

# Minutes



Meeting COUNTY COUNCIL

Date Thursday, 19<sup>th</sup> July 2007 (10.30 am – 3.24 pm)

## Membership

Persons absent are marked with 'A'

## Councillors

John C Allin (Chairman)

The Hon Joan Taylor (Vice-Chairman)

	Reg Adair		Pat Lally
	Peter Barnes	A	Bruce Laughton
	Chris Baron		Edward Llewellyn-Jones
	Joyce Bosnjak		Ellie Lodziak
	Martin M Brandon-Bravo OBE		Joe Lonergan MBE
	Kenneth Bullivant		Mick Murphy
	Richard Butler		Jim Napier
	Steve Carr		Jim O'Riordan
	Steve Carroll		Philip Owen
	John Carter	A	Tom Pettengell
	John Clarke		Sheila Place
	Jen Cole		Peter D Prebble
	Barrie Cooper		Darrell Pulk
	John Cottee		Alan Rhodes
A	M J Cox		Ken Rigby
	Jim Creamer		Sue Saddington
	Mrs Kay Cutts		David Shaw
	Yvonne Davidson		Mrs Stella M Smedley
	Alan Davison		Mark Spencer
	V H Dobson		Andy Stewart
	Sybil Fielding		John R Stocks
A	Andy Freeman		Mick Storey
	Glynn Gilfoyle		Martin Suthers OBE
	Keith Girling		Lynn Sykes
	Albert Haynes		David Taylor
	John M Hemsall	A	Parry Tsimbiridis
	Paul Henshaw		Kevan Wakefield
	Stan Heptinstall MBE		Keith Walker
	Helen Holt		Chris Winterton
	Richard Jackson		Brian Wombwell
	Rod Kempster		Yvonne Woodhead
	David Kirkham		Jason Zadrozny
	John R Knight		

## **OPENING PRAYER**

Upon the Council commencing at 10.30 am Councillor John Allin called upon Members and Officers to observe a minute's silence in memory of the late, former Director of Environment, Peter Webster.

Following the observation of one minute's silence the Chief Executive in the absence of the Chairman's Chaplain led prayers.

The Chairman also welcomed Elizabeth Bennett (Assistant Chief Executive) back to Council following illness.

## **1. MINUTES**

### **RESOLVED: 2007/062**

That the Minutes of the last meeting of the County Council held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2007 be agreed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

## **2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors:-

M. J. Cox  
Andy Freeman  
Bruce Laughton

Tom Pettengell  
Parry Tsimbirdis

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST BY MEMBERS AND OFFICERS**

Councillor Mark Spencer declared a personal and prejudicial interest in agenda item number 10 – Trading Standards Food and Agricultural Plan 2007/08 – because he is a livestock farmer and retailer.

Councillor Martin Suthers declared a personal interest in agenda item number 11 – Motion no 1 – because he was a Trustee of an Environmental Charity, subsequently this declaration was withdrawn when the Chairman informed Council that Motion no 1 had been withdrawn from the agenda.

## **4. CHAIRMAN'S BUSINESS**

### **(a) Presentation of Awards**

Councillor Chris Baron presented to the Chairman a certificate from the Chairman of the 4P's 2007 Awards for Excellence in Local Government PPP for best private sector partner in Children Centre Construction Programme.

## **(b) Constituency Issues**

As set out in appendix A attached to these minutes is a full note of the issues discussed by Councillors:

- (1) Councillor Edward Llewellyn-Jones (Public transport in his constituency)
- (2) Councillor Ellie Lodziak (sudden closure of Castle College nursery in Eastwood and the way in which it was implemented)
- (3) Councillor Reg Adair (Heavy Goods Vehicles using local minor roads around Tollerton and Plumtree).

## **5 (a) Presentation of Petitions**

No petitions were presented.

## **5 (b) Report Back on Petitions**

**RESOLVED: 2007/063**

That the matters contained in the report back on petitions received on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2007 be noted.

## **6(a) QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 6.1**

Four questions had been received as follows:-

- (1) Road Safety measures on the A617 (Councillor Andy Stewart)
- (2) Recent regional backing for Leeds Supertram and cost of NET (Councillor Martin Brandon-Bravo)
- (3) North Notts College planning consent deferral by Ashfield District Council and implications to education and regeneration (Councillor Steve Carroll)
- (4) Mobile masts and locality to schools policy (Councillor Martin Suthers)

The full text of the questions set out above together with the answers given is included at appendix B to these minutes.

