

SUMMONS TO COUNCIL

date Thursday, 20 January 2022 venue County Hall, West Bridgford,
commencing at 10:30 Nottingham

You are hereby requested to attend the above Meeting to be held at the time/place and on the date mentioned above for the purpose of transacting the business on the Agenda as under.



Chief Executive

- 1 Chairman's Business
 - a) Presentation of Awards/Certificates (if any)
- 2 Minutes of the last meeting held on 25 November 2021 7 - 32
- 3 Apologies for Absence
- 4 Declarations of Interests by Members and Officers:- (see note below)
 - (a) Disclosable Pecuniary Interests
 - (b) Private Interests (pecuniary and non-pecuniary)
- 5 Constituency Issues (see note 4)

- 6a Presentation of Petitions (if any) (see note 5 below)

- 6b Responses to Petitions Presented to the Chairman of the County Council 33 - 36

7 Amendments to Appointments of Committee Vice-Chairmen

37 - 38

8 Questions

a) Questions to Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Fire Authority

b) Questions to Committee Chairmen

9 NOTICE OF MOTIONS

ALTERED Motion One - from 25th November 2021 meeting

This Council recognises the evidence base that exists demonstrating the significant health and safety benefits to the public from a reduction in vehicle speed to 20MPH.

This Council resolves therefore to task the Transport and Environment Committee with exploring the feasibility of implementing a 20MPH speed limit on residential roads and any other new measures that could help improve road safety in all its residential conurbations.

Councillor Penny Gowland Councillor Neil Clarke MBE

Motion Two - from 25th November 2021 meeting

This Council recognises the immediacy of the challenge of poor nutrition and the need to encourage healthy eating in Nottinghamshire and beyond. Without radical change, we risk failing to achieve our statutory goals of improving the health & wellbeing of our residents, supporting the NHS, and tackling longstanding inequalities in our communities.

This Council therefore wishes to see nutrition developed as a key part of our 2022-2026 Health & Wellbeing Strategy, and asks Health & Wellbeing Board to consider in detail with partners how best to include this element appropriately, including plans for how officers can actively engage with residents on this key issue.

This Council will further set out to make Nottinghamshire a "Healthy Food Sustainable Shire" and ensure that these principles are considered and reflected appropriately in the development of the forthcoming Council Plan, overseen by the Deputy Leader, with actions arising from it to ensure that our communities are empowered to make positive choices about their nutrition and health.

Councillor Dr John Doddy Councillor Bruce Laughton

Motion Three - from 21st November 2021 meeting

This Council notes that Nottinghamshire is served by 60 static libraries.

This Council notes that according to data released by the Communities Committee - there was 112, 087 physical visits to our 60 libraries between 1 April 2021 to 30 June 2021. This was only 19.49% of the physically footfall target set by Inspire, who run the library services on behalf of Nottinghamshire County Council.

This Council believes that our Library Buildings are a valuable tool in terms of education and community cohesion.

Nottinghamshire County Council therefore commits to keep open all 60 library buildings in their current location until at least 2025.

Councillor Daniel Williamson Councillor Elizabeth Williamson

Motion Four

This Council notes that residents across Nottinghamshire are going through an unprecedented cost of living crisis.

This Council further notes:

- That families across Nottinghamshire face a loss of income of around £1,200 a year from April as a result of tax rises and soaring energy bills, food prices and fuel costs.
- That thousands of residents will lose a minimum of £1040 a year due the Government scrapping Universal Credit / Working Tax credit uplift.
- The rate of inflation rose to 5% in the winter of 2021 and it will reach about 6% by spring 2022.
- That child poverty in Nottinghamshire is rising with 23,068 pupils - 20.4% of children now claiming free school meals.
- That as a result of the decision to scrap the triple lock in the latest UK Budget, pensioners across Nottinghamshire will lose £520 this year alone, and a cumulative £2,600 over the next five years.

This Council believes it should do everything it can to mitigate the impact on the cost of living crisis for Nottinghamshire residents. This includes keeping any Council Tax rises to a minimum. When the adult care precept is taken into account - households could see a 4.99% Council Tax rise and does not include the precepts for the Nottinghamshire Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, the Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service, District or Borough Councils or Parish Council.

A 4.99% increase will lead to a rise of £71.41 per year for the average 'Band D' Council Taxpayer which this Council believes may push residents over the edge. Many residents will face the stark choice of feeding their families, heating their homes or paying their Council Tax.

This Council therefore resolves consider the impact of the cost of living crisis when setting the Council Tax for 2022/23.

Councillor Jason Zadrozny Councillor Steve Carr

NOTES:-

(A) For Councillors

- (1) Members will be informed of the date and time of their Group meeting for Council by their Group Researcher.
- (2) Lunch will usually be taken at approximately 12.30pm.
- (3)
 - (a) Persons making a declaration of interest should have regard to the Code of Conduct and the Procedure Rules for Meetings of the Full Council. Those declaring must indicate whether their interest is a disclosable pecuniary interest or a private interest and the reasons for the declaration.
 - (b) Any member or officer who declares a disclosable pecuniary interest in an item must withdraw from the meeting during discussion and voting upon it, unless a dispensation has been granted. Members or officers requiring clarification on whether to make a declaration of interest are invited to contact the Monitoring Officer or Democratic Services prior to the meeting.
 - (c) Declarations of interest will be recorded and included in the minutes of this meeting and it is therefore important that clear details are given by members and others in turn, to enable Democratic Services to record accurate information.
- (4) At any Full Council meeting except the budget meeting and an extraordinary meeting Members are given an opportunity to speak for up to three minutes on any issue which specifically relates to their division and is relevant to the services provided by the County Council. These speeches must relate specifically to the area the Member represents and should not be of a general nature. They are constituency speeches and therefore must relate to constituency issues only. This is an opportunity simply to air these issues in a Council meeting. It will not give rise to a debate on the issues or a question or answer session. There is a maximum time limit of 15 minutes for this item.

- (5) At any Full Council meeting except the budget meeting and an extraordinary meeting Members may present a petition to the Chairman of the County Council on any matter affecting the residents of their division, and in relation to which the County Council has powers or duties. The Member presenting the petition can introduce and speak about the petition for up to one minute. Members are reminded that there is a time limit of 15 minutes for the presentation of petitions, after which any petitions not yet presented will be received en bloc by the Chairman.
- (6) In relation to questions to the Nottinghamshire and City of Nottingham Fire Authority and Committee Chairmen; after receiving an answer to their question, the Councillor asking the original question may ask one supplementary question on the same matter. There will be no additional supplementary questions.
- (7) Members' attention is drawn to the questions put to the Leader of the Council and the Chairman of the Adult Social Care and Public Health Committee, under paragraphs 42, 46, 47 and 53 of the Procedure Rules, and the answers to which are included at the back of the Council book.
- (8) Members are reminded that these papers may be recycled. Appropriate containers are located in the respective secretariats.
- (9) Commonly used points of order
- 26 – Constituency issues must be about issues which specifically relate to the Member's division and is relevant to the services provided by the County Council
 - 51 – Only 1 supplementary question per question is allowed from the Councillor who asked the original question and supplementary questions must be on the same matter
 - 61 – The Mover or Seconder has spoken for more than 10 minutes when moving the motion
 - 64 – The Member has spoken for more than 5 minutes
 - 66 – The Member is not speaking to the subject under discussion
 - 67 – The Member has already spoken on the motion
 - 86 – Points of Order and Personal Explanations
 - 96 – Disorderly conduct
- (10) Time limit of speeches
- Motions
- 64 – no longer than 5 minutes (subject to any exceptions set out in the Constitution)

Constituency Issues

26 – up to 3 minutes per speech allowed

29 – up to 15 minutes for this item allowed

Petitions

33 – up to one minute per petition allowed

37 – up to 15 minutes for this item allowed

Questions

45 – up to 60 minutes for this item allowed

(B) For Members of the Public

- (1) Members of the public wishing to inspect "Background Papers" referred to in the reports on the agenda or Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act should contact:

Customer Services Centre 0300 500 80 80.

