



Tuesday, 13 July 2021

Dear Sir/Madam

A meeting of the Council will be held on Wednesday, 21 July 2021 in the DE VERE East Midlands Conference Centre, Beeston Lane, The University of Nottingham, Nottingham., commencing at 7.00 pm.

Should you require advice on declaring an interest in any item on the agenda, please contact the Monitoring Officer at your earliest convenience.

Yours faithfully

Chief Executive

To Councillors:

E H Atherton	L A Lally
S A Bagshaw	P Lally
D Bagshaw	H Land
L A Ball BEM	R D MacRae (Chair)
M Brown	G Marshall
B C Carr	J W McGrath
S J Carr	P J Owen
M J Crow	J M Owen
E Cubley	J P T Parker
T A Cullen	S Paterson
S Dannheimer	J C Patrick
S Easom	D D Pringle
L Fletcher	M Radulovic MBE
J C Goold	P Roberts-Thomson
D Grindell (Vice-Chair)	R S Robinson
T Hallam	P D Simpson
M Handley	H E Skinner
M Hannah	C M Tideswell
R I Jackson	I L Tyler
E Kerry	D K Watts
S Kerry	E Williamson
H G Khaled MBE	R D Willimott

AGENDA

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

To receive apologies and to be notified of the attendance of substitutes.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members are requested to declare the existence and nature of any disclosable pecuniary interest and/or other interest in any item on the agenda.

3. MINUTES

(Pages 9 - 22)

The Committee is asked to confirm as a correct record the minutes of the meeting held on 12 May 2021.

4. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

5. PRESENTATION OF PETITIONS

6. LEADER'S REPORT

7. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

8. The following question was submitted by Councillor G Marshall for the Leader of the Council:

9. MEMBERS' SPEECHES ON WARD ISSUES

10. QUESTIONS ON OUTSIDE BODIES

11. DECISIONS FROM COMMITTEE MEETINGS

(Pages 23 - 84)

To note the decisions made by the Council's Committees.

12. NOTICE OF MOTIONS

12.1 The following motion has been received from the Joint Group:

Broxtowe Borough Council notes:

- 1) That Broxtowe is a distinct community and not simply an extension of Nottingham;
- 2) That considerable work has been put in by many people to creating the community feel of the borough

- 3) That Broxtowe has never been one constituency for parliamentary purposes since the constituencies were redrawn in the 1970's
- 4) That the Boundary Commission is required to work independently and not to seek to favour any political party in its recommendations.
- 5) That the Boundary Commission are required by law to propose new constituency boundaries to ensure that all constituencies have between a certain minimum and maximum number of voters
- 6) That the Borough of Broxtowe is too large as a whole to constitute one constituency as it would exceed the maximum number of voters permitted in the latest review
- 7) That in their latest proposals the Boundary Commission propose removing Eastwood and Brinsley from the Ashfield Constituency and placing them in the Broxtowe Constituency
- 8) That the Boundary Commission also propose removing Kimberley and Nuthall from the Broxtowe Constituency and placing them in Nottingham North.

Broxtowe Borough Council further notes:

- 9) That the MP for Broxtowe has proposed an alternative arrangement whereby Kimberley and Nuthall are retained in the Broxtowe Constituency and that parts of Beeston are placed into the Nottingham South constituency.

Broxtowe Borough Council regrets that the rules on constituency size mean that it is unavoidable that part of Broxtowe Borough will not be in the Broxtowe Constituency.

Broxtowe Borough Council believes:

- 1) That each of Nuthall, Kimberley and Beeston are distinct communities in their own right, and that the boundaries of these are well understood.
- 2) That residents in Beeston do not see themselves simply as a part of Nottingham, but rather as residents of Beeston.
- 3) That as the whole of Broxtowe cannot form one Parliamentary Constituency it is preferable for entire communities to be in the same constituency.

Broxtowe Borough Council therefore resolves to write to the Boundary Commission indicating support in principle for the proposed changes to the Broxtowe Constituency boundaries that they have proposed, and also to express our opposition to any alternative proposal which would result in Beeston being split into two for parliamentary purposes.

12.2 The following motion has been received from the Joint Group:

Broxtowe Borough Council notes:

- 1) That the council declared a climate emergency in 2019
- 2) That as part of the response to the climate emergency the council is committed to reducing its carbon footprint
- 3) That it is now fully recognised that vehicles powered by the internal combustion engine are a significant source of greenhouse gases, and domestic car use is a significant contributor to this
- 4) To tackle climate change it is important that there is an efficient and accessible public transport alternative that people can be encouraged to switch to.
- 5) That in February 2019 the franchise to operate the Midland Mainline rail area was awarded to East Midlands Railway, a company owned by Abellio, who began operating in August 2019.
- 6) That Abellio were the operators of the ScotRail franchise which ended early because of poor performance on their behalf.
- 7) That an Emergency Measures Agreement (“EMA”) between the Secretary of State for Transport and Abellio was entered into on 30th March 2020. This EMA commits the operator to seek “to ensure that, as far as possible, operational performance and the provision of Passenger Services is maintained” during the Covid-19
- 8) That East Midlands Railways have encountered problems with older parts of their fleet no longer able to be used because of the lack of disabled facilities on board.
- 9) That since a new timetable was introduced early in 2021 there have been significant difficulties with the service provided by EMR
- 10) That since 2018 the East Coast Mainline has been under public ownership following the collapse of the franchise arrangement for that line.

