

COUNCIL
Wednesday, 13th December, 2006

Councillor A.A. Clarke (Mayor)

Councillors:

P.G. Barnes	S.J. Barnes
D.N. Beeston	A.S. Bexon
P.M. Blandamer	F.J.D. Boot
V.H. Bradley	T.R. Chandran
G.V. Clarke	W.J. Clarke
J.M. Cole	S.M. Creamer
R.T. Day	A.M. Dunkin
M.S. Dunkin	P. Feeney
A.J. Gillam	J.F. Glass
W.H. Golland	I.S. Gollop
R.J. Goodwin	W.T. Grainger (a)
G.J. Griffiths	R.G. Kempster
S.M. Lane	C.M. Lockett
H. Maddock (a)	J.J. McCauley
V. McCrossen	G.L. Millar
R.J. Nicholson	J.M. Parr
W.A. Peet	V.C. Pepper
R.A. Poynter	C.N.F.W. Pratt
C. Preston	S.J. Prew-Smith
D.E. Pulk (a)	D.A. Pycroft (a)
S.J. Ragsdale	A. Rigby
J.J. Spencer	M.S. Spencer
R.F. Spencer	J.O. Tanner
G.G. Tunnicliffe	J.A. Woodward
M.A. Wright	

15 PRESENTATIONS

The Mayor presented an 'Award of Excellence' to the Gedling School in recognition of the work done by the Grounds Manager Steve Redwood and site staff and students to achieve the highest standard of school grounds.

Mr. Phil Barlow gave a brief statement on 'Fair Trade' produce and made a presentation to the Mayor.

16 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE.

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Grainger, Maddock, Pulk and Pycroft.

17 TO APPROVE AS A CORRECT RECORD THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 11 OCTOBER 2006

RESOLVED:

That the minutes of the above meeting be approved as a correct record and signed by the Mayor.

18 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.

Councillors P.G. Barnes, Creamer, Cole and W.J. Clarke declared personal and non-prejudicial interests in Agenda item 11a as they were all members of Nottinghamshire County Council.

Councillors M.S. Spencer and Kempster declared personal and non-prejudicial interests in Agenda items 6, 7 and 11a as they were also members of Nottinghamshire County Council.

(Councillors M.S. Spencer and Kempster left the meeting)

19 TO DEAL WITH QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE PUBLIC UNDER STANDING ORDER NO.8

Question received from Mr M.J. Dwan 12 Georgia Drive, Redhill Nottingham to the Leader of the Council.

'I was alarmed to read in the Nottinghamshire County News that the County Council Leader Councillor David Kirkham is proposing that Nottinghamshire's response to the Government's white paper 'Strong and Prosperous Communities' is for the County Council to set itself up as a new unitary authority. This I understand would end the functions of Borough Councils such as Gedling, Broxtowe and Rushcliffe. This cannot be good for local democracy and can I have the Council's assurance that it will fight the very idea of a unitary County Council system?'

Councillor R.F. Spencer replied in the following terms:-

'Thank you for your question. I know there is a lot of strong feeling amongst the public about the possibility of losing local councils like Gedling Borough Council. I would like if I may Mr Mayor to just run through the actions taken by this Council since the County Council Chief Executive's email to this Council about the proposed work on the unitary bid.

Firstly the Cabinet proposed that we oppose very strongly the question of a unitary County Council. Three Leaders met last night and had a useful first meeting, discussing this and the full Government White Paper and its effects throughout the County and City. That report will be forwarded to all Members.

I therefore wrote to David Kirkham, Leader of the County Council in the following terms:-

'Following your recent decision to ask your Chief Executive to investigate the possibility of submitting a proposal for a Unitary County Council in Nottinghamshire in response to the recent Local Government White Paper, I wanted to write to you to pass on my own and Gedling Borough Council's total opposition to any such proposal.

At its meeting held on 17 November 2006, the Council's Cabinet resolved to 'express to the Nottinghamshire County Council the view that there is no case for a Unitary Authority based on the County Council Proposals that is beneficial to the residents of Gedling'.

I believe that the residents of Gedling have no desire to see a Unitary County Council and certainly no wish to see our respective Councils involved in a damaging, distracting, costly and wasteful confrontation about the structure of Local Government in Gedling. What they need is to see us working together to design and deliver excellent public services which represent the best possible value for the council tax they pay and this is what we should be concentrating on doing. I very much want us to work together to achieve an improved two-tier arrangement in Gedling, but your apparent determination to pursue a Unitary County can only undermine our ability to do this and poses a real threat to the needs and interests of Gedling's residents.

I must therefore call upon you to withdraw this threat of seeking unitary status and to enter into a positive dialogue between us about how we can improve the ways in which our Councils work together.'

Mr Mayor, we sincerely hope that the majority group at County listens to us.'

20

TO DEAL WITH QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN UNDER STANDING ORDER NO.9(1)(A) ON ANY MATTER IN RELATION TO WHICH THE COUNCIL HAS POWERS OR DUTIES.

Question to the Leader of the Council from Councillor J.M Parr in the following terms: -

'If the County Council go ahead and adopt the unitary bid that is being prepared by their officers where does this leave the five members on Gedling Borough Council who have supported the application? In particular could they properly continue to serve as Gedling Borough members?'

Councillor R.F. Spencer replied in the following terms:-

'I would like to thank Councillor Parr for this question. The question does pose a problem if the five majority Group Members at County who are Members of our Council go ahead and vote for a submission to Government for Unitary Status that if successful would lead to the end of Gedling Borough Council. Before that, however, I would appeal to them to think very carefully about the consequences of such a bid.

