**Mansfield District Council**

**Council Minutes**

**Date: Wednesday 27 January 2021 Time: 6:00 PM Place: Virtual Meeting**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Present:**  | **Executive Mayor Andy Abrahams, Councillor Lee Anderson, Councillor Sinead Anderson, Councillor Barry Answer, Councillor Debra Barlow, Councillor Mick Barton, Councillor Ben Birchall, Councillor Stephen Bodle, Councillor Marion Bradshaw, Councillor Andrew Burgin, Councillor Terry Clay, Councillor John Coxhead, Councillor Bill Drewett, Councillor Mark Fretwell, Councillor Stephen N. Garner, Councillor Teresa Hanstock, Councillor Vaughan Hopewell, Councillor Brian Lohan, Councillor Ann Norman, Councillor Daniel Redfern, Councillor Stuart Richardson, Councillor Dave Saunders, Councillor Philip Shields, Councillor Andy Sissons, Councillor John Smart, Councillor David M Smith, Councillor June Stendall, Councillor Roger Sutcliffe, Councillor Sue Swinscoe, Councillor Andrew Tristram, Councillor Sidney Walker, Councillor Stuart Wallace, Councillor Sonya Ward, Councillor Andy Wetton, Councillor Craig Whitby, Councillor Martin Wright** |
| **In Attendance:**  | **H. Barsby, D. Edwards, S. Hall and M. Pemberton** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE |
|  | Councillor Fisher and Garner (late) |
| **21/01** | **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** |
|  | The Monitoring Officer advised that all Members would be recorded as having a non-disclosable pecuniary interest in those reports that relate to the setting of Council Tax, however, a dispensation had been granted enabling Members to participate in the debate and vote upon those items.  |
| **21/02** | **RECEIPT OF CORRESPONDENCE BY THE CHAIR OF THE COUNCIL, ELECTED MAYOR, MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE OR THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER** |
|  | There was no correspondence to report |
| **21/03** | **ADVANCE QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC** |
|  | In the absence of Mr. Clarke, the Chair put the following question to the Elected Mayor - Given that you are 18 months into your tenure as Mayor, can you please provide a report in respect of your manifesto pledges. In providing your response, can you please substantiate the response with relevant data?Response from the Elected MayorThank you for your question Mr. Clark, which I welcome, but hesitate to know where to start as so much has happened it doesn’t seem like 18 months, but two lifetimes ago. Firstly I am so pleased that we got cracking in the first 100 days in office setting the wheels in motion which has laid the foundation to deliver on our manifesto pledges whilst responding to the financial and humanitarian crisis that the pandemic has caused. When I came to office I became acutely aware of the financial challenges that Mansfield District Council had faced due to 10 years of austerity and funding costs. I knew we had to lead by example so I reduced the Executive appointments from 7 for 5 to reduce salary expenditure by more than £120,000 over our term. We promised to invest in Mansfield and build more affordable housing so firstly we needed to secure the finance by increasing the housing revenue budget to enable us to construct over the target of over 200 energy efficient homes on brownfield sites with rents that are within the budgets of our communities. When we said we wanted to invest in Mansfield we also meant up-skilling people and our employees. The Council’s in-house architects have designed the homes we are going to build and align with our green agenda and with the government’s carbon reduction targets. At Mansfield we are ahead of the game by building to the future and lifetime home standards now, instead of waiting for the national changes to the building regulations in 2025. Our average semi-detached homes will produce up to 75%-80% fewer carbon dioxide emissions and drastically reduce fuel bills. This scheme, along with the Bellamy Road housing development which has been designed to build properties around a new open space with a play area, children’s cycle paths, seating, community ward, orchard, raised beds and a new sharp CCTV and traffic calmed road to improve bus routes for residents, they will all start on site later this year. This is an amazing achievement considering all the additional work our officers have had to undertake during the pandemic. This construction work will be tendered for using our Made in Mansfield procurement strategy which will maximise the use of local labour and supply chains and include work experience for apprentices. The reason I have detailed these construction projects in so much detail is because it shows the effort that has gone into updating all our practices and skills to deliver our manifesto pledges to help families on to the housing ladder, create greener spaces, protect the environment, train up young people, invest in Mansfield and keep communities safe. Talking of which we have doubled the number of police officers, Mansfield has the best crime performance in the county with a reduction of 24% and we have dramatically reduced the number of homeless people by giving them assisted accommodation. We have prosecuted rogue landlords and supported vulnerable communities setting up food