## **6(b) QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 6.2**

There were no questions asked under Standing Order 6.2.

## **7. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION – EMPLOYMENT PROCEDURE RULES AND STAFFING STANDING ORDERS**

In moving a motion, Councillor Stocks wished Members to note that there was an amendment to page 5 of the Appendix under paragraph 4 Employment Policies and Procedures, the NB would now read “Whilst the policies and procedures negotiated corporately from time to time be strongly recommended to Community Schools for adoption, the adoption or otherwise of such policies will be a matter for the School governing body, if such responsibility rests with them.”

Councillor David Kirkham seconded the motion and it was:-

### **RESOLVED: 2007/064**

- (1) That the revised employment procedure rules and staffing standing orders be approved as set out in the appendix to the report (with the amendment to paragraph 4 of the Appendix as set out above)
- (2) that the Monitoring Officer be authorised to make the necessary consequential changes to the Constitution to give effect to the revised employment procedure rules namely:
  - (i) renaming the current Selection Committee as the Senior Staffing Committee and amending 13 items of reference as set out in the report
  - (ii) amend the delegation to Officers Section as set out in the report
  - (iii) amend the terms of reference of Appeals Committees, as set out in the report
  - (iv) include the terms of reference for the Local Joint Resolution Committee as set out in the report.

## **8. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION – AUTHORISED SIGNATORIES**

On a motion by Councillor David Kirkham and seconded by Councillor Mick Storey, it was:-

### **RESOLVED: 2007/065**

- (1) That the five senior solicitors in Legal Services be authorised to sign and attest the affixing of the Common Seal on County Council documentation.
- (2) That Article 14 of the Constitution be amended accordingly. That the posts of Executive Head of Democratic and Legal Services, Assistant

Head of Legal Services (Practice manager) and Head of Member Services be deleted from the authority to seal under Article 14.5.

(3) That Article 14.5 be amended to authorise the following posts:-

Chief Executive  
Assistant Chief Executive  
Head of Law & Democracy  
Assistant Head of Legal Services (Corporate Law)  
Assistant Head of Legal Services (Litigation)  
Senior Solicitors (5 post holders)

to attest the affixing of the Common Seal and sign Council documentation as Authorised Signatories.

#### **9. THE LOCAL AUTHORITIES (MODEL CODE OF CONDUCT) ORDER 2007**

On a motion by Councillor Ellie Lodziak, seconded by Councillor Mick Storey, it was:-

#### **RESOLVED: 2007/066**

- (1) That the Model Code of Conduct be adopted and become effective on 1<sup>st</sup> October 2007
- (2) that, subject to approval by the Administration Committee, briefing sessions be organised and offered to all members, co-optees and independents who will be bound by the new code.

#### **10. TRADING STANDARDS FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL PLAN 2007/2008**

Following his earlier declaration of a personal and prejudicial interest, Councillor Mark Spencer left the Council Chamber whilst discussions and voting took place

On a motion by Councillor Glynn Gilfoyle and seconded by Councillor Mick Storey it was:-

#### **RESOLVED: 2007/067**

That the Trading Standards Food and Agricultural Plan for 2007/08 be approved.

Councillor Mark Spencer returned to the Council Chamber.

## **11. NOTICES OF MOTION**

### **Motion 1**

It was noted that the motion had been withdrawn from the agenda.

### **Motion 2**

It was moved by Councillor Mark Spencer and seconded by Councillor Mrs. Kay Cutts:-

“This Council resolves:-

- i) To commend the efforts of all County Council officers involved in the prompt response to flooding incidents at various locations in Nottinghamshire in recent weeks
- ii) To acknowledge that many of these incidents could have been made less severe, and in some cases prevented, through better maintenance of local drainage systems and watercourses
- iii) To pursue central government for a separate identified budget to repair the damage caused to our highways and infrastructure by the recent flooding and to improve drainage systems to cope more effectively with heavy rainfall in the future
- iv) To promote Nottinghamshire County Council as the organisation best placed to co-ordinate the efforts of all agencies and landowners involved in flood prevention in Nottinghamshire.”