- (2) The papers enclosed with this agenda are available in large print if required. Copies can be requested by contacting the Customer Services Centre on 0300 500 80 80. Certain documents (for example appendices and plans to reports) may not be available electronically. Hard copies can be requested from the above contact.
- (3) This agenda and its associated reports are available to view online via an online calendar –
<http://www.nottinghamshire.gov.uk/dms/Meetings.aspx>



Meeting COUNTY COUNCIL

Date Thursday, 25 November 2021 (10.30 am – 5.31 pm)

Membership

Persons absent are marked with 'A'

COUNCILLORS

Mike Quigley MBE (Chairman)

A Roger Jackson (Vice-Chairman)

	Reg Adair	Tom Hollis
	Mike Adams	Mike Introna
	Pauline Allan	Richard Jackson
A	Sinead Anderson	Eric Kerry
	Callum Bailey	Bruce Laughton
	Matt Barney	Johno Lee
	Chris Barnfather	David Martin
	Ben Bradley MP	John 'Maggie' McGrath
	Richard Butler	Andy Meakin
	Anne Callaghan BEM	Nigel Moxon
	André Camilleri	John Ogle
	Scott Carlton	Philip Owen
	Steve Carr	Michael Payne
	John Clarke	Sheila Place
A	Neil Clarke MBE	Mike Pringle
	Robert Corden	Francis Purdue-Horan
	John Cottee	Mrs Sue Saddington
	Jim Creamer	Dave Shaw
A	Eddie Cubley	Helen-Ann Smith
	Sam Deakin	Sam Smith
A	Maureen Dobson	Tom Smith
	Dr John Doddy	Tracey Taylor
	Bethan Eddy	Nigel Turner
	Boyd Elliott	Roger Upton
	Sybil Fielding	Lee Waters
	Kate Foale	Michelle Welsh
	Stephen Garner	Gordon Wheeler
	Glynn Gilfoyle	Jonathan Wheeler
	Keith Girling	Daniel Williamson
	Penny Gowland	Elizabeth Williamson
	Errol Henry JP	John Wilmott
A	Paul Henshaw	Jason Zadrozny

OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE

Anthony May (Chief Executive)
Marjorie Toward (Chief Executives)
Sara Allmond (Chief Executives)

Chief Officers and Group staff observed the meeting from the viewing gallery

1. MINUTES

RESOLVED: 2021/039

That the minutes of the previous meeting of the County Council held on 23 September 2021 be agreed as a true record and signed by the Chairman.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from:-

- Councillor Sinead Anderson (medical/illness)
- Councillor Neil Clarke MBE (medical/illness)
- Councillor Eddie Cubley (other)
- Councillor Maureen Dobson (other)
- Councillor Paul Henshaw (medical/illness)
- Councillor Roger Jackson (other)

APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIRMAN FOR THE MEETING

In the absence of the Vice-Chairman, Councillor Chris Barnfather proposed that Councillor Sue Saddington be appointed as Vice-Chairman for the meeting. Councillor Bruce Laughton seconded the motion.

The Chairman put the Motion to the meeting and after a show of hands the Chairman declared it was carried and it was:-

RESOLVED: 2021/040

That Councillor Sue Saddington be appointed as Vice-Chairman for this meeting only.

3. RECOGNITION OF GROUP AND MEMBERS OF GROUPS

Councillor Chris Barnfather introduced the report and moved a motion in terms of resolution 2021/041 below.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Bruce Laughton.

The Chairman put the Motion to the meeting and after a show of hands the Chairman declared it was carried and it was:-

RESOLVED: 2021/041

That the membership of the political Groups be recognised.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

5. CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS

PRESENTATION AND AWARDS

Disability Confident Leader Accreditation

Councillor Gordon Wheeler introduced the item which awarded the Council the Disability Confident Leader Accreditation, which was achieved by the Council demonstrating that it is an inclusive employer offering fully accessible job opportunities wherever possible. The Chairman received the certificate from Councillor Wheeler and presented it to Martyn Harris, Co-Chair of the Disabled Employees Support Network and Gill Elder, Head of Human Resources.

CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS SINCE THE LAST MEETING

The Chairman updated members on the business he and the Vice-Chairman had carried out since the last meeting, including a number of visits in the Bassetlaw area and the opening of the new Rosecliffe Spencer Academy, Edwalton.

AGENDA ORDER

The Chairman advised members that items 13 and 14 would be moved up the agenda to directly after item 10, to ensure that these items were dealt with at the meeting today.

6. CONSTITUENCY ISSUES

The following Members spoke for up to three minutes on issues which specifically related to their division and were relevant to the services provided by the County Council.

Councillor Jason Zadrozny – regarding public transport in the Ashfields Division

Councillor Helen-Ann Smith – regarding road safety on the Healdswood Estate, Skegby

Councillor John Wilmott – regarding road safety in Hucknall

Councillor Tom Hollis – regarding recycling issues in Carsic, Huthwaite and Sutton

Councillor David Martin – regarding the potential impact of the Maid Marion Line for Selston residents

7a. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

The following petitions were presented to the Chairman as indicated below: -

- (1) Councillor Pauline Allan, request to create and maintain a short section of footpath along side Mapperley Plains
- (2) Councillor Gordon Wheeler, request for a pedestrian crossing in the vicinity of the Dorset Restaurant, Compton Acres
- (3) Councillor Gordon Wheeler, request for environmental improvements to the land adjacent to Wilford Field in his division
- (4) Councillor Daniel Williamson, request to make Reform Street and Cutts Row, Kirkby into one way streets
- (5) Councillor John Clarke, request to install a raised zebra crossing on Digby Avenue, Mapperley

RESOLVED: 2021/042

That the petitions be referred to the appropriate Committees for consideration in accordance with the Procedure Rules, with a report being brought back to Council in due course.

7b. RESPONSE TO PETITION PRESENTED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL

RESOLVED: 2021/043

That the contents and actions taken as set out in the report be noted.

8. MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

Councillor Chris Barnfather introduced the report and moved a motion in terms of resolution 2021/044 below.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Bruce Laughton.

The Chairman put the Motion to the meeting and after a show of hands the Chairman declared it was carried and it was:-

RESOLVED: 2021/044

That the Council confirmed the revised allocation of committee seats as set out in Appendix A of the report.

9. DECISION TO OPT INTO THE NATIONAL SCHEME FOR AUDITOR APPOINTMENT MANAGED BY PUBLIC SECTOR AUDIT APPOINTMENTS (PSAA) THE 'APPOINTING PERSON'

Councillor Philip Owen introduced the report and moved a motion in terms of resolution 2021/045 below.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Nigel Moxon.

The Chairman put the Motion to the meeting and after a show of hands the Chairman declared it was carried and it was:-

RESOLVED: 2021/045

That Council accepts Public Sector Audit Appointments' invitation to opt into the sector-led option for the appointment of external auditors to principal government and police bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023.

10. THE NOTTINGHAMSHIRE PLAN 2021-31: HEALTHY, PROSPEROUS, GREEN

Councillor Ben Bradley MP introduced the report and moved a motion in terms of resolution 2021/046 below.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Bruce Laughton.

Following a debate, the Chairman put the Motion to the meeting and after a show of hands the Chairman declared it was carried and it was:-

RESOLVED: 2021/046

- 1) That The Nottinghamshire Plan 2021-31 – the Council's strategic plan for the next 10 years be approved.
- 2) That progress against the aims and ambitions set out in the plan, be monitored via the Council's annual planning and reporting cycle.