Please remember fellow Gedling Borough Council members, the staff who serve us so well and the Gedling Borough Council residents who deserve the best service that we can provide.'

Councillors M.S. Spencer and Kempster returned to the meeting)

21

TO CONSIDER AND IF APPROVED, ADOPT THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CABINET AND COMMITTEES:-

Personnel & Resources 30 October 2006 (Personnel Policies) minute no 23 pages 30 – 31

A proposition in respect of minute 23 was moved by Councillor F.J.D. Boot and seconded by Councillor R.F. Spencer that the recommendations contained in the minute be adopted.

The Mayor put the proposition to the meeting and declared the same carried and it was:-

RESOLVED:

To approve the revised constitution of the Appeals Sub-Committee.

Licensing Act 28 November 2006 (Gambling Act Principles) minute no 8 page 61

A proposition in respect of minute 8 was moved by Councillor Wright and seconded by Councillor M.S. Dunkin that the recommendations contained in the minute be adopted.

The Mayor put the proposition to the meeting and declared the same

carried and it was: -

RESOLVED

- i. To approve the Gambling Statement of Principles and that the Statement be adopted by Council on behalf of the Authority.
- ii. To formally appoint Nottinghamshire Safeguarding Children Board as the body designated in writing as competent to advise about the protection of children from harm.
- iii. To delegate all necessary statutory functions and regulations under the Gambling Act 2005 to the Licensing Act Committee.

Personnel & Resources 4 December 2006 (Scrutiny Committee Development) minute no 32 pages 84 – 85

A proposition in respect of minute 32 was moved by Councillor Boot and seconded by Councillor R.F. Spencer that the following recommendations contained in the minute be adopted.

1. The existing Scrutiny Committees be disestablished and that two Scrutiny Committees be created to be called, the Performance Review Scrutiny Committee and the Policy Review Scrutiny Committee with the terms of reference appended to the report.
2. The amendments to the Council's Constitution be made as set out in the report and take effect from 16 May 2007.

In accordance with Standing Order 29 the Mayor declared that the proposition would stand adjourned without discussion to the next ordinary meeting of the Council.

Councillors M.S. Spencer and Kempster left the meeting)

22

NOTICES OF MOTION

A. Upon a Notice of Motion received in the name of Councillor I.S. Gollop, a proposition was moved by Councillor Gollop and seconded by Councillor Feeney in the following terms: -

‘This Council does not support the County Council's pursuit of unitary status and the accompanying waste of energy, resources and relationships.

It calls on the County Council to reaffirm its commitment to working with

Gedling Borough Council and the other district councils to improve service delivery and lead action on community safety and environmental protection and preservation'

The Mayor put the proposition to the meeting and declared the same carried and it was: -

RESOLVED:

That this Council does not support the County Council's pursuit of unitary status and the accompanying waste of energy, resources and relationships.

It calls on the County Council to reaffirm its commitment to working with Gedling Borough Council and the other district councils to improve service delivery and lead action on community safety and environmental protection and preservation'

(Councillor McCrossen entered the meeting during consideration of the above item)

(Councillors Kempster and M.S Spencer returned to the meeting at the conclusion of the above item)

B. Upon a Notice Of Motion received in the name of Councillor I.S. Gollop, a proposition was moved by Councillor Gollop and seconded by Councillor Feeney in the following terms: -

'This Council endorses the action of the Portfolio Holder for Agenda 21 in setting a target of a 50% reduction in the carbon emissions arising from the Council's activities, over the next 5 years.'

An amendment was moved by Councillor Gillam and seconded by Councillor Poynter in the following terms:-

'This Council regrets the lack of attention given to environmental issues since the last election particularly in view of the two high increases in its energy costs. Council therefore instructs the Portfolio Holder for Agenda 21 to arrange for an environmental audit of the Council, as unanimously recommended by the Services Scrutiny Committee, with a view to guiding it on how to achieve the maximum practical reduction in carbon emissions and costs.'

The Mayor put the amendment to the meeting and declared the same carried.

The amendment then became the substantive proposition and upon the Mayor putting the proposition to the meeting it was declared carried and it was:-

RESOLVED:

'That this Council regrets the lack of attention given to environmental issues since the last election particularly in view of the two high increases in its energy costs. Council therefore instructs the Portfolio Holder for Agenda 21 to arrange for an environmental audit of the Council, as unanimously recommended by the Services Scrutiny Committee, with a view to guiding it on how to achieve the maximum practical reduction in carbon emissions and costs.

12 FIT FOR PURPOSE - A VISION FOR THE FUTURE OPERATION OF GEDLING BOROUGH COUNCIL

A proposition was moved by Councillor R.F. Spencer and seconded by Councillor Gollop to adopt the vision as the future operational strategy for the Council and to await further reports with regard to its implementation.

An amendment was moved by Councillor Gillam and seconded by Councillor Poynter in the following terms:-

' To delete the following bullet points 3 and 5 on page 97: -

- § Delivering fewer services directly by itself
- § Smaller'

The Chairman put the amendment to the meeting and declared the same lost.

The Mayor then put the original proposition to the meeting and declared the same carried and it was: -

RESOLVED:

To adopt the vision as the future operational strategy for the Council and to await further reports with regard to its implementation.

13 ANNUAL REPORTS OF THE SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

Annual Reports from the Chairs of the following Scrutiny Committees were received by the Council:-

Community and Quality of Life
Services
Resources and Management.

RESOLVED:

To accept the reports.

The meeting closed at 8.25 pm.