

# North Tyneside Council

## Report to Council

### Date: 27 September 2012

#### ITEM 4

Title: Motions

Notice has been received of the following motions from Members of the Council to be put to the Council meeting.

**1. Motion signed by Mrs L Arkley, Elected Mayor and Councillors J Allan, N J Huscroft and Mrs J Wallace**

Newcastle City Council has passed a resolution in which it asks all local authorities in the North East to make representations to Government supporting the retention of the Royal Regiment of Fusiliers.

Accordingly, Council is asked to agree the following motion in relation to its impact on North Tyneside:

“Council expresses concern at the impact on the City of proposals to abolish the 2<sup>nd</sup> Battalion of The Royal Regiment of Fusiliers.

Council acknowledges the professionalism of all our armed services personnel, that may even see troops make the ultimate sacrifice.

Whilst understanding the need to achieve budget savings across the MOD, we call on the Secretary of State and Chief of the General Staff to recognise:

- Proposals announced on 5 July fall short on strategic context at a time when new threats are emerging and weak and failing states outnumber strong ones by two to one putting at risk sustainable military utility.
- Proposals put a strain on 15,000 Military Reservists and companies that employ them, if they are to fill the gap left by 20,000 fewer troops and 37 fewer Army units.
- Newcastle and the wider North East is a key recruiting ground for local Fusiliers. Removing the Battalion will impact severely on job, training and life skills opportunities for local men and women at a time when the North East is suffering from the highest rate of unemployment in England. It may also increase the call on Council and other public services who support unemployed people.
- Veterans returning home bring with them a vast range of skills, knowledge and experience and Newcastle and the North East will suffer from this loss.

Council therefore resolves:

- To write to the Secretary of State expressing strong concern about the impact of disbandment on the City now and in the future.
- That Members of Council sign e-petition 35724 and raise awareness of the damaging impact of these proposals in local communities.
- Local people, businesses and partner organisations also be asked to join with us and sign e-petition 35724 to trigger a full debate in Parliament and reverse this disbandment, given the potential impact on Reservists.”

### **Legal implications**

There are no legal implications directly arising from this motion.

### **Financial implications]**

There are no direct financial implications arising from this motion. Any wider financial implications arising from future decisions on the proposed MOD actions would be subject to future Council and/or Cabinet reports.

## **2. Motion signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, N Redfearn, J O’Shea and T Mulvenna**

"That this Council is concerned about the time it is taking to produce the Core Strategy. In order to progress the development of the Core Strategy the Council refers to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee a request to bring forward, by no later than 24 January 2013, recommendations to be forwarded to Cabinet to assist it to finalise the initial proposals for the Core Strategy."

### **Legal implications**

It is open to full Council to refer the request described in the motion to Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Core Strategy, once approved, will form the Council's Development Plan under the Policy Framework. Accordingly the Strategy is required to be taken forward in accordance with the Council's Policy Framework rules of procedure. Following Cabinet's approval of the initial proposals for the Strategy (referred to in the motion), under the rules of procedure Overview and Scrutiny Committee has a key role to play in consideration of the initial and final proposals for the Strategy.

### **Financial implications**

The production of the Core Strategy will be contained within existing Service budgets.

**3. Motion signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, N Redfearn, J O'Shea and T Mulvenna**

"This Council notes that some councils are considering how to limit the support that they give to the development of sustainable energy sources within their administrative areas and this will impact on the development of the renewable energy industry.

This Council supports efforts by North of Tyne Local Economic Partnership to attract business to the North Bank of the Tyne Enterprise Zone. The Council believes that North Tyneside Council and other councils in the region are important 'drivers' to attract renewable energy investors. We believe that the Enterprise Zone will benefit the whole region and therefore the region should co-operate and support and not seek to undermine the growth of the renewable energy sector.

This Council calls on the Elected Mayor to write to all the MPs who are signatories to the attached letter expressing this Council's dismay and concern over the potential impact of their letter\* to the Prime Minister dated 30 January 2012 published in the Telegraph newspaper which if supported would also undermine the growth of the renewable energies sector and so the growth of the North Bank LEP. "

\*Letter to the Prime Minister dated 30 January 2012 published in the Telegraph Newspaper:

As Members of Parliament from across the political spectrum, we have grown more and more concerned about the Government's policy of support for on-shore wind energy production. In these financially straightened times, we think it is unwise to make consumers pay, through taxpayer subsidy, for inefficient and intermittent energy production that typifies on-shore wind turbines. In the on-going review of subsidy for renewable energy subsidies, we ask the Government to dramatically cut the subsidy for on-shore wind and spread the savings made between other types of reliable renewable energy production and energy efficiency measures. We also are worried that the new National Planning Policy Framework, in its current form, diminishes the chances of local people defeating unwanted on-shore wind farm proposals through the planning system. Thus we attach some subtle amendments to the existing wording that we believe will help rebalance the system. Finally, recent planning appeals have approved wind farm developments with the inspectors citing renewable energy targets as being more important than planning considerations. Taken to its logical conclusion, this means that it is impossible to defeat applications through the planning system. We would urge you to ensure that planning inspectors know that the views of local people and long established planning requirements should always be taken into account.