The Council adjourned from 12.35pm to 1.35pm for lunch, after consideration of this item.

13. EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC

The Chairman moved a motion in terms of resolution 2021/047 below.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Bruce Laughton.

The item was introduced by the Monitoring Officer.

Following a debate, the Chairman put the Motion to the meeting and after a show of hands the Chairman declared it was carried.

The requisite number of Members requested a recorded vote and it was ascertained that the following 33 Members voted '**For**' the motion:-

Reg Adair	Richard Jackson
Mike Adams	Eric Kerry
Callum Bailey	Bruce Laughton
Matt Barney	Johno Lee
Chris Barnfather	Nigel Moxon
Ben Bradley MP	John Ogle
Richard Butler	Philip Owen
André Camilleri	Mike Quigley MBE
Scott Carlton	Mrs Sue Saddington
Robert Corden	Sam Smith
John Cottee	Tom Smith
Dr John Doddy	Tracey Taylor
Bethan Eddy	Nigel Turner
Boyd Elliott	Roger Upton
Stephen Garner	Gordon Wheeler
Keith Girling	Jonathan Wheeler
Mike Introna	

The following 27 members voted "**Against**" the motion:-

Pauline Allan	Andy Meakin
Anne Callaghan	Michael Payne
Steve Carr	Sheila Place
John Clarke	Mike Pringle
Jim Creamer	Francis Purdue-Horan
Samantha Deakin	Dave Shaw
Sybil Fielding	Helen-Ann Smith
Kate Foale	Lee Waters
Glynn Gilfoyle	Michelle Welsh
Penny Gowland	Daniel Williamson
Errol Henry	Elizabeth Williamson
Tom Hollis	John Wilmott
David Martin	Jason Zadrozny
John 'Maggie' McGrath	

No members '**Abstained**' from the vote.

RESOLVED: 2021/047

That the public be excluded for the following item on the grounds that the discussions are likely to involve disclosure of exempt information described in Paragraphs 1, 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 as amended and the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

The meeting was closed to the public for the following item.

14. SECTION 5 REPORT

Councillor Gordon Wheeler introduced the report which set out a breach of Section 116 of the Local Government Act 1972 and moved a motion as per the recommendations in the exempt report.

The motion was seconded by Councillor Jonathan Wheeler.

Following a debate, the Chairman put the Motion to the meeting and after a show of hands the Chairman declared it was carried.

The requisite number of Members requested a recorded vote and it was ascertained that the following 33 Members voted '**For**' the motion:-

Reg Adair	Richard Jackson
Mike Adams	Eric Kerry
Callum Bailey	Bruce Laughton
Matt Barney	Johno Lee
Chris Barnfather	Nigel Moxon
Ben Bradley MP	John Ogle
Richard Butler	Philip Owen
André Camilleri	Mike Quigley MBE
Scott Carlton	Mrs Sue Saddington
Robert Corden	Sam Smith
John Cottee	Tom Smith
Dr John Doddy	Tracey Taylor
Bethan Eddy	Nigel Turner
Boyd Elliott	Roger Upton
Stephen Garner	Gordon Wheeler
Keith Girling	Jonathan Wheeler
Mike Introna	

The following 25 members voted "**Against**" the motion:-

Pauline Allan	Steve Carr
Anne Callaghan	John Clarke

Jim Creamer
Samantha Deakin
Sybil Fielding
Kate Foale
Glynn Gilfoyle
Penny Gowland
Errol Henry
Tom Hollis
David Martin
John 'Maggie' McGrath
Andy Meakin

Michael Payne
Sheila Place
Mike Pringle
Helen-Ann Smith
Lee Waters
Michelle Welsh
Daniel Williamson
Elizabeth Williamson
John Wilmott
Jason Zadrozny

The following 2 members '**Abstained**' from the vote:-

Francis Purdue-Horan

Dave Shaw

RESOLVED: 2021/048

That the recommendations as set out in the exempt report were agreed which can be summarised without disclosing exempt information as follows:

That the breach of S116 of the Local Government Act 1972, in appointing a former member to be an employee of the Council within a year of the end of their ceasing to be a member was noted; and that the action proposed in the report be agreed; including that a review of the Council's recruitment practice and procedures has been commissioned.

The meeting was reopened to the public following the conclusion of this item.

Councillor Jason Zadrozny and Councillor Tom Hollis submitted their apologies and left the meeting at this point.

11a. QUESTIONS TO NOTTINGHAMSHIRE AND CITY OF NOTTINGHAM FIRE AUTHORITY

None

11b. QUESTIONS TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

Twelve questions had been received as follows: -

- 1) from Councillor Bethan Eddy concerning progress with talks on a Devolution Deal (Councillor Ben Bradley MP replied)
- 2) from Councillor Helen-Ann Smith regarding speeding traffic on Healdswood Estate, Skegby (Councillor John Ogle replied on behalf of Councillor Neil Clarke MBE)

- 3) from Councillor Jason Zadrozny about the Integrated Rail Plan – Councillor Zadrozny was not in the Chamber to ask his question.
- 4) from Councillor Kate Foale concerning about HS2 and Toton (Councillor Ben Bradley MP replied)
- 5) from Councillor Mike Adams regarding vacant buildings (Councillor Keith Girling replied)
- 6) from Councillor Kate Foale about Freeport job creation (Councillor Ben Bradley MP replied)
- 7) from Councillor Tom Hollis concerning care home staff recruitment and retention – Councillor Hollis was not in the Chamber to ask his question.
- 8) from Councillor Paul Henshaw regarding dual roles – Councillor Henshaw was not in the Chamber to ask his question
- 9) from Councillor Steve Carr about children’s centres (Councillor Tracey Taylor replied)
- 10) from Councillor Anne Callaghan BEM concerning Small Steps Service (Councillor Boyd Elliott replied on behalf of Councillor Tracey Taylor)
- 11) from Councillor Francis Purdue-Horan regarding a new Household Recycling Centre in Rushcliffe (Councillor Mike Adams replied on behalf of Councillor Neil Clarke MBE)
- 12) from Councillor Lee Waters about transparency of the Council (Councillor Philip Owen replied)

The questions which were not asked as the member was not in the Chamber would receive a written response as set out in the Constitution.

The full responses to the questions above are set out in set out in Appendix A to these minutes.

12. NOTICE OF MOTIONS

Motion One – from 23rd September 2021 meeting

The motion was withdrawn by the mover of the motion.

PROCEDURAL MOTION TO AMEND THE ORDER OF BUSINESS

It was moved by Councillor Kate Foale and seconded by Councillor Michael Payne and

RESOLVED: 2021/049

That motion might be moved forward on the agenda to be considered as the next item.

Motion Eight

A Motion as set out below was moved by Councillor Michelle Welsh and seconded by Councillor Penny Gowland:

“Nottinghamshire County Council is extremely disturbed that the Maternity Services at Nottingham University Hospital (NUH) have been deemed inadequate.

The good health of mothers and babies in Nottinghamshire is of paramount importance to this Council. The Council recognises that NUH has tried for several years to improve the Service, but it has failed. It has now become apparent that this problem is far larger than first thought.

Serious incidents within the maternity departments at NUH were downgraded by the hospital to avoid scrutiny and mistakes were kept hidden from regulators and senior health bosses which meant the Trust avoided proper scrutiny.

Therefore, Nottinghamshire County Council will call upon the Government to conduct a full public enquiry into Maternity Services at NUH and resolves to:

- Write to the Secretary of State for Health to express serious concerns and to present the case for a full public enquiry into the Maternity Services at NUH;
- Ask the Secretary of State to meet with the Health Scrutiny Committee and families affected regarding Maternity Services at NUH.”

