order to fund the programme and deliver on the Council's ambitions it was now considered prudent and appropriate to look at external borrowing of up to £10million to support a Capital Programme of £35million to deliver: the Bingham Hub containing office and leisure facilities and a community hall; a crematorium in Stragglethorpe; and enhancing the Borough's community assets including; parks, existing leisure centres and community buildings. It was also noted that the Budget was not just about money but could also be used to drive behavioural change and the £1million investment in a Climate Change Fund was highlighted.

In conclusion, Councillor Robinson drew Council's attention to the new Transformation Strategy for 2020-25, which aimed to deliver £4.8million of savings to the Council and reminded Councillors that the Council still retained significant reserves of £5.5million to deal with unforeseen occurrences such as the recent flooding within the Borough and any action the Council might need to take as a result of the Coronavirus. He thanked officers for their hard work in bringing the Budget to Council for approval.

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

Councillor Gray reported that the Budget had been the subject of much debate within the Labour Group and there was much to celebrate within the Budget, including: the Bingham Hub; improvements to Lutterell Hall; remedial works at both Keyworth and Cotgrave Leisure Centres; improvements at Gresham Pavilion; and the £1million dedicated Climate Change Fund. The Labour Group had appreciated the time and effort both officers and Councillor Moore had taken to help them understand such a complex document. However, it would

have been preferable to see a more ambitious affordable homes programme to increase the availability of social housing within the Borough and it was inappropriate to pass the cost of funding the Council's ambitions on to residents through the maximum Council Tax increase the Council could impose.

Councillor Jones thanked officers for their hard work on setting the Budget and confirmed that his Group welcomed the £1million Climate Change Fund. It would have been preferable to see a phasing of the Capital Programme rather than a reliance on external borrowing to protect the Council from risks including the currently unknown impact of Brexit, the loss of the power station, and a possible pandemic. Funding for Bingham Leisure Centre was welcomed, and the positive environmental impact this development would have, including the associated office space. As with the crematorium, those initiatives would result in future income for the Council. However, the Cabinet was urged to reconsider external borrowing to fund the Capital Programme.

Councillor Richard Mallender thanked officers for their excellent work in preparing Council over the last few years for the difficult decisions a lack of Revenue Support Grant would lead to. Investment for the Bingham Hub, crematorium, and repairs to Lutterell Hall were welcomed and it was particularly pleasing to see the £1million Climate Change Fund.

Councillor Thomas thanked officers for their professional expertise in presenting a clear and interesting Budget. It was a concern that the West Bridgford Special Expense was not increasing, despite many of the Borough's outlying towns and villages increasing their precept. The number of costly improvements to West Bridgford facilities in the Capital Programme, which did not appear to be funded by the Special Expense was highlighted and it was questioned whether those were being subsidised by the rest of the Borough. It was hoped in the future some ambitious projects in the towns and villages south of the Borough would be considered.

Councillor Moore responded to a number of questions raised by Councillors and reminded them that the first meeting of the West Bridgford Special Expenses Working Group would be held on in a few weeks. This year there had been a lower attendance at the Budget Workshops and Councillors were encouraged to take advantage of the opportunity to influence the Budget in future years. He thanked officers for their hard work in producing this substantial budget.

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 Hetherington, L Howitt, R Inglis, R Jones, A Major, R Mallender, D Mason, G Moore, 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, Mrs C Jeffreys, S Mallender, 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 2020/21 to 2024/25 (Annex B) including the Transformation Strategy and Efficiency Statement (Appendix 3) to deliver efficiencies over the five-year period be approved;
- c) the Capital Programme as set out in Appendix 4 be adopted;
- d) the Capital and Investment Strategy at Appendix 5 be adopted;
- e) the Rushcliffe's 2020/21 Council Tax for a Band D property at £142.74 (increase from 2019/20 of £4.95 or 3.59%) be set;
- f) the Special Expenses for West Bridgford, Ruddington and Keyworth, Appendix 1, resulting in the following Band D Council tax levels for the Special Expense Areas:
  - i) West Bridgford £48.51 (£48.51 in 2019/20);
  - ii) Keyworth £3.76 (£1.60 in 2019/20); and
  - iii) Ruddington £4.12 (£3.37 in 2019/20) be set;
- g) with regards to 2e) and 2f), the associated Bands in accordance with the formula in section 36(1) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 be set; and
- h) the 2020/21 Pay Policy as detailed at Annex B, Appendix 7 be adopted.

## 57 **Council Tax 2020/21**

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic and Borough Wide Leadership, Councillor Robinson presented the report of the Executive Manager – Finance and Corporate Services that outlined the Council's position on Council Tax for the year 2020/21.

Councillor Robinson confirmed that this was a statutory item to approve the Council Tax for 2020/21 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. This Council Tax remained the lowest in Nottinghamshire and within the lowest quartile nationally.

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

Councillor Jen Walker stated that there was an irony that later in the evening,

the Council would be considering a Motion to request Government funding for the East Midlands, whilst at the same meeting, Council would be approving the raising of Council Tax. The Labour Group would not be supporting the recommendation as the tax was levied on a notional value that had no relation to household income or the market value of the property, with the poorest percentage of the population proportionately paying significantly higher than the wealthiest. The proposed increase would place an excessive burden on working people. For the last 10 years, locally wages had been depressed, and due to austerity and cuts from central Government, privatisation and uncertainty, the Council had no other option but to increase Council Tax to protect itself from an uncertain future. Officers were thanked for their hard work in drafting the report and it was hoped that the requested investment from central Government would be received soon, albeit 10 years too late.