The following amendments, were moved by Councillor Glynn Gilfoyle and seconded by Councillor Stella Smedley,

“amend paragraph (ii) to read

- (ii) to acknowledge the need to review the maintenance of local drainage systems and watercourses and to request that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee include this topic within the remit of their current scrutiny on Flooding. “

Amend paragraph (iii) to read

- (iii) to welcome government support for flood hit communities and schools in Nottinghamshire, and pursue central government for a separate identified budget to

- (a) repair the damage caused to our highways and infra-structure by the recent flooding
- (b) review and improve drainage systems where this is shown to be beneficial in reducing the risk of flooding

and delete paragraph (iv)”

Councillor Mark Spencer, having indicated that the amendments were acceptable to him, the motion as amended took the place of the original motion and was then before the meeting for debate. Following debate, the motion as amended was put to the meeting and was declared to be carried unanimously.

**RESOLVED: 2007/068**

This Council resolves:-

- i) To commend the efforts of all County Council officers involved in the prompt response to flooding incidents at various locations in Nottinghamshire in recent weeks
- (ii) to acknowledge the need to review the maintenance of local drainage systems and watercourses and to request that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee include this topic within the remit of their current scrutiny on Flooding.
- (iii) to welcome government support for flood hit communities and schools in Nottinghamshire, and pursue central government for a separate identified budget to
  - (a) repair the damage caused to our highways and infra-structure by the recent flooding
  - (b) review and improve drainage systems where this is shown to be beneficial in reducing the risk of flooding

**Motion 3**

It was moved by Councillor Steve Carroll and seconded by Councillor Chris Winterton and following full debate, the motion was put to the meeting and it was unanimously:-

**RESOLVED: 2007/069**

This council recognises the need for a balanced and diverse energy policy to secure Britain’s energy needs in the future. Currently our energy mix in the UK is 37% gas, 35% coal, 23% nuclear and the rest by oil and renewables. Britain

burned 68 million tonnes of coal last year of which more than 50 million tonnes was imported from around the world.

With the trend for increased demand for coal set to continue and the development of clean coal technology making coal burn more efficient and environmentally acceptable, this council urges the government to look again at Nottinghamshire coal as a viable contribution to our long term energy needs.

## **12. ADJOURNMENT DEBATES**

There were no adjournment debates.

## **EXCLUSION OF THE PUBLIC**

On a motion by Councillor Sheila Place, seconded by Councillor Chris Winterton, it was:-

### **RESOLVED: 2007/070**

That under paragraph 3 of the Local Government Act (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 the public be excluded from the meeting for the remaining item of business on the agenda on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information.

## **EXEMPT INFORMATION ITEM**

## **13. LAND TO THE NORTH A38 KINGSMILL ROAD EAST, SUTTON-IN-ASHFIELD**

On a motion by Councillor Chris Baron, seconded by Councillor Mick Storey, it was:-

### **RESOLVED: 2007/071**

That the sale of land to the north of the A38 Kingsmill Road East, Sutton-in-Ashfield be approved.

**CHAIRMAN**

M\_19July07



**COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING 19<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2007**

**THREE MINUTE SPEECHES**

**Councillor Edward Llewellyn-Jones**

“Thank you Chair.

I want to highlight one particular issue in my Division. But, perhaps, first of all I ought to say a few things about it – Sutton-in-Ashfield Central. The name implies it covers the centre of Sutton. That is not quite accurate – only half of the centre of Sutton is covered by my Division. I suspect the descriptor Central came from the fact that it is completely surrounded by all the other divisions in Sutton and, therefore, is a fairly small centralised geographical area which covers mostly of new housing.

Except for the shops in the centre of the town, the Division is made up of housing, three primary and one secondary school. There is one park which was carved out of the local tip site. The major part of the housing incorporates a former council house estate with its mixed housing for families and the elderly. There is little space for recreation and only a few shops. As was the practice in the past, there are parts of this estate where older people have been gathered and they are not close to the principal food shops or other amenities. The days of the corner shop have long gone (more sophisticated now). One of the ways we tried to overcome this difficulty was to provide a bus service which could transport people across Sutton so that they, on the one hand could visit friends and relatives or do their shopping. It worked well until the bus service was privatised. From this point onwards the County Council tried to keep the bus service running for many of these people. In the last few years it was heavily subsidised. Just over a year ago the bus company decided to withdraw the bus service despite the subsidies. A substantial number of older people, somewhere between 2 and 4 hundred, were suddenly left without transport. Some were unable to get into town to buy their food because they had difficulty walking distances. Through a wonderful community spirit people helped each other and the worst of the problems were avoided. But that was not the ideal solution. It was important to seek to restore the bus service. Despite discussions with the bus company, at the highest level, they would not budge. They argued that by diverting the bus away from the older people's area their income had actually increased. I found that a bizarre argument.