An amendment to the motion as set out below was moved by Councillor Sue Saddington and seconded by Councillor Matt Barney:-

“Nottinghamshire County Council is extremely disturbed that the Maternity Services at Nottingham University Hospital (NUH) have been deemed inadequate.

The good health of mothers and babies in Nottinghamshire is of paramount importance to this Council. The Council recognises that NUH has tried for several years to improve the Service, but it has failed. It has now become apparent that this problem is far larger than first thought.

Serious incidents within the maternity departments at NUH ~~were~~ **appear to have been** downgraded by the hospital to avoid scrutiny and mistakes ~~were~~ kept hidden from regulators and senior health bosses which meant the Trust avoided proper scrutiny.

Therefore, Nottinghamshire County Council ~~has already~~ **will** called upon the Government to conduct a full public enquiry into Maternity Services at NUH ~~by~~ **and** resolves to:

- **Writing to and meeting with** the Secretary of State for Health to express serious concerns and to present the case for a full public enquiry into the Maternity Services at NUH;

and will

- Ask the Secretary of State **or their nominee** to meet with the **Chairman or Vice Chairman of the** Health Scrutiny Committee **and to discuss concerns raised by** families affected regarding Maternity Services at NUH.”

The Council adjourned from 5.20pm to 5.28pm to allow the amendment to be considered. The amendment was accepted by the mover of the motion with a small change to the final bullet point to read:

- Ask the Secretary of State **or their nominee** to meet with the **Chairman and representatives of the** Health Scrutiny Committee **and to discuss concerns raised by** families affected regarding Maternity Services at NUH.

Therefore, the motion was altered.

The Chairman put the altered Motion to the meeting and after a show of hands the Chairman declared it was carried and it was:-

RESOLVED: 2021/050

Nottinghamshire County Council is extremely disturbed that the Maternity Services at Nottingham University Hospital (NUH) have been deemed inadequate.

The good health of mothers and babies in Nottinghamshire is of paramount importance to this Council. The Council recognises that NUH has tried for several years to improve the Service, but it has failed. It has now become apparent that this problem is far larger than first thought.

Serious incidents within the maternity departments at NUH appear to have been downgraded by the hospital to avoid scrutiny and mistakes kept hidden from regulators and senior health bosses which meant the Trust avoided proper scrutiny.

Therefore, Nottinghamshire County Council has already called upon the Government to conduct a full public enquiry into Maternity Services at NUH by:

- Writing to and meeting with the Secretary of State for Health to express serious concerns and to present the case for a full public enquiry into the Maternity Services at NUH;

and will

- Ask the Secretary of State or their nominee to meet with the Chairman and representatives of the Health Scrutiny Committee to discuss concerns raised by families affected regarding Maternity Services at NUH.

As the time limit of 5.30pm was reached all remaining business would be carried over to the next meeting.

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 5.31 pm.

CHAIRMAN

APPENDIX A

COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 25 NOVEMBER 2021 QUESTIONS TO COMMITTEE CHAIRMEN

Question to the Leader of the Council from Councillor Bethan Eddy

Would the Leader provide Council with an update on the progress of talks with the Government on setting up a Devolution Deal for Nottinghamshire

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Ben Bradley MP

Some Members will recall that previous attempts to achieve a Devolution Deal through a North Midlands Combined Authority or Local Government Reorganisation have stalled before we have ever been able to deliver on those ambitions.

I am pleased to say, currently, the work to bring together councils across Nottinghamshire to make that fresh case for devolution of more funding and powers from central government is making rapid progress. It appears to have a far greater chance of success, touch wood!

The Prime Minister has stated that Devolutions Deals will be available to County areas who make a strong case, and has called for local leaders to work together constructively in a bid for Devolution and deliver the Government's 'Levelling Up' ambition, especially in areas that have been hit hard by the COVID pandemic and have historically missed out on public and private investment in recent years compared with other parts of the country. You only have to have spent ten minutes in any of our debates ever to recognise that we are one of those places.

Nottinghamshire County Council and Nottingham City Council, working with all our borough and district partners, are preparing the case for the County and City to receive these powers, giving us the opportunity to improve public services and enrich the lives of our residents. We have a shared ambition for more powers and funding that will help boost economic investment, improve the environment, and tackle health and educational inequalities across our area.

The county and city economy generates more than £2.65 billion in Gross Value Added (GVA), with further untapped potential for growth, but Nottinghamshire and the East Midlands, as we've discussed, is certainly one of those areas that has historically received some of the lowest levels of funding.

That's why, with the full support of the City of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee, we published in October the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Case for Devolution – a summary of our vision for change. I don't intend to list everything that's in it, because members can go and find it and read it for themselves, but I will highlight the five key priorities that were identified within it. They are:

- Education and Skills - to improve numeracy and literacy and better support people into quality local employment;
- Transport - to deliver improved local infrastructure and connectivity;
- Environment - including enhanced and protected blue and green infrastructure, improved flood alleviation, and accelerating net zero targets;
- Land and Housing – including delivering more affordable housing, better health outcomes, reduced social isolation;
- Economy and Infrastructure - regenerating our city and town centres, accelerating the delivery of broadband and building stronger partnerships with neighbouring areas such as Derby and Derbyshire;

And in fact, Chairman, we're also adding a sixth priority which is not featured in any of the Devolution Deals elsewhere:

- to support vulnerable children and young people in targeted communities, building on the good work that we have been doing as a Council, and we are discussing what that might look like with the Government presently.

There is a major incentive for the Government to support a Devolution Deal for Nottinghamshire, because, this time, we have the collective support of all of our borough and district councils: Ashfield, Bassetlaw, Broxtowe, Gedling, Mansfield, Newark and Sherwood, and Rushcliffe have all made a formal and financial commitments to delivering this piece of work.

This County Council, together with Nottingham City, our borough and district partners and all of the public service agencies across Nottinghamshire, are all pulling in the same direction, all involved in writing these documents and creating this bid, which was not always the case with previous devolution attempts.

This Council has opened its mind to changing its governance model to meet the Government's request for a suitably strong system of leadership, and this Devolution Deal project has re-energised the joint City of Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Economic Prosperity Committee, which was established some time ago, but now offers an ideal governance vehicle for us to take this partnership forward.

With the agreement of these authorities, we have expressed interest to the Government in being a Pathfinder for a Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Devolution Deal. We anticipate the Government's Levelling Up White Paper will be published before Christmas and will name those Pathfinders, so we are working hard to secure Nottinghamshire's place as one of them.

The Economic Prosperity Committee (EPC) has already signed off a plan to release £0.5 million a year from the surplus rates pool of these councils, which is money set aside for the Economic Prosperity Committee to use for economic development, to host a small team of staff to develop the business case proposals, which will come to

Policy Committee next week. That's a fund, as I say, specifically set aside for the EPC to use for economic development purposes.

Even if we were not named as a Pathfinder, we will still be at the front of the queue for a County Deal when the legislation is passed because of the work we're doing as a partnership, through the EPC, to reform local public services to bring local benefits in terms of better, more joined up services. I am not aware of anybody who has made as much progress and put as much into this over the last four or five months as we have, not just the County Council but those partners across local government that I have mentioned.

Earlier this month I joined the Chief Executive Anthony May, City Council Leader David Mellen, and Councillor Zadrozny in presenting our case to Neil O'Brien MP, who is the Minister responsible for these deals. This was a very productive meeting with many positive noises regarding Nottinghamshire's chances of landing a Pathfinder Deal. If this comes to fruition through the White Paper then we will enter into a period of intense negotiations with Government to clarify exactly what resources and powers we will receive, and what we will agree and be expected to deliver with them. Additionally we've met with other Counties who are part of those discussions at the CCN Conference this week, to talk about shared priorities and how we collectively talk to Government about those things that are true of all of the people who are still having conversations with Government. We understand that there are six councils in the country from more than 40 proposals who are having these conversations about Pathfinder deals.