Councillor Jones stated that it was a concern that the central Government Revenue Support Grant had been removed, the upper levels of Council Tax had not been increased and public services were reduced to the bare minimum. However, recognising that situation, reluctantly, the Liberal Democrat Group would support the recommendation.

Councillor Richard Mallender referred to the removal of the Revenue Support Grant, which affected everyone. Council Tax was not an ideal way to address the needs of local authorities and communities and alternative ways of financing local authorities should be investigated; however, given the current situation, the Green Group would be supporting the recommendation.

Councillor Clarke advised that it was a statutory requirement to set a Council Tax and if the Council failed to do so, it would be breaking the law.

Councillor Moore reiterated that the Council had to set a Council Tax and the proposed increase of £4.95 per year was relatively small.

Councillor Simms referred to the popularity of the Borough and the high number of people who wished to live in Rushcliffe. Employment was very high nationally, there was support from families on low wages and the Council had to raise money through its Council Tax.

Councillor Purdue-Horan stated that as part of the budget process, the current Police and Crime Commissioner, Mr Paddy Tipping, had taken the opportunity to maximise the increase allowed under the Government rules. Councillor Purdue-Horan would support Councillor Jen Walker, if she joined with him and others to ask the Police and Crime Commissioner to maximise resources in Rushcliffe, as currently residents were paying the highest amounts after Nottingham City Council itself. With crime recently on the rise, it was uncertain if Rushcliffe Council Tax payers were receiving the best value for money.

Councillor Butler stated that Council Tax had to be set and this Council continued to perform well.

Councillor Gaunt stated that although it was an affluent Borough there were many residents in Rushcliffe living on low wages with several jobs to make ends meet. The Labour Group would not be voting against the setting of a Council Tax, it would be voting against the proposed increase.



Councillor Thomas stated that residents enjoyed the services that Council Tax paid for and it was uncertain why the Council was so content to have its Council Tax in the lowest quartile.

Councillor Robinson stated that the administration was very proud of its achievements for the authority. It was a legal requirement to set a Council Tax and if it was not increased, it would inevitably lead to cuts in services and redundancies. Residents in Rushcliffe were wealthier than they have ever been before and the Council was proud to have its Council Tax within the lowest quartile nationally.

It was **RESOLVED** that the Council Tax Resolution for 2020/21 as detailed at Appendix A be approved.

**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	95.16	1,023.30	152.88	54.24	<b>1,325.58</b>
B	111.02	1,193.85	178.36	63.28	<b>1,546.51</b>
C	126.88	1,364.40	203.84	72.32	<b>1,767.44</b>
<b>D</b>	<b>142.74</b>	<b>1,534.95</b>	<b>229.32</b>	<b>81.36</b>	<b>1,988.37</b>
E	174.46	1,876.05	280.28	99.44	<b>2,430.23</b>
F	206.18	2,217.15	331.24	117.52	<b>2,872.09</b>
G	237.90	2,558.25	382.20	135.60	<b>3,313.95</b>
H	285.48	3,069.90	458.64	162.72	<b>3,976.74</b>

## Appendix A (i)

## Council Tax to be Levied Within the Borough for the Year Ending 31 March 2021

2020/21 PARISH/AREA	TAX BASE	PRECEPT	SPECIAL CHARGES	TAX RATE PARISH AREA	MAJOR PRECEPTS	COUNCIL TAX BAND D
ASLOCKTON	430.5	11,905		27.65	1,988.37	2,016.02
BARTON-IN-FABIS	210.1	5,446		25.92	1,988.37	2,014.29
BINGHAM	3,612.3	300,265		83.12	1,988.37	2,071.49
BRADMORE	168.6	3,122		18.52	1,988.37	2,006.89
BUNNY	293.7	21,900		74.57	1,988.37	2,062.94
CAR COLSTON	84.2	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
CLIPSTON	31.1	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
COLSTON BASSETT	125.6	11,220		89.33	1,988.37	2,077.70
COSTOCK	299.4	19,500		65.13	1,988.37	2,053.50
COTGRAVE	2,418.5	228,966		94.67	1,988.37	2,083.04
CROPWELL BISHOP	656.0	95,751		145.96	1,988.37	2,134.33
CROPWELL BUTLER	337.8	12,420		36.77	1,988.37	2,025.14
EAST BRIDGFORD	848.5	41,150		48.50	1,988.37	2,036.87
EAST LEAKE	3,180.3	312,384		98.22	1,988.37	2,086.59
ELTON-ON-THE-HILL	45.8	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
FLAWBOROUGH	26.9	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
FLINTHAM	220.4	14,600		66.24	1,988.37	2,054.61
GOTHAM	613.1	38,146		62.22	1,988.37	2,050.59
GRANBY-CUM-SUTTON	176.7	10,266		58.10	1,988.37	2,046.47
HAWKSWORTH	66.9	10,400		155.46	1,988.37	2,143.83
HICKLING	252.6	7,821		30.96	1,988.37	2,019.33
HOLME PIERREPONT & GAMSTON	1,085.7	37,250		34.31	1,988.37	2,022.68
KEYWORTH	2,689.7	180,350	10,100	70.81	1,988.37	2,059.18
KINGSTON-ON-SOAR	136.5	4,400		32.23	1,988.37	2,020.60
KINOULTON	422.7	6,500		15.38	1,988.37	2,003.75
KNEETON	22.7	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
LANGAR-CUM-BARNSTONE	356.0	38,794		108.97	1,988.37	2,097.34
NEWTON	322.9	19,300		59.77	1,988.37	2,048.14
NORMANTON-ON-SOAR	187.5	13,865		73.95	1,988.37	2,062.32
NORMANTON-ON-THE-WOLDS	154.8	8,500		54.91	1,988.37	2,043.28
ORSTON	218.3	9,501		43.52	1,988.37	2,031.89
OWTHORPE	49.7	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
PLUMTREE	122.6	4,942		40.31	1,988.37	2,028.68
RADCLIFFE-ON-TRENT	3,256.1	306,529		94.14	1,988.37	2,082.51
RATCLIFFE-ON-SOAR	53.2	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
REMPSTONE	202.1	5,095		25.21	1,988.37	2,013.58
RUDDINGTON	2,743.9	310,470	11,300	117.27	1,988.37	2,105.64
SAXONDALE	15.0	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
SCARRINGTON	84.6	750		8.87	1,988.37	1,997.24
SCREVETON	78.3	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37