Yours sincerely,

Signed by 106 MPs."

## **Legal implications**

In determining planning applications, Planning officers and Planning committees are required to take into account all material planning considerations relevant to the application.

## **Financial implications**

There are no direct financial implications arising from this motion. The financial implications of any future proposals for the Council's involvement in the LEP or the sustainable energy market would be subject to a separate report as and when they come forward.

### **4. Motion signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, N Redfearn, J O'Shea and T Mulvenna**

“That this Council is concerned about the very recent announcement by the Department of Education on the agreed merger of Priory Primary School and Kings School Tynemouth and the creation of an Academy. The Council requests that all relevant information concerning the decision of the Secretary of State is sought as soon as possible and that the Strategic Director of Children, Young People and Learning be requested to provide a report to the next meeting of the full Council to enable full debate on the matter to take place. Further that the Council requests assurances that any final decision by the Secretary of State on the creation of an Academy is not made pending formal consultation with the Council in relation to the impact of these proposals on North Tyneside Schools.”

## **Legal implications**

The Academies Act 2010 makes provision for the Secretary of State for Education to enter into arrangements with other parties to establish an Academy school. Academies are independent of the local authority and receive public funding directly from the state under a funding arrangement.

Before a local authority maintained school is converted into Academy the Act requires that consultation on the question of whether the conversion should take place must occur. The Act does not stipulate the persons or organisations which must be consulted but leaves that to the discretion of the person carrying out the consultation. A local authority has a clear interest in proposals of this nature.

## **Financial implications**

There are no direct financial implications arising from this motion. Future reports on this matter will consider the expected financial implications associated with the proposed Academy.

**5. Motion signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, N Redfearn, J O'Shea and T Mulvenna**

“That this Council requests that the Mayor investigates why there has been a delay in extending the yellow lines parking restrictions in the Abbots Way Housing Estate within the Collingwood Ward, which has been an ongoing matter for nearly twelve months. Council would welcome a report back from the Mayor at the next meeting of Council on her findings.”

**Legal implications**

There are no legal implications directly arising from this motion.

**Financial implications**

There are no direct financial implications arising from this motion. If the motion is agreed, any financial implications associated with the specific parking restrictions will be reported in subsequent updates.

**6. Motion signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, N Redfearn, J O'Shea and T Mulvenna**

“This Council is concerned at the introduction of charges for access to the people’s network internet access at Libraries.

The Council calls on the Mayor to reconsider the introduction of charges, and to maintain free access, as it will have a detrimental effect on the most deprived sections of the community, many who have to use the internet for access to information and applications for employment.”

**Legal implications**

Cabinet has responsibility for the setting of fees and charges in relation to internet access at libraries. However it is open to full Council to make recommendations to Cabinet in relation to such charges, for consideration by Cabinet in its decision making in this regard.

**Financial implications**

There is no direct financial implication associated with the motion to reconsider the decision to implement of charges for internet access or the introduction of the Premier Ease Card, which includes extended internet access in libraries.

Any review of the scheme would have to be mindful of the fact that the 2012/13 budget includes an income target of £0.030m associated with the introduction of these charges. However, there are no existing detailed workings to calculate the proportion of this income that relates to internet access, so an estimate would need to be made. Any decision to change the proposed scheme would need to re-provide

for this income or find compensating efficiencies so that the budget remains within financial envelope approved by Council on 1 March 2012.

**7. Motion signed by Councillors J Allan, C Gambling, N Redfearn, J O'Shea and T Mulvenna**

“This Council is concerned at the introduction of a £20 charge for the collection of the brown garden waste bins. We believe this will have a detrimental effect upon recycling in North Tyneside and may end up costing more in terms of collection and environmental impact than it will realise in income.

The Council calls on the Mayor to reconsider the decision to implement the charge and to maintain free collection for this service.”

**Legal Implications**

Cabinet has responsibility for the setting of charges for garden waste collections. However it is open to full Council to make recommendations to Cabinet in relation to such charges, for consideration by Cabinet in its decision making in this regard.

**Financial implications**

There is no direct financial implication associated with the motion to reconsider the decision to implement the scheme. However, any review of the scheme would have to be mindful of the fact that the 2012/13 budget includes a net revenue savings target of £0.250m associated with this scheme. Any decision to change the proposed scheme would need to re-provide for the income foregone or find compensating efficiencies so that the budget remains within financial envelope approved by Council on 1 March 2012.