So, Chairman, where other attempts to secure further money and power from central government have fallen short, often because of a lack of political consensus, this time we are able to tell ministers that the whole of Nottinghamshire wants to work together to secure this Devolution Deal. That is a very powerful message.

These are far-reaching plans set to benefit not just the whole of our county but the wider region with Derbyshire and Leicestershire also being three of those six that are having conversations with Government. That gives the East Midlands the potential for a huge boost for our future development.

Question to the Chairman of the Transport and Environment Committee from Councillor Helen-Ann Smith

The Healdswood Estate in Skegby suffers from speeding traffic – with many using the estate's roads as a racetrack. Would the Chairman agree to meet me on the estate at the earliest opportunity to discuss options to improve road safety in the area?

Response by the Vice-Chairman of the Transport and Environment Committee, Councillor John Ogle on behalf of the Chairman of the Transport and Environment Committee, Councillor Neil Clarke MBE

Community safety, road safety are priorities for this Council and Via. You will be aware that fatalities and injuries on Nottinghamshire roads are reducing year by year on trend.

Councillor Clarke and myself are aware from speaking with officers that there have been two recent speeding complaints regarding Healdswood Street, which is one of the feeder roads onto the Healdswood Estate.

As Members may be aware, Councillor Clarke is currently undergoing a hip operation and therefore may not be in a position to conduct a site visit until early next year but is happy to do so once he is able.

Alternatively, as a Vice Chairman of the Transport and Environment Committee I focus in particular on highways and transport issues and I am happy to meet on site with Councillor Smith if she would like this meeting sooner than meeting with Councillor Clarke.

Whichever of us attends, we would of course liaise with the District Highways Manager when making these arrangements.

Question to the Leader of the Council from Councillor Kate Foale

Now it has been confirmed that HS2 will not be going to Toton, will there be a proper and thorough impact assessment to consider the impact of this watered-down plan will have on the local economy in Toton and across Nottinghamshire?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Ben Bradley MP

I welcome the question because it gives me an opportunity to talk about the IRP (Integrated Rail Plan) again and I am really pleased with it – the plan for the north and the midlands as it affects our County and to clarify the point you made about Toton.

As Leader of Nottinghamshire County Council, MP for Mansfield and an advocate for the East Midlands, I welcome the news that HS2 is coming to Nottinghamshire, including East Midlands Parkway Station. Derby, Nottingham and Chesterfield will receive HS2 services in the first instance, that's fantastic news. For those who have been involved in the process, they will know that this has not always been guaranteed. That was certainly not the position we were in six months ago. Others may have had higher expectations but those who have been involved know that to be true.

I further welcome the Government's commitment to complete the electrification of the Midland Main Line – hoorah! – because we have talked about that to death, and here we are. It has been committed to, and the Secretary of State has said in the Chamber of the House of Commons that work will commence before Christmas on the electrification of the Midland Main Line.

The eastern leg of HS2 will run from Birmingham to the East Midlands Parkway, around three miles from Toton, and the high-speed line will cut the journey from Birmingham to Nottingham from 74 minutes to 26 minutes, bringing the West Midlands within a commutable distance, bringing that whole economy closer to our region in terms of work and leisure.

HS2 won't stop at East Midlands Parkway, it is not the intended destination – trains will go on to Derby and Nottingham city centres, rather than through a Toton Hub

Station. That is a technical one because of the difficulties of navigating the Trowell curve via Toton to get into Nottingham which would have required additional significant engineering works. The Government have always been keen to join cities together.

However, it doesn't mean that plans for significant development at Toton have stalled. Far from it. The economic case is well known and in truth it's not so much about train lines as it is about being a hub for investment, for job creation and for economic growth. The Government confirms that it will accelerate transport improvements at Toton, providing a station for local and regional services, to be delivered in line with the substantial private sector investment that we expect to come forward on the site, and that indeed we have already discussed on that site through the relevant corporation through a variety of means with a variety of partners. It's likely that the transport package will include a shuttle to operate between Toton and East Midlands Parkway.

The Integrated Rail Plan also promises to exploit links with other investment in Nottinghamshire, bringing forward business cases for all sorts of regional connectivity including committing to road, rail and tram connections for Toton, and both the Maid Marion Line and the Robin Hood Line extensions which will link some of our most disadvantaged communities in the north of the county into those jobs.

Councillor Zadrozny raised this earlier, as did Councillor Pringle about the certainty around those projects. As he knows, Michael Gove confirmed this week that all of that is funded and will be delivered. The reason there is limited information in the IRP itself is because it lays out projects of national significance and these are much more local projects. As I said earlier on, you won't find many local projects listed in the document. The fact that ours in Nottinghamshire are in it, when none of the others are, is very significant.

All this means there should ultimately be more opportunities for more Nottinghamshire residents to board trains at stations throughout the region than was the case under previous HS2 proposals. Those stations on mainline routes will also see investment in contactless ticketing which will improve the service and processes for rail users.

The proposals for Toton form part of an ambitious long-term vision for the future of the regional economy. The IRP seeks to accelerate the East Midlands Development Corporation as a catalyst to unlock sites across Nottinghamshire and the Midlands, and to lever in private sector investment. It will oversee coordinated developments around Toton and Chetwynd Barracks, Ratcliffe-on-Soar Power Station and East Midlands Airport, covering an area the equivalent size of three Olympic Parks, with the aim of creating 84,000 jobs, adding nearly £5 billion to our regional economy, as well as 4,500 more homes. From an HS2 perspective, the DevCo is our vehicle to deliver at Toton, and the simplified and faster processes it can bring in order to accelerate that delivery are hugely important.

The next step is to go away and talk to Government and to Michael Gove's department about practically what are the next steps in making that happen including both legislation and funding, and those meetings are coming together as we speak.

Early engagement has been secured with the Department for Transport as well as the Department for Levelling Up, so that we can move forward quickly with these plans. I

am meeting the rail minister very soon and, as I say, we welcome the comments from Michael Gove saying that all of these projects will ultimately be delivered.

To answer Councillor Foale's question directly, we will of course be undertaking a proper impact assessment around Toton and find out exactly what these plans mean for the economy, but the broad picture is already fairly clear. In total, the IRP confirms £12.8 billion of investment in our transport in the East Midlands, with the vast majority of that funding coming to Nottinghamshire, which is really welcome, and although HS2 trains don't run to Toton in the first instance there are still a number of options as to how we get from East Midlands Parkway to Sheffield, some of which still include HS2 trains visiting Toton, so that's not yet clear, but what this does do is give us the certainty to get started in terms of kicking on with that private sector investment and getting something built.

I've personally never known a time when we have been able to welcome an investment of £12.8 billion in our regional transport links. I think you would probably have to go back to the building of the M1 to get that amount of money into our regional economy.

For Nottinghamshire and for our economic priorities this is really good news and I welcome the fact that we have some certainty with some of those projects now to get on and deliver for local people.

Question to the Chairman of the Economic Development and Asset Management Committee from Councillor Mike Adams

Is the Chairman of the Economic Development & Asset Management Committee aware of recent allegations in the media that this Council is spending "a ridiculous amount of taxpayers' money" on vacant buildings, and would he please clarify the facts of the matter?