SHELFORD	116.0	10,000		86.21	1,988.37	2,074.58
SHELTON	62.3	545		8.75	1,988.37	1,997.12
SIBTHORPE	58.5	1,700		29.06	1,988.37	2,017.43
STANFORD-ON-SOAR	64.0	5,000		78.13	1,988.37	2,066.50
STANTON-ON-THE-WOLDS	213.7	7,240		33.88	1,988.37	2,022.25
SUTTON BONINGTON	652.2	28,500		43.70	1,988.37	2,032.07
THOROTON	70.6	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
THRUMPTON	73.7	3,680		49.93	1,988.37	2,038.30
TOLLERTON	812.1	62,750		77.27	1,988.37	2,065.64
UPPER BROUGHTON	161.9	8,500		52.50	1,988.37	2,040.87
WEST BRIDGFORD	14,233.5	0	690,500	48.51	1,988.37	2,036.88
WEST LEAKE	68.0	2,100		30.88	1,988.37	2,019.25
WHATTON-IN-THE-VALE	379.5	15,832		41.72	1,988.37	2,030.09
WIDMERPOOL	170.2	6,395		37.57	1,988.37	2,025.94
WILLOUGHBY-ON-WOLDS	289.6	10,836		37.42	1,988.37	2,025.79
WIVERTON & TITHBY	53.3	0		0.00	1,988.37	1,988.37
WYSALL & THORPE IN THE GLEBE	207.3	15,200		73.32	1,988.37	2,061.69
<b>TOTAL RUSHCLIFFE BOROUGH COUNCIL</b>	<b>43,987.7</b>	<b>2,269,786</b>	<b>711,900</b>	<b>67.78</b>	<b>1,988.37</b>	<b>2,056.15</b>