Broxtowe Borough Council therefore notes with regret:

- 1) The decision of East Midlands Railways to remove 54 services stopping at Beeston each day from its revised timetable, including a significant reduction in the number of services between Beeston and Nottingham and the complete withdrawal of the service between Beeston, Attenborough and Matlock.

- 2) That although these changes are described by EMR as temporary they have given no indication of any date by which they will be brought to an end.
- 3) That these changes will inevitably lead to a modal shift in transport usage and will lead to a significant growth in journeys by private car.
- 4) That this increase in car usage will have a detrimental impact on the efforts of the council and other bodies to reduce carbon emissions and achieve the targets set out in the Green Futures programme;
- 5) That the reduction in services will cause inconvenience for residents of Beeston and Attenborough
- 6) That this decision was implemented with no consultation with passengers or local authorities and at very short notice.

Broxtowe Borough Council does not believe:

- 1) That the difficulties encountered by EMR justify the extreme reduction in services through Beeston and Attenborough that has been implemented.
- 2) That the cuts to services are in compliance with either the wording or the spirit of the EMA.

Broxtowe Borough Council therefore calls on East Midlands Railways to reverse these cuts to its service as a matter of urgency, and to commit immediately to a deadline for doing so.

Broxtowe Borough Council further calls on the Secretary of State for Transport to actively review the performance of East Midlands Railways and to consider the early termination of their franchise and returning their services to public ownership and operation.

12.3 The following motion has been received from the Liberal Democrat Group:

This council notes that:

- a) The government have now published the Electoral Integrity Bill;
- b) This bill contains provisions to require voter ID;
- c) There is no evidence that there is any problem in the United Kingdom with voter impersonation;
- d) Research in 2015 by the Electoral Commission found that 7.5% of the electorate (3.5 million people) did not have access to photo ID.
- e) The Electoral Commission's 2021 winter tracker found that more disadvantaged groups are more likely

to not have ID, including the unemployed (11%), those renting from a local authority (13%) or housing association (12%), as well as disabled people (8%). The government's commissioned research found that older voters (aged 85+) were less likely than those in younger groups to have ID that was recognisable (91% compared to 95%–98%). It also found that those with severely limiting disabilities, the unemployed, people without qualifications, and those who had never voted before were all less likely to hold any form of photo ID.

- f) In the 2019 local elections where Broxtowe was a pilot area showed that 231 Broxtowe residents were turned away from polling stations for not having the correct ID, and that of these 69 people failed to return later. If this was replicated across each of the 363 district or unitary council areas in Great Britain this would mean that 83,853 people would be turned away at the polling stations and of these 25,047 people would not return to vote.
- g) These figures do not include people who did not attempt to vote because they did not have the right ID or those who left after talking to party tellers before entering the polling station.
- h) That research by the cabinet office showed that implementing full voter ID across the country was likely to cost up to £20million per general election;
- i) That requiring voters to produce ID is likely to act as a method of voter suppression;
- j) The Conservative MP David Davis said that "Voter ID will potentially disenfranchise thousands of people. It is an illogical and illiberal solution to a non-existent problem."

This Council calls on the government to abandon proposals to introduce voter ID and calls on both our MP's to vote against these proposals.

12.4 The following motion has been received from Councillor M Radulovic MBE:

"This Council is greatly concerned at the proposals in the White Paper to introduce 'zoning' and to reduce or remove the role of planning applications in the planning system. This would unacceptably reduce or remove the scope for local planning authorities to assess detailed applications on their merits. It would also unacceptably reduce the involvement of local residents and communities in the planning process and remove their right to object to specific applications. The Council strongly urges the Secretary of State to reconsider these proposals."

13. AWSWORTH NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN (Pages 85 - 86)

To seek the resolution of the Council to 'make' (adopt) the Awsworth Neighbourhood Plan, following a successful referendum result on 10 June 2021.

14. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

The Committee is asked to RESOLVE that, under Section 100A of the Local Government Act, 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act.

15. REFERENCE

15.1 Purchase of affordable homes at Bramcote (Pages 87 - 94)

Finance and Resources
8 July 2021

Recommended to Council that:

- . Subject to confirmation from the Council's external accountant (GL Hearn) that the scheme can be accommodated within the HRA business plan, up to the amount included in the report, be allocated in the HRA capital programme for 2022/23 to 2025/26 for the construction of up to 51 rented and shared ownership homes at the site.**
- . A delegation be made to the Deputy Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer, following consultation with the Chairs of Finance and Resources, Housing and Policy and Performance Committees, for all approvals relating to the purchase, financing acquisition and construction of the homes.**
- . A delegation be made to the Deputy Chief Executive and Section 151 Officer to agree a compliant procurement route to allow the building contract to be entered into.**