hubs, delivering food parcels and medications and made well-being phone calls to those isolated by the pandemic. We are more than just a Council and we have kept our manifesto pledge to protect our communities and make them safe, so we have kept our pledge to incentivise investment in our town by committing to regenerate the blighted areas by building affordable homes in the town centre, re-developing the old bus station site into hotel and retail, work in partnership with Nottingham Trent University and West Notts College to make Mansfield a University town by converting disused buildings into student accommodation and upgrading our heritage buildings including the old Town Hall. Measures we have taken to keep our pledge to make Mansfield healthy and green include becoming trustees of Berry Hill Park, bringing the Harriers back home, working towards bringing sports facilities back to Warsop, investing £1million to introduce green spaces and to dwell and play in the town centre and implementing practical solutions to address the climate emergency by offering grants for external wall insulation, replacing roofs, doors, windows and provide first time gas connections to upgrade dilapidated old properties, thus tackling fuel poverty and we are reviewing all Council operations to reduce our collective carbon footprint. On a personal note, my first action when entering office was to set up my Mayor’s 500 Fund and I have now donated over £20,000 from my salary to 28 different projects which was part of my own personal commitment to help those wonderful volunteers who care for their communities. I say again, we are more than just a Council, collecting rubbish from the streets and doing those other functions, we are busy delivering our pledges. |
| **21/04** | **ADVANCE QUESTIONS FROM ELECTED MEMBERS** |
|  | (i) Question to the Elected Mayor from Councillor BartonMayor, Can you tell me and the rest of Full Council why you took the Deputy Mayors job off Councillor Richardson please?Response from the Elected MayorThank you for your question. The answer has already been provided on the news section of MDC’s website, and was covered by the Media at the end of October last year, but the main motivating factor was to ensure that delivering the Council’s priorities was done in the most efficient way and in that respect, most of the decisions made are closely linked with the Council’s finances, notwithstanding the excellent work carried out by Councillor Richardson in the first 18 months as Deputy Mayor, it made sense to make Councillor Whitby, who is the Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Finance, Deputy Mayor, so that we could work closely on this most important priority. Also, I am a great believer that young people are our future and this promotion showed I have confidence in Councillor Whitby as a potential future leader. Councillor Richardson and myself have worked seamlessly together for the last 18 months and we discussed the reasoning for the changes together, and Councillor Richardson has fully supported me in this decision. Councillor Richardson continues to make an important contribution to the Cabinet as Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Growth and I am grateful for his hard work, commitment and enthusiasm in this role.Supplementary Question from Councillor Barton to the Elected MayorJust a point of clarification, before you said that Mr. Mayor, in your pre-amble to the other question, you have only got four cabinet members, you said you had got 5 but you only have 4. I take what you are saying on board and I haven’t got a problem with Councillor Whitby, the problem I have got is that you elected Councillor Richardson, when myself and other members of my Group became Portfolio Holders, we had to put a CV in. I was just wondering how you gave the job to Councillor Richardson, you are right, the Portfolio for Regeneration is an important job, I’m not saying you’re not taking it seriously, but I will come onto that in my next question because I do think there is a big flaw in your management of the Council with only having 4 Portfolio Holders, you’ve got 36 Councillors in this Council and you’ve got a lot of experience, but you chose not to pick other members of your own group, I’m surprised.So what you’ve said about Councillor Whitby I get with Deputy Mayor, Councillor Richardson has only made one, well I don’t think he has even made one, Delegated Decision in the last four years, can you tell me if you believe in Councillor Richardson and his job for the next two years please. Response from the Elected MayorYes that’s a very easy one for me to answer. Councillor Richardson’s enthusiasm, contribution and ideas and attendance at all meetings to do with regeneration of the town centre and his passion to actually re-invigorate the town centre for events to look at those blighted areas and push for change, I have complete confidence in Councillor Richardson and I repeat again, he has done a sterling job for me in that role and he will continue to do so.