ALL PRECEPTS PARISH AREA	COUNCIL TAX BAND							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
ASLOCKTON	1,344.01	1,568.02	1,792.02	2,016.02	2,464.02	2,912.03	3,360.03	4,032.04
BARTON-IN-FABIS	1,342.86	1,566.87	1,790.48	2,014.29	2,461.91	2,909.53	3,357.15	4,028.58
BINGHAM	1,380.99	1,611.16	1,841.32	2,071.49	2,531.82	2,992.15	3,452.48	4,142.98
BRADMORE	1,337.93	1,560.91	1,783.90	2,006.89	2,452.87	2,898.84	3,344.82	4,013.78
BUNNY	1,375.29	1,604.51	1,833.72	2,062.94	2,521.37	2,979.80	3,438.23	4,125.88
CAR COLSTON	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
CLIPSTON	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
COLSTON BASSETT	1,385.13	1,615.99	1,846.84	2,077.70	2,539.41	3,001.12	3,462.83	4,155.40
COSTOCK	1,369.00	1,597.17	1,825.33	2,053.50	2,509.83	2,966.17	3,422.50	4,107.00
COTGRAVE	1,388.69	1,620.14	1,851.59	2,083.04	2,545.94	3,008.84	3,471.73	4,166.08
CROPWELL BISHOP	1,422.89	1,660.03	1,897.18	2,134.33	2,608.63	3,082.92	3,557.22	4,268.66
CROPWELL BUTLER	1,350.09	1,575.11	1,800.12	2,025.14	2,475.17	2,925.20	3,375.23	4,050.28
EAST BRIDGFORD	1,357.91	1,584.23	1,810.55	2,036.87	2,489.51	2,942.15	3,394.78	4,073.74
EAST LEAKE	1,391.06	1,622.90	1,854.75	2,086.59	2,550.28	3,013.96	3,477.65	4,173.18
ELTON-ON-THE-HILL	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
FLAWBOROUGH	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
FLINTHAM	1,369.74	1,598.03	1,826.32	2,054.61	2,511.19	2,967.77	3,424.35	4,109.22
GOTHAM	1,367.06	1,594.90	1,822.75	2,050.59	2,506.28	2,961.96	3,417.65	4,101.18
GRANBY-CUM-SUTTON	1,364.31	1,591.70	1,819.08	2,046.47	2,501.24	2,956.01	3,410.78	4,092.94
HAWKSWORTH	1,429.22	1,667.42	1,905.63	2,143.83	2,620.24	3,096.64	3,573.05	4,287.66
HICKLING	1,346.22	1,570.59	1,794.96	2,019.33	2,468.07	2,916.81	3,365.55	4,038.66
HOLME PIERREPONT & GAMSTON	1,348.45	1,573.20	1,797.94	2,022.68	2,472.16	2,921.65	3,371.13	4,045.36
KEYWORTH	1,372.79	1,601.58	1,830.38	2,059.18	2,516.78	2,974.37	3,431.97	4,118.36
KINGSTON-ON-SOAR	1,347.07	1,571.58	1,796.09	2,020.60	2,469.62	2,918.64	3,367.67	4,041.20
KINOULTON	1,335.83	1,558.47	1,781.11	2,003.75	2,449.03	2,894.31	3,339.58	4,007.50
KNEETON	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
LANGAR-CUM- BARNSTONE	1,398.23	1,631.26	1,864.30	2,097.34	2,563.42	3,029.49	3,495.57	4,194.68
NEWTON	1,365.43	1,593.00	1,820.57	2,048.14	2,503.28	2,958.42	3,413.57	4,096.28
NORMANTON-ON-SOAR	1,374.88	1,604.03	1,833.17	2,062.32	2,520.61	2,978.91	3,437.20	4,124.64
NORMANTON-ON-THE- WOLDS	1,362.19	1,589.22	1,816.25	2,043.28	2,497.34	2,951.40	3,405.47	4,086.56
ORSTON	1,354.59	1,580.36	1,806.12	2,031.89	2,483.42	2,934.95	3,386.48	4,063.78
OWTHORPE	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
PLUMTREE	1,352.45	1,577.86	1,803.27	2,028.68	2,479.50	2,930.32	3,381.13	4,057.36
RADCLIFFE-ON-TRENT	1,388.34	1,619.73	1,851.12	2,082.51	2,545.29	3,008.07	3,470.85	4,165.02
RATCLIFFE-ON-SOAR	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
REMPSTONE	1,342.39	1,566.12	1,788.85	2,013.58	2,461.04	2,908.50	3,355.97	4,027.16
RUDDINGTON	1,403.76	1,637.72	1,871.68	2,105.64	2,573.56	3,041.48	3,509.40	4,211.28
SAXONDALE	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
SCARRINGTON	1,331.49	1,553.41	1,775.32	1,997.24	2,441.07	2,894.90	3,328.73	3,994.48
SCREVETON	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
SHELFORD	1,383.05	1,613.56	1,844.07	2,074.58	2,535.60	2,996.62	3,457.63	4,149.16
SHELTON	1,331.41	1,553.32	1,775.22	1,997.12	2,440.92	2,894.73	3,328.53	3,994.24
SIBTHORPE	1,344.95	1,569.11	1,793.27	2,017.43	2,465.75	2,914.07	3,362.38	4,034.86
STANFORD-ON-SOAR	1,377.67	1,607.28	1,836.89	2,066.50	2,525.72	2,984.94	3,444.17	4,133.00
STANTON-ON-THE-WOLDS	1,348.17	1,572.86	1,797.56	2,022.25	2,471.64	2,921.03	3,370.42	4,044.50
SUTTON BONINGTON	1,354.71	1,580.50	1,806.28	2,032.07	2,483.64	2,935.21	3,386.78	4,064.14
THOROTON	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
THRUMPTON	1,358.87	1,585.34	1,811.82	2,038.30	2,491.26	2,944.21	3,397.17	4,076.60
TOLLERTON	1,377.09	1,606.61	1,836.12	2,065.64	2,524.67	2,983.70	3,442.73	4,131.28
UPPER BROUGHTON	1,360.58	1,587.34	1,814.11	2,040.87	2,494.40	2,947.92	3,401.45	4,081.74
WEST BRIDGFORD	1,357.92	1,584.24	1,810.56	2,036.88	2,489.52	2,942.16	3,394.80	4,073.76
WEST LEAKE	1,346.17	1,570.53	1,794.89	2,019.25	2,467.97	2,916.69	3,365.42	4,038.50
WHATTON-IN-THE-VALE	1,353.39	1,578.96	1,804.52	2,030.09	2,481.22	2,932.35	3,383.48	4,060.18
WIDMERPOOL	1,350.63	1,575.73	1,800.84	2,025.94	2,476.15	2,926.36	3,376.57	4,051.88
WILLOUGHBY-ON-THE - WOLDS	1,350.53	1,575.61	1,800.70	2,025.79	2,475.97	2,926.14	3,376.32	4,051.58
WIVERTON & TITHBY	1,325.58	1,546.51	1,767.44	1,988.37	2,430.23	2,872.09	3,313.95	3,976.74
WYSALL & THORPE IN THE GLEBE	1,374.46	1,603.54	1,832.61	2,061.69	2,519.84	2,978.00	3,436.15	4,123.38

## 58 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 to the Midlands Engine Development Corporation, which had been allocated funding in 2018 of £2m. Over the past two years, supported by the Chief Executive, he had sat on the Oversight Board. This related to the Government bringing decision-making and resources to the East Midlands, with three key geographical areas involved, including the Ratcliffe on Soar power station in Rushcliffe. It was therefore vital that the Council participated in this development and played a key role. The majority of members had attended briefings from the Chief Executive of Nottinghamshire County Council and were aware of the direction being taken. A Business Case setting out preferred options would be submitted to Government in March 2020, if accepted legislation was anticipated by 2022. The report recognised the Development Corporation and its importance for Rushcliffe, with £100K allocated in the Reserve Fund in case of any required expenditure. It was proposed to establish a Member Working Group to be regularly advised on the progress of the Development Corporation over the next two years, during the interim delivery period.