The solution in the short run has come in the shape of a bus service run by the County Council and supported by Government finance. It does not follow recognised bus routes and is able to divert off its set route to pick up passengers who cannot walk very far. It has been such a success that we have had to put on

an earlier bus to accommodate the numbers of people wanting to go into town to do their shopping. Now there are two morning shopper buses. What this says to me is that with a bit of hard work and support from the appropriate departments in the County Council we can find solutions to people's problems."

## **Councillor Ellie Lodziak**

"Thank you Chairman.

In the 1990's, during a period of major regeneration in Eastwood, Broxtowe College acquired Parkside Special School from the County Council. Over the next few years, working in partnership with the Phoenix Project, employers, the local community and statutory and voluntary agencies, it developed a range of courses, facilities and resources to appropriately meet the needs of the local community, including a nursery providing a high standard of childcare.

Last year, Broxtowe College and The People's College Nottingham merged to become Castle College Nottingham. Concerns that smaller campuses such as Eastwood and Kimberley Community College would lose their unique ethos were unfortunately justified on 2 July, this year when Castle College wrote to parents and carers and informed staff that the Nursery was to close on 6 July. Some parents were given this letter only two days before closure.

Chairman, I do not wish to comment today on the College's decision to close the Nursery as there may be a legitimate business case. However, I do feel strongly that I must express the views of many of my constituents about the way it was done, and how it will affect the children.

The parents and carers were told they **had** received adequate notice as they had got the summer break to organise alternative arrangements, but the majority of places with funded vacancies are term time only, therefore sourcing suitable placements could not, in realistic terms, start until September. The upheaval for these small children moving to a new provider after the summer holidays, together with a settling in period, will be enormous.

I feel that treating people in this way with, only four days' notice and no consultation with staff, parents and carers, is unacceptable. I agree with local councillors, Nick Palmer, MP for Broxtowe, and parents that an acceptable compromise would be for the Nursery to remain open for one more term which would give everyone a reasonable chance to find suitable alternative places and employment and ensure a smooth transition for the children.

Finally, Chairman and Members, I would like to say how very saddened I am by this event. I am very aware that this sort of practice is not uncommon in the private sector but I expect a lot better from our education establishments. Do business interests now come before caring for our communities?

I have some more information here if anyone would like a copy.

Thank you Chairman.”

## **Councillor Reg Adair**

“Chairman, residents of Tollerton and Plumtree in my division have been campaigning for some time for Nottinghamshire County Council to address the problem of Heavy Goods Vehicles thundering past their homes.

They are very keen for Nottinghamshire to consider a similar scheme to that used by Leicestershire County Council, where a weight restriction system is in place which restricts lorries to using A and B roads, and bans them from rat running through village lanes.

This has proved very effective in Leicestershire, where arrangements have been made with the local police to ensure the bans are enforced. The police have been using cameras to track and pursue offenders, and are working with satellite navigation suppliers to promote major routes.

Members have heard, at recent Council Meetings, the damage being caused by HGVs to the local environment in terms of noise, vibration, pollution, and their threat to the safety of pedestrians, especially children on the way to or from village schools.

Tollerton and Plumtree residents have been most resourceful in pursuing this issue, through their Tollerton Against Speeding Campaign Force, known as TASCforce:

- Joint Parish Council/TASCforce letters have been sent to each HGV company using roads in Tollerton asking them to use other roads.
- Similar letters have been sent to these companies by Nottinghamshire County Council, but with variable results.
- Frequent requests have been made to Nottinghamshire County council to consider Tollerton for weight restriction. They would like to know the reason this has not been followed through.
- A recent query was submitted to the County Council as to whether Tollerton and Plumtree could be considered for a WIDTH restriction, again turned down.
- They have campaigned for better signage from the A46 onto the A606 to warn HGVs that there is a low level bridge ahead.

The County Council did agree to ask TASCforce to comment at draft stage on Nottinghamshire's proposed new criteria for weight restrictions, but in practice this did not happen.

As a result, the new criteria will not help the local residents, because the first step is for the weight restrictions to be considered, 8% of the total traffic must be HGVs, and this is not quite the case in Tollerton.