Response from the Chairman of the Economic Development and Asset Management Committee, Councillor Keith Girling

I think if you cast your mind back to this administration's first Council meeting, Councillor Bradley stood up and talked about co-operation, working together, and we know we have to have opposition and we know you have to bring things up and that's great, but actually about the openness and wanting to work with you, so a bit of advice, and an offer, if you like: if you want to do a story about what this Council is doing and you want the facts, there's actually no need to go through Freedom of Information. Come to us, we'll tell you, and you can do your story. Actually, you might find out some facts that change your mind. So that's just an offer to you.

As services move out of buildings it is necessary for the Council to manage vacated buildings safely for the benefit of the local communities they are located in and to safeguard our assets while we either seek to repurpose or dispose of the buildings. Members will be aware that in the past we have experienced serious fires at empty properties at the former Rolleston Drive depot and at the Grove. When this happens not only does this have a significant impact on the assets of the County Council and significant funds need to be spent in making the buildings safe or demolishing them in

their entirety, but they also have a profound impact on communities in terms of health and wellbeing caused by the incident itself.

To ensure that we manage our vacant buildings as safely as possible, effective from 1st August 2020, we commissioned Arc to undertake their management to ensure consistency of approach. This has been welcomed by our insurers. The buildings have been risk assessed and have security alarms and monitoring. This does come at a cost but is necessary to ensure our assets and communities are kept safe.

Furthermore, by employing Arc there are economies of scale and I can ensure this Council that it gets the best possible price for these services. This process is then managed through our commissioning process with Arc with regular written reports and meetings and access to their 24-hour cover arrangements to deal with any incidents.

I understand that a recent article on this matter described 37 buildings incurring security and maintenance costs to a value of £425,599 in the last year. The number of empty properties being managed now sits at 32. You will note that I referred in my response in the article that following my appointment in May 2021 I ordered a review of all the council's properties and how they could be best handled going forward. I am pleased to announce that through working with Officers there are plans in place for nearly all of the 37 properties referenced in the article, which was the number at the time, but by now sits at 32.

Over the next year the plan for each of these properties will be as follows;

- two of the properties are soon to be demolished;
- 15 of the properties are caretaker's properties at schools. Due to the location of these in and around school sites they are not all easy to repurpose and need to be dealt with sensitively. We are working with Gedling Borough Council to lease three of the 15 and exploring options to house families in need of accommodation in others.
- four are under consideration for other County Council Strategic Priorities; and
- seven are in our disposals programme and are either on the market or will be in the New Year.

The remaining four are all subject to ongoing work to bring back into beneficial use or demolish.

The onus is clearly on us to ensure that we minimise the number of vacant buildings we have, and this can be achieved through making quick decisions on whether buildings can be reused or whether they should be demolished or disposed of. This Administration and the previous Administration has had an active demolition programme removing properties beyond their economic life and the recent report to my EDAM (Economic Development and Asset Management) Committee on the Investing in Notts programme highlighted the ongoing review of our wider property estate and its alignment to the disposal programme. We continue to constantly review the status and future of our empty properties and I remain committed to ensuring they are kept safe while empty and are repurposed, demolished or disposed of, and my Committee will continue to oversee this.

Question to the Leader of the Council from Councillor Kate Foale

As work is progressing to make the full business case for a Freeport in the East Midlands, what is being done to guarantee that there will be real benefit to the people in Nottinghamshire, including more decent, well paid and secure jobs and a thriving and sustainable local business sector based in the County?

Response from the Leader of the Council, Councillor Ben Bradley MP

I should start by making clear that developing the East Midlands Freeport's Full Business Case is not entirely within our gift as a County Council but is a joint effort of partners across local government and business. It is actually Leicestershire County Council who are the accountable body for it.

With that said, members and officers from this council have been very active throughout the development of the Freeport Business Case at both stages, which demonstrate the scale of the job opportunities that will be created in the region.

This work, alongside the wider projects at Ratcliffe-on-Soar, Toton, and the wider East Midlands Airport Area that we are progressing through the East Midlands Development Corporation, will deliver 84,000 jobs and £4.8 billion in economic uplift.

Of particular importance to the Freeport Business Case is the provision of proper training to ensure that these jobs benefit local people and their communities. This will include the establishment of local skills academies and ensure that residents don't miss out. Developing better skills education in coalfield communities like Ashfield & Mansfield is a passion of mine, and I am keen to ensure that young people – especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds – are able to take advantage of these opportunities.

A key part of the business case has been to ensure that the economic uplift looks beyond the establishment of the Freeport, into things like construction jobs, and that it develops the long-term prospects that will give our region consistent growth over many years. It is expected that the 'end users' of the Freeport will be major, high-value companies in the manufacturing and energy production sectors, with suitably high-value jobs to match, which return good wages and salaries to local people.

Finally, Chairman, the establishment of a Freeport at East Midlands Airport will allow our region to benefit even further from the continued growth of the airport's freight operation – the largest pure freight airport in the UK - which in turn makes the local supply chain more efficient. This will of course benefit all companies in the region but will be especially important to our small and medium-sized businesses who do not have the same scale to soak up this cost that a larger company might have.

Independently of that, in talks with Manchester Airport Group who run East Midlands Airport they have said to me that the growth of that airport and the continuation of that airport is dependent upon this economic growth and the work that we are doing around that part of the region.

All told, this is a fantastic opportunity for our region and I am certain that the employees and owners of local businesses in particular will be much better off for having the UK's only inland freeport on their doorstep. It works in tandem with our wider regional projects that we have been selling to Government for the last few months, including the Development Corporation (which could form part of the Freeport's Governance) and therefore also the plans for Toton, which sit under the DevCo and obviously we have these Integrated rail plan announcements which join the whole lot of it together. It's almost like there is a plan we are all working to, but we are progressing well. The date for the publication of that full Business Case is the end of January and we continue to make progress on this wider package.

Question to the Chairman of the Children and Young People's Committee from Councillor Steve Carr

Beeston North with Lenton Abbey Children's Centre building and service is 100% funded by Nottinghamshire County Council. It provides a valuable service for many of the most vulnerable families in my Division.

Will Nottinghamshire County Council agree to protect the budget and services for all Children's Centres in Nottinghamshire including Beeston North and Lenton Abbey Children's Centre until at least 2025 so they can remain open in their current locations?

Response from the Chairman of the Children and Young People's Committee, Councillor Tracey Taylor

I notice that there is an Independent Alliance motion later on in the agenda today asking for similar reassurances about the future of Nottinghamshire's 60 libraries, even though this Conservative Council has already fiercely protected all of its libraries and there are no grounds to suggest that that commitment will change.

This question appears to be hinting at a threat to children's centre services in Nottinghamshire, including Beeston North and Lenton Abbey, despite the fact that, once again, this Council has an excellent record of protecting such services compared with many other local authorities.

I believe your concerns may be based on current proposals recently in the news by Nottingham City Council to close a number of their children's centres, but I can confirm that the Beeston North and Lenton Abbey Children's Centre building and service is 100% funded by this County Council. We are not reliant on any City Council funding. So, if Councillor Carr is asking me whether we are committed to properly funding and protecting the services we provide to children and families across Nottinghamshire, including in his area, then absolutely we are.

That does not mean, however, that we guarantee to continue delivering those services in exactly the same way forever. Frankly that would be a foolish promise for any administration to make, because we always have a duty to examine new and innovative ways to improve the effectiveness of our service delivery and ensure the best outcomes for those families who need our help most. Nothing in the world of adult social care or children's services provision stands still, and nor should it, because the

demands facing us are changing all the time, and there are often new funds and opportunities available which we should always seek to explore.