The report was moved by Councillor Robinson.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Butler stated that it was an exciting proposal, and it was important to encourage employment opportunities. It was essential that the Council was part of the Development Corporation and embrace future development and change.

Councillor Gray stated that the Labour Group supported the recommendation and looked forward to future investment and job opportunities.

Councillor Jones stated that the Liberal Democrat Group supported the recommendation and hoped that when the power station site was decommissioned it would be used to develop alternative energy supplies.

Councillor Richard Mallender stated that the Green Group would be supporting the recommendation and hoped that in future the power station could be used to produce renewable energy. Provision of employment and housing was pleasing, as was the proposal for the provision of a 'Green Highway' between the three sites and he looked forward with interest to seeing those plans. In respect of the airport, it would be necessary to reduce the amount of freight transported by air and seek alternative ways to move it by developing the railway infrastructure.

Councillor Thomas stated that the main concern of the Independent Group was that the Development Corporation would be subject to delay and the Council was urged to continue to work closely with Uniper regarding the future development of the power station site.

Councillor Rex Walker referred to the lack of investment in the East Midlands

compared to other regions, which had historically resulted in the region being unable to attract the investment required for long lasting economic development. Such current opportunities were rare, action had to be taken, and the proposals were welcomed. If the proposals went ahead, there would be a loss in local accountability and the Council should seek to ensure that immediate neighbouring communities retained genuine input into the development plans.

Councillor Simms referred to the importance of strategy and the geographical location of the East Midlands in the centre of the country, which should make it the 'hub' of the country and create wealth and prosperity in the area.

Councillor Gowland referred to this exciting opportunity, which Rushcliffe should embrace. In respect of HS2, it was encouraging to hear that future plans could include modifications to integrate and upgrade existing train lines and it was hoped that would occur.

Councillor Edyvean confirmed that he had attended a meeting of the Oversight Board on behalf of Councillor Robinson, and the Chair of the Midlands Engine, Sir John Peace referred to HS2 and the importance of integrating the Northern Powerhouse and Midlands Engine rail links into HS2. Part of the proposal would be to ensure that those links occur. It was hoped that the proposal would also increase social mobility, to provide opportunities for everyone.

Councillor Robinson referred to HS2 and agreed that it was likely that future plans could change the direction of the project, with many preferring links across the country. Everyone recognised the importance of the proposals and the strategic nature of the power station and the local presence. However, to gain any investment, this approved body was required by the Government and to ensure that the Development Corporation must be in place. He confirmed that an application for a Free Port for this area had been received and publicised. It is one of 10 being promoted to the Government, and it was hoped that a Free Port would come to this area.

It was **RESOLVED** that:

- a) the statement of intent be endorsed;
- b) the Council's involvement in the establishment of the Development Corporation and the required interim arrangements be supported;
- c) the potential budget impact of the interim arrangements be noted; and
- d) a Member Working Group to be regularly consulted on the progress of the development corporation work over the next two years, during the period of the interim delivery vehicle be set up.

## 59 **Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan**

The Portfolio Holder for Housing presented the report of the Executive Manager – Communities providing information on the Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan. The documents had been introduced by the Localism Act 2011 and gave local residents the opportunity to shape the future of their

communities. The Plan had been promoted by the Parish Council, publicised, consulted on, examined by an independent Examiner and considered by the Borough Council. At its last meeting, the Cabinet agreed that the Plan should come to Council for approval, to proceed to a referendum. The referendum would take place on 26 March 2020 and follow the same format as previous neighbourhood plans. If more than 50% of those voting voted “yes” then the Borough Council was required to “adopt” the Plan. If the result was “no”, then the Parish Council would have to decide what it wanted to do.

The report was moved by Councillor Upton.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Combellack stated that she was a great exponent of neighbourhood plans as they gave local residents a great opportunity to shape their local areas and provide legal weight to planning decisions. They protected the character of local areas of historic interest, whilst allowing new development to keep villages vibrant. This particular plan was a well-balanced and professional plan, which had been commended by the Independent Examiner.

Councillor Gray confirmed that the Labour Group supported the recommendation and thanked everyone involved for their hard work and diligence.

Councillor Jones confirmed that the Liberal Democrat Group supported the recommendation and reiterated the previous comments.

Councillor Richard Mallender confirmed that the Green Group was happy to support the recommendation.

Councillor Thomas confirmed that the Independent Group was happy to support the recommendation and congratulated all those involved. It was hoped that it would be taken into consideration in the planning process thereafter.

Councillor Butler referred to the significant work involved, especially for small communities such as Colston Bassett and it highlighted how much they cared for their community.

Councillor Upton reiterated the comments made and stated that from personal experience he was aware of the hard work involved.

It was **RESOLVED** that, subject to a majority vote in the referendum:

- a) the Colston Bassett Neighbourhood Plan be ‘made’; and
- b) authority be delegated to the Executive Manager – Communities to issue a statement setting out this decision as soon as possible following the referendum.