(ii) Question to the Elected Mayor from Councillor BartonMayor, can you tell me why you took Councillor Fisher off your Cabinet please?Response from the Elected MayorThank you for your second question Councillor Barton. The answer follows on partly from your first question, it was set out in my press statement last October, but as you know when we came to office in May 2019, we became aware of the precarious state of the finances and endeavoured to review the roles carried out. If you recall we reduced the number of executive appointments from 7 to 5, combining the role of Deputy Mayor and Regeneration and Growth and putting the Portfolios of Corporate and Finance together, saving the authority over £30,000 each year, which does amount to £120,000 during our term. Now, with the imminent issue of trying to ease the on-going financial pressures in order to support our medium term financial strategy, I reviewed all of the Cabinet roles. It was evident that the role of Communities and Well-being was being carried out by all our Councillors across the district and it is part of what we do almost every day. Strategically I decided that the responsibility could be shared, but it was most closely aligned with the Portfolio for Housing with the additional support being provided by all of the Cabinet. Notwithstanding the brilliant work Councillor Fisher carries out in her ward, especially the fantastic allotment project, I decided the re-shuffle which reduces the financial burden to the authority saving £38,000 over the next 2 and a half years was justified. These combined significant savings are in excess of £158,000 and it really helps us in balancing the budget.Supplementary Question from Councillor BartonMayor, you keep mentioning figures, is it all about money with you? 36 Councillors represent 109,000 residents. You have never been a Councillor, you’ve never been a Portfolio Holder, you’ve never been the Chairman of a Committee. I actually think you’ve got this totally wrong, I think you are doing the Council injustice, it’s not about money, it’s how Portfolios are run, it’s a very important job, your own Portfolios will tell you that, and it’s a 7 day a week job, I think you’re doing the Council a total injustice, and it’s not about money it’s about how the Council is run. We represent the public as Councillors, all 36 of us and you as the Mayor, getting rid of 3 Portfolio Holders I don’t think you are doing the town justice. Councillor Fisher is a really hardworking Councillor, which you said, but I am really surprised you have taken Councillor Fisher off the Cabinet. Can I ask you if you take the role of the Portfolio Holder for Community Safety seriously Mayor?Response from the Elected MayorOf course I take that role very seriously and, as I set out in my previous answer, Mansfield had the biggest reduction in crime in the whole of the County. We have built great relationships with the Chief Constable of Nottinghamshire and Padding Tipping, we’ve concentrated, I can give some examples on the Leyton Burrows site, that it’s been a problem for years, we worked closely with Councillor Swinscoe, the Housing Association, the Police and the Community and its never a perfect job but we transformed what has been happening in that area. I am absolutely proud and can’t thank the officers enough for the way we have managed to already get well on our way to delivering our manifesto pledges. I give it as an example because it shows there are many many elements behind that work which is transforming the way the Council works to actually deliver that up to date green healthy agenda and I am confident that the changes I have made will produce the most response and efficient team to support the community and so I am very satisfied that you will be able to judge me on that.(iii) Question to the Elected Mayor from Councillor BartonCan you tell me why you were unsuccessful in bidding for the £25,000,000 for the Future High Street Fund please?Response from the Elected MayorThank you for your third question Councillor Barton. Firstly, despite some retrospective comments from our MP to the contrary, we believe that our Further High Streets Fund bid ticked all the boxes when we submitted it in June 2020. We had worked closely with our world renowned consultant Arup who ironically are the government’s retained consultant advisors for the future high streets, to deliver a scheme that would regenerate the High Street by bringing environmentally friendly living space to blighted brownfield areas of the town, reimagine the market place and increase dwell time and events and provide a healthy green place. We also propose to convert unused vacant town centre buildings to create purpose built student accommodation in line with our aspiration for Mansfield to become a University town, of course this won’t happen overnight but we want to start along that road. All of these proposals match the government’s agenda to save our high streets and we were given assurances by our MP, who liaised closely with the government department, that our submission fitted all of their criteria, so collectively we were quietly confident and expected success, bearing in mind that the concept of this bid was prepared in September 2019, Mansfield’s ideas to build houses to get people back into the town centre to stimulate hospitality, retail ventures, build to the highest screen specification to reduce fuel poverty and protect the environment and support the government’s targets for house building were viewed as ahead of the curve then. They have since adopted