We are moving towards the development of Family Hubs in Nottinghamshire. There are plans to reshape early help services to enable Nottinghamshire to develop these hubs with partners. This means families will be able to access a range of support to meet their needs through Family Hub Networks, which will provide virtual and face to face support using a mixture of outreach work, home visiting and community-based provision. Family Hubs will continue to provide early help services for expectant parents and families with children under the age of 5 in line with our Best Start strategy.

If Councillor Carr or indeed any other councillor or member of the public wants to learn more about Family Hubs they can visit the National Centre for Family Hubs website - www.nationalcentreforfamilyhubs.org.uk - and see for themselves why many local authorities are looking to modernise their service in this way. This is a national direction of travel. So far, the Treasury has provided a £34m transformation fund to support family hubs opening in 12 areas, and £82m was pledged in the spending review to support the rollout of hubs in 75 areas.

On 2nd November the Children and Families Minister, Will Quince addressed the National Centre for Family Hubs. He said, and I quote:

“At their simplest, a family hub is where families with children of all ages know they can get help and support. They may go to a building, or they may access that help online – or maybe a mix of the two. The exact service offer will vary from place to place, as it should, reflecting the needs of the local population, but will have a great ‘Start for Life’ offer for parents, carers and babies at its core.”

“Of course, this in itself is not a new idea. We have had family services, family support units, children’s centres for many years. But the family hub model builds on what we have learned, what local councils and professionals have learned, and what families have told us all, about how to give them the very best support we can – the support that they deserve. This is summarised in the three principles that characterise and define family hubs – access, connections, and relationships.”

Will Quince’s statement also highlighted the range of Government departments who are promoting the development of Family Hubs, so this is a truly co-ordinated and cross-cutting project anchored upon the Family Hubs Unit created by the DfE.

In the Local Government Chronicle the Minister stated that Family Hubs should build on the existing children’s centre model to support greater numbers of families. He said that while the children’s centre model promoted by the last Labour Government was “only for children from 0 to five”, Family Hubs will be for “the whole family”. To clarify, the intention is that they should be for children from 0-19.

The Anna Freud National Centre for Children and Families is also supporting the initiative by leading the National Centre for Family Hubs, which supports best practice. Will Quince has however stated that “ultimately”, family hubs will be “for local authorities to deliver”. He has said, “We want them to be creative, innovative, and really push the boundaries as to what a family hub model could deliver.”

He said: "I don't want to be overly prescriptive. I will make absolutely clear what my expectation is as to what a family hub must be and must deliver. But if they want to go further, I would absolutely encourage that."

So Chairman, we are looking closely at how this new opportunity can benefit Nottinghamshire families, including those in Beeston North and Lenton Abbey. This may well involve modernising and delivering services a little differently in future to what we do at present, but the aim will always be to achieve the best outcomes for children and families across Nottinghamshire.

Question to the Chairman of the Children and Young People's Committee from Councillor Anne Callaghan BEM

Nottinghamshire County Council commission the Small Steps Service to support families of young children, where there is no formal diagnosis of Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) or Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD), but where behaviours may be indicative or characteristic of these conditions. Many of these children are struggling both at home and in school and experience several school exclusions due to displaying extremely challenging behaviours.

Do you believe that it is acceptable that many of these children are waiting up to two years for an appointment to this Service and ten months for an intervention?

Response from the Chairman of Adult Social Care and Public Health Committee, Councillor Boyd Elliott on behalf of Chairman of the Children and Young People's Committee, Councillor Tracey Taylor

To be clear, Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) commission the provider Family Action to deliver the Small Steps Service. Nottinghamshire County Council are not the responsible commissioner for the Small Steps Service.

The service is commissioned to provide additional support as part of the support and diagnostic pathway for Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD) and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD). When commissioning of the service transferred to the CCG in June 2020, funding increased by a third to address increasing demand.

The CCG is aware that waiting times for assessment and interventions are not acceptable and is working with Family Action and system partners to urgently address this, with the CCG investing additional non-recurrent funding to reduce waiting times. A waiting time improvement trajectory is being agreed between the CCG and Family Action with the aim to reduce waiting times to achieve contractual standards during 2022. Support is provided to families awaiting assessment including access to the provider's helpline, workshops and evidence-based parenting courses.

The Children's Integrated Commissioning Hub, hosted by Public Health, work on behalf and with the CCG to ensure improvements in health outcomes for children and young people.

Question to the Chairman of the Transport and Environment Committee from Councillor Francis Purdue-Horan

The Communities and Place Committee approved on 1st October 2020 that a new Household Waste Recycling Centre in Rushcliffe, near Cotgrave, be progressed towards a formal Planning process. We are now over 12 months further on and there has been no planning application submitted and no news on its current status. Would he give an update on the situation and reasons for the delay?

Response from the Vice-Chairman of the Transport and Environment Committee, Councillor Mike Adams on behalf of Chairman of the Transport and Environment Committee, Councillor Neil Clarke MBE

The County Council's new Administration is currently reassessing its priorities to ensure best use of the available capital funding and has therefore paused progress on the proposed recycling centre at Cotgrave pending the forthcoming implementation of the National Resources and Waste Strategy and the associated Environment Act.

This Strategy and the Act will fundamentally change the type and amount of waste collected at the kerbside and through the recycling centres. A report setting out a proposal to undertake a strategic review of the current network of centres in light of those changes, and the lessons learnt through the Covid 19 pandemic, will be considered by the Transport and Environment Committee early in 2022.

Once that review is complete, further proposals to improve recycling in the county will be brought forward.

Question to the Chairman of the Governance and Ethics Committee from Councillor Lee Waters

Does the Chairman agree that this Council has a legal and moral duty to be transparent and beyond reproach?

Response from the Chairman of the Governance and Ethics Committee, Councillor Philip Owen

As far as I know this is the only time that there has ever been a question to the Chairman of the Governance and Ethics Committee, and after you've listened to the answer there will probably not be another one in the foreseeable future!

I cannot help but observe that a question on transparency could not be more opaque. The simple, short answer, clearly, has got to be 'yes'. I was tempted to say 'no' but that would have mucked up your pre-prepared supplementary, so I thought I had better not!

But there is a fine balance to tread, Chairman.

There are occasions when this Council, its Members, its employees or the organisations we work with could be unfairly disadvantaged by being wholly transparent. For example, when considering complex legal or commercial matters, or

matters affected by General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR), a lack of sensitivity on such matters could leave this authority, and the taxpayers who fund our services, worse off.

If Councillor Waters is fortunate enough to serve as a councillor for as long as I have, he will no doubt come across plenty of occasions where taking necessary precautions around the release of personal or commercially sensitive information serves the best long-term interests of the public.

To that end, I would draw your attention, Chairman to the paragraph at the top of the Excluded document where it says 'By virtue of Schedule 12A any disclosure of this report or a part of this report, circulating information, is possibly legally actionable by individuals or the Council'. So, if I were to release information that I shouldn't be, or the Council shouldn't be releasing, then I could end up in prison perhaps! Now there are many who would say that's the best place for me, and many of them are sitting on my side of the house!

Fundamentally, Chairman, officers and members of this council must abide by the seven Nolan Principles of Public Life. These acknowledge that no individual – and therefore no local authority – is completely beyond reproach, not even me, and that we must therefore allow ourselves to be challenged, and as a result be open to change.

This is the nature of the democratic process. It places the duty on us as councillors to ensure that we have appropriate checks and balances in place to ensure that we are acting in the public interest to the best of our ability.

**REPORT OF THE CHAIRMAN OF THE TRANSPORT AND ENVIRONMENT
COMMITTEE****RESPONSES TO PETITIONS PRESENTED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNTY COUNCIL****Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is inform Council of the decisions made by the Transport and Environment Committee concerning issues raised in petitions presented to the County Council at its 23 September 2021 meeting.