## 60 **Street Trading Policy**

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Safety, Councillor Inglis presented the report of the Executive Manger – Neighbourhoods providing updates to the

Street Tracing Policy and clarified that the Policy was from 2020 to 2025 and not 2019 to 2024 as referred to in the report.

Councillor Inglis advised that this new Policy was an advancement to the Borough's current implementation of match day street trading restrictions surrounding Trent Bridge and the City Ground. Due to its success, the Policy had been prepared to encompass the entire Borough. The draft Policy had been subject to consultation in September 2019 and subsequently endorsed by the Licensing Committee in November 2019. Several streets would be designated as prohibited, with no street trading permitted for those areas listed in the document. The remaining streets would be designated consent streets, requiring permission from the Council, with landowners' authorisation being a condition. The aim of the Policy was to create a street trading environment that complimented the Council's premises based trading, whilst being sensitive to the needs of residents, seeking to advance diversity of choice and enhance the character and safety of local environments. It would ensure that traders met all legal and trading standards. The Policy would ensure that Licensing Officers had the authority to ensure compliance, with the aim of having a minimum of three star food hygiene rating for all food outlets. The adoption of the Policy would support the Council with control over street trading and provide greater clarity to the trade regarding compliance and officers were thanked for their hard work in preparing this comprehensive document.

The report was moved by Councillor Inglis.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Williams stated that this comprehensive Policy would ensure the improvement of food hygiene standards and the reduction in the use of single-use plastics was welcomed.

Councillor J Walker stated that she had a pecuniary interest and would leave the room.

*Having declared an interest, Councillor J Walker left the room.*

Councillor Gray stated that the Labour Group supported the recommendation and reiterated the importance of improving food hygiene standards to a three star rating.

Councillor Major confirmed that the Liberal Democrat Group supported the recommendation.

Councillor Richard Mallender confirmed that the Green Group supported the recommendation and welcomed the improved environmental standards and the push to reduce the use of single use plastics. The pollution caused by heavy traffic in the area, particularly on match days was a concern. It was also hoped that in future, the use of diesel generators in mobile units would decrease and more battery power generation should be encouraged to reduce further pollution.

It was **RESOLVED** that the draft Street Trading Policy 2020 – 2025 be approved and adopted.

*Councillor J Walker returned to the meeting.*



## 61 **Private Hire and Hackney Carriage Policy**

The Portfolio Holder for Environment and Safety, Councillor Inglis presented the report of the Executive Manager – Neighbourhoods providing updates to the Private Hire and Hackney Carriage Policy.

Councillor Inglis advised that this was an interim report prior to the structured five-year review due in 2022, which embraced new legislation and driver standard recommendations. Both Hackney Carriage and Private Hire vehicles provided a vital service and its visible role portrayed an image of both the Council and the Borough. The comprehensive Policy, which outlined requirements, and standards that had to be met had been put out to full consultation in September 2019. Customers and in particular the disabled and children should feel safe and be protected and expected high standards of vehicle safety and driver integrity. The Policy outlined requirements to current legislation and regulations, the age, condition and types of vehicles and consideration of passenger access, comfort and cleanliness. The Policy had considered the impact on Hackney Carriage drivers of having to invest in new vehicles to meet greater stringent regulations, by allowing vehicles registered after 2011 to be licensed, rather than newer vehicles to provide a buffer to them in preparation for future environmental and emissions criteria. That would help to maintain a sustainable and viable business for the taxi trade to operate. It was important to ensure a positive customer experience and it was envisaged that the Policy would ensure that both the industry and the local and night-time economies would continue to thrive.

The report was moved by Councillor Inglis.

In seconding the recommendation, Councillor Healey referred to the importance of maintaining excellent passenger safety and the service operating to the highest standards and this Policy would ensure that.

Councillor Gray advised that the Labour Group had no specific comments to make regarding the Policy and would be interested in hearing the views of other Councillors.

Councillor Jones commented that whilst the Liberal Democrat Group was supportive of the majority of the document, the Group could not support the recommendation as it was concerned that there were insufficient environmental standards proposed for the vehicle emissions, with the option to allow vehicles registered in 2011 to be licensed until 2023. In addition, Euro 4 emission standards were being accepted, whilst Euro 6 level was available.

Councillor Richard Mallender advised that whilst the Green Group supported the majority of the document, it would not be supporting the recommendation, as the Council was missing an opportunity to improve vehicle standards and emissions. By adopting this Policy, the Council would fall behind other Councils, with most pursuing a phased approach to removing diesel vehicles. This Council should be setting higher targets to reduce emissions and adopt a timescale for drivers to move to new vehicles. Wherever possible, fully electric vehicles should be introduced or at least hybrid. As the majority of taxis worked in West Bridgford, many around the sporting venues, it was important that

emissions were lowered to create a healthy environment and positive image. The Policy lacked ambition and should be reviewed in the near future, and given that the majority of taxis worked around West Bridgford, it was hoped that the West Bridgford Growth Board would be involved in any review.

Councillor Thomas asked when a review of the Policy would be undertaken.

Councillor Inglis thanked Councillors for their feedback, particularly on the issue of emissions, referred to the substantial cost of purchasing a new taxi, and stated that the Policy provided a 'buffer' until the full review in 2022. A fine balance had to be struck to ensure business continuity whilst trying to reduce emissions.