many of those ideas in their own government strategies, so along with these grants to assist property owners of dilapidated retail properties to undertake conversion works, renovation of the market place to create that more green and welcoming space, so we could get more events there which would in turn generate footfall and support the leisure and hospitality, we believed that we had met all the government’s requirements. A sense of disappointment and disbelief when I got the letter from Robert Jenerick on Boxing Day it said that although our business had met the gateway criteria, it did not represent value for money, so at that time and without seeing the government’s assessment criteria, I found that very hard to take because we had committed, Mansfield District Council had committed match funding of up to £12.5m effectively 35% of the £32.8m bid submission to match fund, so it seemed inconceivable that any other bid would have matched a higher percentage of investment with match funding. So in order to find out why we weren’t successful, we joined a 20 minute feedback call from government representatives. In this feedback, it echoed effectively what was in the letter and it said that the bid did not meet the minimum benefit cost ratio threshold. The assessment was that the desired uplift in land values were not a result from our proposals in order to satisfy the treasury based economic assessment. As such the strategic case for the bid was not even considered by the assessors because of the shortfall in the benefit cost ratio score. However, the assessors stated that they recognised the strength of the strategic case and all the work which had gone into it but unfortunately it all became academic against the benefit cost ratio score. I have since discussed this with our MP who, like myself, is equally as frustrated and has agreed that the old treasury based criteria to judge the submissions, which were focussed on value for money, were out of date and contained no element of levelling up, which is what the government’s intention was with the Future High Streets fund, so our consultant Arup, supported the development and submission of the Future High Streets fund bid and they indicated that they were expecting the full strength of the strategic case to be recognised and funding secured through the bid. The point was made that if the same submission had been for an area in London or Manchester then there would not have been an issue with the benefit cost ratio and therefore an area like Mansfield was inherently disadvantaged through this process. The whole point of regeneration is to invest in failure sites through the public purse and that in turn then gives confidence and willingness of the private sector to also invest and if we had got that funding I am confident it would have been the catalyst to more private sector investment.Supplementary Question from Councillor BartonLike you Mayor, I was very disappointed that we didn’t get it, but I’m going to be honest with you, you mentioned the MP there 3 or 4 times, this is a time not to put politics in a place and if we get, I will get to my question in a minute, but just to give you some information about why I am coming to this question, this is about Mansfield, it’s not about the Labour Group, it’s not about the Mansfield Independent Group, it’s not about the Conservatives. If we get the opportunity to bid for a huge amount of government money, will you put politics to one side and work together with our local MP, all 36 Councillors, because I’ve never seen a copy of that bid, I don’t know if anybody else has apart from the Cabinet, and we represent 109,000 residents, also can you ask 2020 and all the businesses in the town centre for their view and maybe bring it back to full Council or take it through Scrutiny before actually putting the bid forward because it’s us as a Council that represents 109,00 residents and maybe they might have a view. So if we get a chance again, can you put all that together and please let us have a say Mayor?Response from the Elected MayorSo firstly, this is not about politics in any way whatsoever, if you would have picked up on some aspects, we worked closely with the MP, we worked closely with the ministerial department so we actually made sure that the content of our bid matched what they wanted. Referencing the MP in my answer, he himself was frustrated and wants to see that criteria changed such that towns like Mansfield when they submit bids, levelling up bids, that they are considered properly because we are disadvantaged obviously with this land value criteria. So that was the element of my answer that included the MP. With regard to consultation for future bids, and I will just say about the Future High Streets Fund, we haven’t given up on it yet and we have written to government to express our disappointment and your point about consultation, the content of the Future High Street Funds bid, the elements of it, we were joining a moving picture and that includes the town’s fund. We’ve set up the Place Board, we have now engaged consultants for a master plan, all of which didn’t exist previously and this consultation includes the MP, D2N2, Nottingham Trent University, it includes representatives from private industry, education, every aspect that affects Mansfield Town, so we have consulted and we will continue to consult and we will continue to fight to get the aspirations of our Future High Streets fund, which we still believe in, as part of our town’s deal. |