I can understand residents' frustration. Recent surveys conducted by TASCforce found that in a four hour period as many as 50 trucks were using Cotgrave Lane and Tollerton Lane at various times of day. Likewise, a survey over a 12 hour period counted more than 240 HGVs.

It's true this may not account for 8% of the total traffic, but for people living nearby, it is a hazardous nightmare which clearly impacts on their environment and quality of life.

Chairman, I think the residents have made a strong case for Heavy Goods Vehicles to be banned from their villages and restricted to major roads, and I hope the Cabinet Member and her officers will take this into account.”

**COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING 19<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2007**

**QUESTIONS UNDER STANDING ORDER 6.1**

**Question to the Cabinet Member for Environment from Councillor Andy Stewart**

Can the Cabinet Member for Environment tell Council when the additional road safety measures on the A617 at Kirklington will be implemented, given that they were agreed as 'urgent over six months ago?

**Response by Councillor Stella Smedley, Cabinet Member for Environment:**

"Thank you Chair.

May I thank Councillor Stewart for his question.

Road safety remedial measures have already been introduced in Kirklington in response to a series of accidents, particularly at the bends at either ends of the village on the A617.

These measures have included interactive bend warning signs, chevron signs and other road markings at a cost of £14,000.

Further signing improvements will be introduced on the A617 approach from the Mansfield direction within the next month, and I can confirm that the resurfacing of the carriageway through the village is also now complete".

**Question to the Cabinet Member for Environment from Councillor Martin Brandon-Bravo**

Leeds City Council recently secured regional backing for the first phase of a new £300 million trolleybus system, to replace the collapsed Leeds Supertram scheme which would have cost around £750 million.

A press release from Leeds City Council (15<sup>th</sup> June) states:

'Drawn up as an alternative to the Leeds Supertram scheme, the New Generation Transport network would deliver many of the congestion-busting benefits that Supertram would have provided, with greater flexibility for future extension into other areas.'

With the projected costs of NET Phase Two quickly approaching Leeds Supertram proportions, will the Cabinet Member follow Leeds City Council's lead and consider a more cost-effective and flexible alternative?

**Response by Councillor Stella Smedley, Cabinet Member for Environment:**

“Thank you.

I went into a bit of panic then for a moment Martin, because I had obviously moved my answer to somewhere else.

Much publicity was given, last year, to the failure of Liverpool and Leeds to secure Government approval for their tram schemes and to Manchester for non-approval of tram extensions. Indeed, the only tram scheme to receive provisional Government approval, for several years, is NET Phase Two. All of this Council can be assured that Nottingham and Nottinghamshire are now the envy of many larger cities in the UK.

One of the factors to influence the Government in approving NET Phase Two was, of course, the outstanding success of NET Line One. Customer surveys indicate that 94% of passengers are satisfied with the service provided.

I know that Leeds is now developing an alternative which has secured regional backing but is still being considered by the Department for Transport. My understanding is that the new trolleybus proposal would use the same routes as the original Supertram Scheme. It will, therefore, incur many of the environmental costs associated with the original Scheme but will fall considerably short of its transport and economic benefits.

The performance of the NET Phase Two proposals has been tested against a range of alternatives, including improvements to the local rail network, enhanced bus priority measures and the provision of a High Quality Bus network in the Clifton and Beeston/Chilwell corridors.

These alternative strategies have been identified as providing a level of economic benefits commensurate with their Scheme cost, but at a much lower level than the NET Phase Two proposals. In economic terms, the alternatives to NET Phase Two are unable to meet either national or local objectives as effectively as NET. Also of importance are wider issues, notably acceptability and delivery risks associated with a High Quality Bus network, particularly in providing similar levels of segregation to NET due to route acceptability, potential service reliability issues and likely impacts on city centre circulation and on the provision of public transport services in other corridors.

The key benefit of NET Phase Two when compared to a high quality bus system is in enhancing network productivity and efficiency, and building on the success of Line One. NET Phase Two will provide full integration with Line One, creating a wide range of new journey opportunities and maximising the efficient use of the constrained road and public transport network, especially by releasing capacity in

the central area to improve the operation of the wider public transport network in those corridors not served by NET.

It is scaremongering to imply that the projected costs of NET Phase Two are 'quickly approaching Leeds Supertram proportions'. The Government's conditional approval was granted after detailed scrutiny of the business case and financial models developed by the consultants Pricewaterhouse Coopers.