It was **RESOLVED** the revised Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licensing Policy 2017 - 2022 be adopted.

## 62 Notices of Motion

a) The following motion was moved by Councillor Robinson and seconded by Councillor Brennan.

“Following the resounding election result in December 2019 and our welcome departure from the EU in January 2020, this Council calls on the new Government to:

- Increase infrastructure investment across the East Midlands and in our Towns and Villages;
- Implement new, higher, national environmental standards for house building;
- Increase funding to Local Authorities, Police, Health and Schools;
- Redesign the business rates system to one that supports the local economy and is also fit for purpose to support Local Government in the future; and
- Create a healthy and prosperous environment for businesses in the Borough to grow and take full advantage of new freedoms outside EU bureaucracy and regulation.”

Councillor Robinson, in moving the motion stated that it was important and timely to put this forward, as the country had left the EU and a new Government had been elected. The motion sent a clear message that the East Midlands needed Government investment. As discussed earlier in the meeting, formal bodies were in place to drive the region forward and the investment would help all of the Borough's residents. The motion referred to increasing infrastructure, improving environmental standards for house building, which Rushcliffe was already championing, and ensuring that local businesses received more support from central Government by redesigning the business rates system, which currently gave large organisations a huge advantage over local retailers. The decision to finally leave the EU had been welcomed by local businesses and there was a growing confidence of a prosperous future, free from EU bureaucracy and protectionism, with the freedom to make decisions ourselves. The motion sent a strong message on behalf of Rushcliffe to the Government and it was hoped that it would be supported.

In seconding the motion, Councillor Brennan reiterated the comments made by Councillor Robinson that it was timely and pertinent that this motion should come before Council for the benefit of Rushcliffe businesses and residents. Whilst it was acknowledged that leaving the EU remained a divisive issue, the country was now free to trade and define itself once again on the global stage. Released resources should be invested into our own infrastructure and spent on our priorities. The Council called on the Government to use those resources in the East Midlands and particularly across Rushcliffe to enable the Council to support local residents and businesses to take advantage of the new opportunities this era would bring. Business rates should be fair, with the system recognising new shopping trends and the challenges faced by traditional high street retailers. A greater proportion of business rates should be retained in the Borough to support key Council services and to invest in the local economy. Historically the East Midlands region has been under funded and the Council calls upon the Government to invest in public services and local government. It was time to look forward to future achievements that would benefit everyone in the Borough.

Councillor Gray proposed the following amendment:

“Following the election result in December 2019 and our departure from the EU in January 2020, this Council calls on the new Government to:

- Increase infrastructure investment across the East Midlands and in our Towns and Villages;
- Legislate for new, higher, national environmental standards for house building;
- Increase funding to Local Authorities, Police, Health and Schools;
- Redesign the business rates system to one that supports local economy and also fit for purpose to support Local Government in the future; and
- Create a healthy and prosperous environment for residents and businesses in the Borough to thrive, in particular considering the needs of the East Midlands in arrangements for leaving the EU.”

Councillor Gray, in moving the amendment stated that the sense of the motion would not be changed by removing the words ‘resounding’ and ‘welcome’ which were unacceptable and divisive, and it would still send a clear message to the Government of the Borough’s future aspirations. Brexit had led to great division within the country and it was hoped that those divisions could be healed. The amendment called for the Government to legislate for new housing standards rather than implement them, and included a reference to residents as well as businesses and it was hoped that the Council could move forward together and accept the amendment.

In seconding the amendment, Councillor Gowland referred to the importance of the Council ensuring a healthy, happy and thriving environment for local residents. Some of the wording in the original motion was unwelcome and unnecessary. Many people remained unhappy about the Referendum result and the motion would upset them. The proposed amendment would be more acceptable and meaningful.

Councillor Jones agreed that some of the wording in the original motion was unacceptable and divisive and it was noted that the majority of residents in

Rushcliffe had voted to remain in the Referendum. It was important to include a reference to legislative power and to refer to residents of the Borough and he confirmed that the Liberal Democrat Group would be supporting the amendment.

Councillor Richard Mallender stated that the main body of the motion was acceptable; however, some of the initial wording was unnecessary and he would be supporting the amendment. This was a divisive issue, which many people still felt very strongly about and the amendment reflected that.

Councillor Moore referred to unwelcome comments from Labour Councillors about Conservative Councillors on social media. He stated that Councillor Robinson was entitled to put this motion forward and confirmed that the Conservative Group would be voting against the amendment.

Councillor Thomas confirmed that she supported the amendment. Rushcliffe had delivered a resounding Referendum result in favour of remaining in the EU and to welcome our departure from the EU would be in conflict with the views of the majority of Rushcliffe's residents. Councillor Thomas requested a recorded vote on the amendment.

Councillor Gaunt reiterated the comments made about the Referendum result in Rushcliffe. He stated that although the majority of people had accepted the result, they did not welcome it and were fearful of the future. By removing the words 'resounding' and 'welcome' from the motion, it would help everyone to move forward and work together.

Councillor Gray referred to comments he may have made on his social media account and stated that he would check his account and if he had made those comments, he did not believe that it reflected his general feelings about the Conservative Group and he reiterated that the amendment made the motion more acceptable to everyone and hoped that everyone would support it.

Councillor Robinson advised that the motion referred to both the national election and referendum results. The country had voted to leave the EU and it was time to move on and make changes.