| **21/05** | **DELEGATED DECISION BY THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR SAFER COMMUNITIES, HOUSING AND WELLBEING - BELLAMY ROAD COMMUNITY HEART HOUSING DEVELOPMENT** |
|  | It was proposed by Councillor Bradshaw and seconded by the Elected Mayor that the recommendation to Council to vire funds to the Bellamy Road Community Heart Scheme capital budget be approved. Members were advised that a masterplan for the regeneration of the Bellamy Road estate back was adopted back in 2013 and that due to the Government’s rent policy introduced in 2016 which resulted in the Council having to reduce rents for four years, the masterplan could not be implemented.However with the rent reduction ending last year, the Council was now in a position to deliver a transformational scheme in the heart of the Bellamy Road estate.Members were advised that the scheme would deliver 22 new high quality family homes and also provide attractive and functional open space in the heart of the community.Due to the successful bid by the Bellamy Road Tenant and Residents Association for funding from Nottinghamshire County Council under the Local Improvement Scheme funding programme together with match funding from this Council, a fully equipped play area would also be created. The open space would also include seating areas and provision for a community orchard and raised beds.Discussions were progressing with Places for People who owned vacant land at the side of the Council’s development to see if could be incorporated into the scheme with a view to possibly extending the open space and providing more facilities. A new shop would provided as part of the proposals which will be designed to be able to offer cafe facilities and outdoor seating.Key to the proposals was the provision of a road connection between Thorpe Road and Egmanton Road, which would allow a bus service to run through the centre of the estate.A consultation on the proposals with residents had been well received.Council was advised that the new homes would be built to the Future Homes Standard, which sought to reduce carbon emissions by providing low carbon heating and also ensuring high energy efficiency, which was before the national implementation of this standard in 2025. Several members spoke in favour of the proposals in terms of the high development standards to be provided by the development and that the proposals fulfilled a long term commitment to the residents of the area.On the motion being put to the vote, the Chair announced that the motion had been carried unanimously.RESOLVED - That £2,000,000 be vired from the already approved capital budget of £4,000,000 for The Newarks, Bellamy Road development scheme within the Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme to the Bellamy Road Community Heart Scheme capital budget. |
| **21/06** | **DELEGATED DECISION BY THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR SAFER COMMUNITIES, HOUSING AND WELLBEING - DEVELOPMENT OF CENTENARY ROAD, PHASE 3** |
|  | It was proposed by Councillor Bradshaw and seconded by the Elected Mayor, that the recommendation to Council from the delegated decision relating to the development of Centenary Road be approved.Council was advised that the third phase of the project contained proposals to complete the regeneration of this area with the provision of 77 new Council owned properties for older people and families.The proposals sought to provide a mixed community by catering for people of all ages and providing properties of different types and sizes. The proposed road layouts sought to minimise the amount of traffic travelling through Poppy Fields and to ensure that rat runs were not created.Council was advised that the properties associated with the third phase would be built to the Future Homes Standard, to provide low carbon heating and ensure high energy efficiency, prior to the national implementation of the standard in 2025.Several members spoke in favour of the motion, in particular the standards to which the properties were to be constructed to.On the motion being put to the vote, the Chair announced that the motion had been carried unanimously. RESOLVED - That the already approved capital budgets of £1,800,000 for the Shirland Drive Boiler site development and £280,000 for the Sandy Lane Boiler site development within the Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme be vired to the Centenary Road capital budget. |
| **21/07** | **EXTRACT MINUTE FROM CABINET - MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2021/22 - 2023/24** |