Information**A. Request to repair potholes at The Homesteads, Kirkby in Ashfield (Ref:2021/0421)**

2. A petition consisting of 50 signatures was presented to the 23 September 2021 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Andy Meakin. The petition relates to The Homesteads in Kirkby in Ashfield and requests that a number of potholes, which were highlighted in a separate report, are repaired.
3. The Homesteads was inspected on the 5 October 2021. There were 2 potholes that were identified for works and the actionable defects in the report have now been completed. This section of road is currently inspected annually, but due to the vulnerable residents in this location it is now planned to increase this to a quarterly inspection in response to the concerns raised.
4. This road is on the County Council's 'Candidate List', its condition having been picked up initially by the annual technical survey, along with subsequent recommendations from the Highway Inspectors. Currently, all potential countywide highway maintenance schemes included on the 'Candidate List' are being considered for possible inclusion in a future year's capital maintenance programme; with the provisional 2022/23 programme due to be considered by Transport and Environment Committee at its January 2022 meeting.
5. It was agreed that the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

B. Request for traffic calming and a residents' permit parking scheme on Beacon Hill Road, Newark (Ref:2021/0422)

6. A petition with 23 signatures was presented to the 23 September 2021 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Sam Smith on behalf of residents requesting the introduction of traffic calming and a residents' permit parking scheme on Beacon Hill Road between Sleaford Road and Sherwood Avenue in Newark.

7. Beacon Hill Road lies to the east of Newark town centre. The road is residential in character but its location means that it is often used by through traffic. The carriageway is narrow at the western end and has double yellow lines installed to ensure that parked vehicles do not cause congestion. The road widens towards the eastern end and on-street parking has historically been permitted here because the majority of properties do not have access to off-street parking. However, this parking can lead to delays because the road is not wide enough to enable traffic to pass parked vehicles in both directions at the same time.
8. The petition requests the installation of traffic calming in order to reduce traffic congestion. While the installation of traffic calming would likely reduce the incentive to use Beacon Hill Road as a through route, thus cutting queues, it is likely to be a controversial measure. Traffic calming features can have adverse impacts on emergency services and other road users, and are often opposed by as many residents as support them due to the local impacts. As a result, the County Council's current policy is to only introduce traffic calming features as a measure to reduce the numbers of casualties from road traffic collisions when no other safety measures can be implemented. A recent assessment of the road traffic collisions on Beacon Hill Road indicates that, at the present time, it does not warrant any intervention measures such as physical traffic calming. This will however, continue to be monitored
9. With regard to parking, it has already been noted that a significant proportion of properties at the eastern end have no off-street parking, with only one out of the 18 terraced properties having off-street parking. Residents' parking permit schemes only assist when problems are caused by intrusive parking by non-residents and therefore a parking survey will be carried out to determine if a permit scheme is likely to offer any material benefit to residents.
10. It was agreed that the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

C. Request for a speed limit reduction on A6117 Old Mill Lane, Forest Town (Ref:2021/0423)

11. A petition with 30 signatures was presented to the 23 September 2021 meeting of the County Council by Councillor Nigel Moxon on behalf of residents requesting a reduction of the speed limit on the A6117 Old Mill Lane between Sandlands Way and Barringer Road in Forest Town.
12. The County Council is obliged to review speed limits in line with national guidance as set out in the Department for Transport (DfT) Circular 01/2013 "Setting Local Speed Limits". The guidance notes that a principal aim in determining appropriate speed limits should be to provide a consistent message between speed limit and what the road looks like, and for changes in speed limit to be reflective of changes in the road layout and characteristics. A 30mph speed limit should apply in built-up areas with development on both sides of the road.
13. This section of Old Mill Lane has no property frontage on either side and there is no point along it where this changes. The presence of street lights means that the county council would be required to remove the existing speed limit repeater signs. With this in mind, and given the character of the road, the council would not expect to achieve compliance with a 30 mph speed limit at this location without the need for police enforcement. It is a key principle of the speed limit guidance that limits achieve compliance without the need for enforcement.
14. The petition specifies driver behaviour and difficulty exiting side roads as justifications for the request. Whilst this concern is acknowledged, the DfT guidance states that speed limits should not be used to attempt to solve the problem of isolated hazards, for example a side road junction.

15. Following the advice set out in the national guidance, it is considered that a reduction in the speed limit is not appropriate. However, an assessment will be carried out to determine if the installation of a vehicle-activated speed sign is appropriate and a study will be carried out to determine if improvements to the junction can be made that will assist motorists when exiting.

16. It was agreed that the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

Statutory and Policy Implications

17. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, data protection and information governance finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (public health services), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and adults at risk, service users, smarter working, sustainability and the environment and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the contents of the report be noted.

Councillor Neil Clarke MBE
Chairman of Transport and Environment Committee

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Adrian Smith, Corporate Director, Place
adrian.smith@nottscc.gov.uk

Background Papers and Published Documents

- Responses to Petitions Presented to the Chairman of the County Council – Transport and Environment Committee, 17th November 2021 (published)

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- Kirkby North – Councillor Andy Meakin
- Mansfield East – Councillor Nigel Moxon and Councillor Robert Corden
- Newark East – Councillor Sam Smith

REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE

AMENDMENTS TO APPOINTMENTS OF COMMITTEE VICE-CHAIRMEN

Purpose of the Report

1. To approve a change in appointments to the roles of Vice-Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee and Adult Social Care and Public Health Committee for the current municipal year.

Information

2. Relevant appointments to the roles of Committee Chairman and Vice-Chairman were agreed for the current municipal year by Full Council on 27 May 2021.
3. Within those overall appointments, Councillor Nigel Turner was appointed as one of the two Vice-Chairmen of Adult Social Care and Health Committee and Councillor Matt Barney was appointed as the Vice-Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee.
4. The Ruling Group Business Manager informed Democratic Services on 5 January 2022 that they wish to swap these appointments so that Councillor Turner is appointed as Vice Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee in place of Councillor Barney and Councillor Barney is appointed as one of the two Vice Chairman of Adult Social Care and Health Committee in place of Councillor Turner.

Other Options Considered

5. None

Reason/s for Recommendation/s

6. Changes in membership can be actioned by the Team Manager of Democratic Services in line with the powers delegated by Full Council.
7. Full Council makes appointments to the roles of Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of relevant Committees at the annual meeting for the relevant municipal year. As a result it is good practice to make any alterations to those appointments via a report to Council.

Statutory and Policy Implications

8. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, data protection and information governance finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (public health services), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and adults at risk, service users, smarter working, sustainability and the environment and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

Financial Implications

9. Both Vice-Chairman positions involved qualify for the same level of Special Responsibility Allowance (SRA) of £11,739 per annum, as set out in the Constitution, and provision has been made for this within the annual Democratic Services budget.

10. As such, there are no financial implications arising from this proposed amendment.

RECOMMENDATION/S

- 1) To appoint Councillor Nigel Turner as the Vice-Chairman of Health Scrutiny Committee until the annual Full Council meeting in 2022.
- 2) To appoint Councillor Matt Barney as the Vice-Chairman of Adult Social Care and Public Health Committee until the annual Full Council meeting in 2022.

Anthony May
Chief Executive

For any enquiries about this report please contact:

Marjorie Toward, Service Director, Customers, Governance and Employees and Monitoring Officer

Constitutional Comments (HD 6/01/2022)

11. The proposals in this report are within the remit of Full Council.

Financial Comments (RWK – 10/02/2022)

12. There are no specific financial implications arising directly from this report.

Background Papers and Published Documents

Except for previously published documents, which will be available elsewhere, the documents listed here will be available for inspection in accordance with Section 100D of the Local Government Act 1972.

- Establishment of Committees report to Full Council - 27th May 2021 (published)

Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected

- All