The next stage of NET Phase Two is the Public Inquiry to be held in Nottingham in November and December of this year. I have every confidence that the independent Inspector will listen carefully to all the arguments for and against the Scheme and conclude that this key regional transport scheme should be supported."

**Question to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Property from Councillor Steve Carroll**

Would the Cabinet Member for Finance and Property explain what the implications are for education and regeneration in the north of the county, following Ashfield District Council's decision to defer planning consent for a new West Notts College?

**Response by Councillor Chris Baron, Cabinet Member for Finance and Property:**

"Thank you Chairman and can I thank Councillor Carroll for this question.

Ashfield District Council Planning Committee met on July 9<sup>th</sup> with an important decision before them – they had to decide whether to grant planning permission for a joint college and technology park on the County Council owned land at Rushley Farm at the junction with the A60 and the Mansfield and Ashfield Regeneration Route, known as the MARR.

This exciting Scheme represented a unique opportunity for Ashfield - and Mansfield.

It would have resulted in an enlarged state-of-the-art college linked to a technology park with a provision to provide a link between the worlds of education and work.

It was a Scheme that had the backing of the County Council, the College and local people.

It was a Scheme that would have been the envy of almost every further education establishment in the country.

Councillor Carroll will be aware of the level of need within the Mansfield and Ashfield area for decent jobs and a good education:

- In terms of education, out of the 408 district council areas across the country assessed in terms of skills and qualifications, Mansfield ranks 341 and Ashfield, 382. Rushcliffe, by comparison come second!
- The national average for the proportion of the working population with NVQ level 4 or above is 26.4%. In Mansfield it is 18.6% and in Ashfield, 15.1%. In Rushcliffe it is 48.1%!
- Nationally, almost 60% of kids leave school with 5 or more A-C grades at GCSE level. In Ashfield, it's only 40% and in Mansfield it's less than 42%

In terms of the local economy and the need for regeneration, the message is similar:

- In Ashfield average gross weekly earnings are 93% of the national average. In Mansfield, it's 75%. The employment rate in both districts is also below the national average.
- The national average for the percentage of workers employed in the Knowledge Economy is almost 24%. In Ashfield it's less than 15% and in Mansfield it's just over 17%.
- In Ashfield there are over six and a half thousand claimants of Invalidity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance. In Mansfield, it's almost seven thousand.

That is why this decision on the future of West Notts College was so important. This is why there was so much at stake.

So what did Ashfield District Council do when asked by their own planning officers to give approval to the Scheme? They decided - by nine votes to eight - to defer the decision.

For 3 months.

They might just as well have rejected the proposals there and then. Because Chairman, although three months may not seem a long time, the implications of this none decision will have a devastating effect for the future education prospects for young people in the Ashfield and Mansfield areas.

A decision that will almost certainly result in West Notts College being unable to access funding from the Learning and Skills Council, which is fundamental to the prospects of a new college being built.

This was made perfectly clear in the papers supporting the application and in the press releases from the College in the period leading up to July 9<sup>th</sup>.



Yet the Committee still deferred their decision on the basis of 'a lack of public consultation' and a lack of evidence that alternative sites had been considered.

If they had been bothered to read the application in advance, they would have seen that a detailed assessment of alternative sites had been included.

And as for 'public consultation', the College had already exceeded its obligations by holding well-attended public meetings and by displaying the plans for the new college, not only in the College itself, but also in the Four Seasons shopping centre.

Chairman, this decision reveals everything about the people who are now running Ashfield District Council. Their lack of leadership and vision, their ignorance of planning processes and their willingness to bend to the views of a vocal few, means that they have cheated future generations of a facility that would have helped to give them the life chances they deserve.

I believe they should be ashamed of themselves."

**Question to the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services from Councillor Martin Suthers**

Would the Cabinet Member advise Council as to whether the Department is considering a review or update of its policy on the location of mobile phone masts on or near school premises, as approved by Policy Committee on 9<sup>th</sup> July 2001?

**Councillor Joyce Bosnjak, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People's Services:**

"Thanks to Councillor Suthers for his question re mobile phone masts and you are right Martin.

The last County Council policy was fixed back in 2001, but recently we have had a number of enquiries, particularly in Orston and Southwell about that and in reviewing it, as we will, in association with Corporate Property, we would obviously have to take Central Government and Planning Law guidance, but we are happy to review it against national guidelines."