|  | It was proposed by the Portfolio Holder for Corporate and Finance and seconded by the Elected Mayor that the recommendations from the Cabinet, relating to the Medium Term Financial Strategy be approved.In proposing the motion Council was advised that a balanced budget had been achieved for the General Fund revenue account in line with statutory requirements. When the budget was first reported to Cabinet on 2 November 2020, the position was balanced, however, further information from central government had enabled the budget could be balanced using a combination of government grants and savings proposals, instead of only savings.Details of the proposed savings which had contributed to the balanced budget were submitted, which had also been considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Corporate Resources), during their scrutiny of the draft Medium Term Financial Strategy.Members were advised that since the updated budget report was presented to Cabinet on 18 January 2021, there has been an amendment to the report, with regard to a potential pay freeze, as was announced as part of the Chancellor’s Spending Review. As this was still subject to the overall funding that Local Government received, and the pay claim that was still to be submitted by relevant trade unions, a provisional 2% pay award had been included within service budgets. The effect of the uncertainty surrounding the pay freeze were included within the report submitted and would reduce the amount to be transferred to Earmarked Reserves.In order to balance the budget, Cabinet had recommended an increase the Council’s element of the Council Tax bill, in order ensure that cuts to services were limited as far as possible. The recommendation to increase Council Tax by £5.00 on a Band D property, equated to 2.7% on the other bands. 56% of properties within the District were in Band A, which meant that the annual increase for the majority of properties would be an additional £3.33 for the year. Further Council was advised that 88% of properties in the district were in bands A, B and C, meaning the occupants of these properties would pay less than £5.00 extra for the yearIt was anticipated that the Fair Funding review, would change the methodology used to calculate the level of grant awarded to each Local Authority, would be implemented during 2021/22. However, due to the Covid-19 pandemic and required lockdowns, this had been postponed until 2022/23. As such the level of government grant awarded to the Council, had been the 2020/21 allocation rolled forward. The Council had gained from £250,000 additional Government Grant it was not previously expecting, together with a New Homes Bonus. A new grant, known as the “Lower Tier Services Grant”, had also been provided to district councils, although this was anticipated to be a one-year allocation.Council was also advised that the Government had indicated that Local Authorities which choose not to put their Council Tax up would be deemed as not needing their maximum government grant levels, and would likely see their grant levels cut, thus effectively forcing Local Authorities to increase their Council Tax.Members' attention was also drawn to the forecasts budget deficits for the 2022/23 and 2023/24 financial years of £1.07m and £1.15m, as shown in Appendix 1.The Housing Revenue Account showed a balanced budget position, which is unchanged from the draft budget report which was considered by Cabinet in October 2020.The Council had followed Government Guidelines for setting dwelling rent which equated to a 1.7% increase.The General Fund and Housing Revenue Account Consolidated Capital Programmes were also submitted for Council's approval.There were no significant changes to the General Fund Capital Programme from the 20/21 Capital Programme, which included the continuation of schemes for providing assistance to those living in private sector housing, the renewal of the vehicle fleet and capital works on operational buildings.The fees and charges for the General Fund and Housing Revenue Account were also submitted and there had been increases this was generally in line with the Bank of England’s target for inflation at 2%.Several members spoke in favour of the proposed increase in Council Tax, to build into the Council's base budget income and also replace income which would have been previously received in Government grants.In addition, several members spoke against the proposed increase due to the cumulative effect on residents of both increase in Council Tax from the precepting bodies and also this authority increasing its fees and charges at the same time.The Monitoring Officer advised Council that the Independent Panel into Members Allowances, had been contacted with regard to the proposal to reduce all Special Responsibility Allowances by 10%. Members were advised that the Panel had not objected to this proposal.On recommendation (v) being put to the vote the following votes were recorded - For - Elected Mayor, Councillors Barlow, Bradshaw, Burgin, Clay, Coxhead, Fretwell, Lohan, Norman, Redfern, Richardson, Shields, Sissons, Smart, Stendall, Sutcliffe, Swinscoe, Ward, Wetton and WhitbyAgainst - Councillors L. Anderson, S. Anderson, Answer, Barton, Bodle, Drewett, Hanstock, Hopewell, Saunders, Tristram, Wallace, Walker and WrightAbstained - Councillors Birchall and SmithThe Chair announced that the motion had been carried by 20 votes in favour, with 13 against and two abstentions.On recommendations (i), (ii) and (xi) being put to the vote, the following votes were recorded - For - Elected Mayor, Councillors Answer, Barton, Barlow, Birchall, Bodle, Bradshaw, Burgin, Clay, Coxhead, Drewett, Fretwell, Hanstock, Hopewell, Lohan, Norman, Redfern, Richardson, Saunders, Shields, Sissons, Smart, Smith, Stendall, Sutcliffe, Swinscoe, Tristram, Wallace, Ward, Wetton, Whitby