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

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

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

ABSTENTIONS: Councillors Mrs C Jeffreys and S Mallender

The amended motion was declared as lost.

In debating the original motion, Councillor Viridi stated that on 31 January 2020, the UK gained a firm direction with an end to uncertainty and a sense of optimism amongst local businesses. There would now be the opportunity to negotiate trade deals directly with non-EU countries. Local business owners had very positive expectations on increasing investment, allowing support for local businesses. The economy had not entered a recession and the business community was relieved to be able to plan for the future. More resources would become available and the motion requested investment for the East Midlands, and Rushcliffe in particular to assist with long-term growth. This was an unprecedented opportunity to attract more investment to create a healthy and prosperous environment for all.

Councillor Clarke stated that the motion would provide the Council with greater impetus and power to lobby central Government for funding to address the current imbalance. Infrastructural improvements drove business growth and improved standards of living. There were so many different funding 'pots', it was essential that the Council was proactively requesting support.

Councillor Gaunt stated that the motion was attempting to draw a line under the events of the last ten years, when the East Midlands had been let down by previous Governments. Growth in the Borough would be welcomed; however, the motion had been presented too late. Since 2015, there had been no motions calling for investment in the area. According to a recent Treasury report, the East Midlands continued to lose out in all aspects of public investment, including transport, health and education and in particular, local schools were struggling with under investment.

Councillor Purdue-Horan stated that he agreed with the phrasing of the motion and referred to the new era following the General Election in December 2019. The previous 10 years had consisted of a coalition Government and then uncertainty over Brexit. This marked a new opportunity for the Borough to challenge the Government and he was confident of its success.

Councillor Robinson thanked Councillors for the debate and stated that the UK was the sixth biggest economy in the world and the country should be confident in the decision that it had made to leave the EU. The country was blessed with the best industries in the world, some represented in Rushcliffe. The Economic Prosperity Fund has been established, with decisions now made in Westminster, and local MPs making decisions. This was a constructive and ambitious Borough, the motion was pertinent and relevant, and he asked Councillors to support the motion.

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

*Councillor Adair left the meeting*

(b) The following motion was moved by Councillor Thomas and seconded by Councillor Jones.

“This Council resolves:

- to actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of

- fireworks on vulnerable people and animal welfare – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks;
- to encourage all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their vulnerable people and animals;
  - similarly, to encourage residents to advise their neighbours in advance of private displays;
  - to promote awareness of alternatives for both public and private displays including laser/light shows and quieter fireworks; and
  - to actively consider such alternatives when planning Rushcliffe's own displays and celebrations.”

Councillor Thomas, in moving the motion highlighted the impact of fireworks on those residents in the Borough with high levels of anxiety, associated mental health issues, debilitating PTSD, as well as many pet owners. This motion had been submitted to Council following a request from residents in East Leake who supported the national RSPCA campaign.

In seconding the motion, Councillor Jones stated that it was now far easier to purchase firework throughout the year and that had led to more frequent and unpredictable occurrences. This motion sought to encourage responsible citizenship as well as the promotion of responsible alternatives.

Councillor J Wheeler proposed the following amendment:

“This Council resolves:

- to launch a public awareness campaign detailing the impact of fireworks on vulnerable people and animals, and to encourage and advise people to advertise their events as far in advance as possible.
- as part of the campaign, residents and businesses should be informed about alternatives such as quiet fireworks and other forms of displays.
- to ask Scrutiny to review the use of fireworks and light shows at Council run events and put forwards recommendations to the Cabinet.”

Councillor J Wheeler, in moving the amendment to the motion, stated that he hoped the revised wording recognised the issue as one of great importance to the Council, and proposed a suitable and actionable method of investigation via scrutiny leading to recommendations to the Cabinet.

Councillor R Mallender stated that the amendment strengthened the original motion and should be supported.

Councillor Bansal agreed that it was an important motion, as the Council should have greater sensitivity towards the religious beliefs and events of other cultures.

Councillor Way thanked Councillor J Wheeler for his proposed amendment, which demonstrated that the issue was being taken seriously and strengthened.

Councillor Purdue-Horan stated that the intention of the amendment was supportive and informed the Council that at the last meeting of the Corporate Overview Group, the options for engaging members of the public in scrutiny

had been explored, and this would be an excellent topic of investigation to lead the way.

Councillor Thomas responded that she did not object to the amendment to the motion but hoped that the issue could be debated at scrutiny far enough in advance of the next scheduled celebrations to allow changes to be implemented.

There was no further debate. After being put to the vote, the amendment to the motion was carried. This then became the substantive motion on which a further vote was taken and carried.

### 63 **Adjournment**

Councillor Robinson called to adjourn the meeting, as there was insufficient time to conclude the remaining business on the agenda.

Councillor Mason seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting.

Councillor Jones raised a point of order and stated that under Standing Orders, Council meetings proceeded until 10pm and then a vote was taken to decide if the meeting should be extended until 10.30.

The Monitoring Officer advised that a motion without notice to adjourn the meeting had been moved and seconded in accordance with Standing Orders and accordingly should be voted on. The Mayor as the meeting Chairman was entitled to put the motion to vote without a debate.

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

It was **RESOLVED** that in accordance with the Council's Constitution, the Mayor closed the meeting at 9.50pm and all remaining items were adjourned to the next ordinary Council meeting in July 2020.

The meeting closed at 9.50 pm.

CHAIRMAN