and WrightAgainst - Councillors L. Anderson, S. Anderson and WalkerOn recommendations (iii), (xii) and (xiii) being put to the vote, the following votes were recorded - For - Elected Mayor, Councillors Answer, Barton, Barlow, Birchall, Bodle, Bradshaw, Burgin, Clay, Coxhead, Drewett, Fretwell, Hanstock, Hopewell, Lohan, Norman, Redfern, Richardson, Saunders, Shields, Sissons, Smart, Smith, Stendall, Sutcliffe, Swinscoe, Tristram, Wallace, Ward, Wetton, Whitby and WrightAgainst - Councillors L. Anderson and S. Anderson Abstention - Councillor WalkerOn recommendations (ix) and (x) being put to the vote, the following votes were recorded - For - Elected Mayor, Councillors Answer, Barton, Barlow, Birchall, Bodle, Bradshaw, Burgin, Clay, Coxhead, Drewett, Fretwell, Hanstock, Hopewell, Lohan, Norman, Redfern, Richardson, Saunders, Shields, Sissons, Smart, Smith, Stendall, Sutcliffe, Swinscoe, Tristram, Wallace, Ward, Wetton, Whitby and WrightAgainst - Councillors L. Anderson and S. AndersonAbstention - Councillor WalkerRESOLVED - (i) That the General Fund revenue budget for 2021/22 financial year be approved as set out in Appendix 1.(ii) That the General Fund revenue budget for 2022/23 to 2023/24 financial year be approved in principle, subject to an annual review, as set out in Appendix 1.(iii) That the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue budget for 2021/22 financial year be approved as set out in Appendix 3.(iv) That the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) revenue budget for the 2022/23 to 2023/24 financial years be approved in principle, subject to an annual review, as set out in Appendix 3.(v) That the Mansfield District Council 2021/22 Band D Council Tax be approved at £194.72, being a £5.00 increase on 2020/21 (which equates to a 2.7% increase on all other bands).(vi) That the fees and charges for General Fund services be approved for the 2021/22 financial year, as set out in Appendix 9.(vii) That the fees and charges for Housing Revenue Account services be approved for the 2021/22 financial year, as set out in Appendix 10.(viii) That Council Dwelling rents be increased by 1.7% for the 2021/22 financial year, compared to 2020/21, in line with Government Guideline Rents (CPIH plus 1%).(ix) That the General Fund Consolidated Capital Programme as detailed in Table 3 and Appendix 4 be approved.(x) That the Housing Revenue Account Consolidated Capital Programme as detailed in Table 4 and Appendix 5 be approved. |
| **21/08** | **SPECIAL URGENCY DECISIONS**  |
|  | The Chief Executive Officer submitted a report which detailed two recent decisions which were taken via the Council's Special Urgency Procedure, where it had not been possible to advertise the decision before they were taken.The first decision was taken on 21 December 2020, £66,200 and related to the acceptance of funds from Nottinghamshire County Council’s Covid Winter Grant Scheme, to support those vulnerable eligible individuals experiencing food insecurity and the Council’s fuel bank pilot.The second was made on 19 January 2021, when funds were accepted from the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government, Community Champion Fund.It was proposed by the Elected Mayor and seconded by Councillor Barton that the report be noted. The report was noted through a show of hands.RESOLVED - That the report be noted |
| **21/09** | **MOTIONS** |
|  | It was proposed by Councillor Wallace and seconded by the Councillor Barton that - 1. To encourage all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people.2. To actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks.3. To write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays.4. To encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock quieter fireworks for public display.In proposing the motion, Councillor Wallace stated that the aim was to minimise the risk both to animals and vulnerable people from fireworks, whilst recognising that they brought enjoyment to some people and were used in many celebrations. Several members spoke in favour of the motion, in that the noise created by modern fireworks were a danger both to the health of animals and humans, including veterans suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder. Members also referred to the increase in the use of fireworks and that collective action was required working with a number of different agencies and organisations.On the motion being put to the vote by a show of hands, the Chair announced that the motion had been carried unanimously. RESOLVED - That - 1. To encourage all public firework displays within the local authority boundaries to be advertised in advance of the event, allowing residents to take precautions for their animals and vulnerable people.2. To actively promote a public awareness campaign about the impact of fireworks on animal welfare and vulnerable people – including the precautions that can be taken to mitigate risks.3. To write to the UK Government urging them to introduce legislation to limit the maximum noise level of fireworks to 90dB for those sold to the public for private displays.4. To encourage local suppliers of fireworks to stock quieter fireworks for public display. |
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