

PUBLIC

MINUTES of the meeting of the **DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL** held virtually on 2 December 2020

PRESENT

Councillor T Ainsworth (In the Chair)

Councillors D Allen, R Ashton, K S Athwal, J Atkin, N Atkin, Mrs E Atkins, S A Bambrick, N Barker, B Bingham, Ms S L Blank, J Boulton, S Brittain, S Bull, Mrs S Burfoot, K Buttery, Mrs D W E Charles, Mrs L M Chilton, J A Coyle, A Dale, Mrs C Dale, J E Dixon, R Flatley, M Ford, Mrs A Foster, J A Frudd, R George, K Gillott, A Griffiths, Mrs C A Hart, G Hickton, R Iliffe, Mrs J M Innes, T A Kemp, T King, B Lewis, W Major, P Makin, S Marshall-Clarke, D McGregor, R Mihaly, C R Moesby, P Murray, G Musson, R A Parkinson, Mrs J E Patten, J Perkins, Mrs I Ratcliffe, B Ridgway, C Short, P J Smith, S A Spencer, A Stevenson, S Swann, D H Taylor, Mrs J A Twigg, M Wall, Ms A Western, G Wharmby, Mrs J Wharmby and B Wright.

76/20 **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE** Apologies for absence were received on behalf of Councillors H Elliott, Mrs L Grooby and B Woods.

77/20 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST** There were no declarations of interest.

78/20 **MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING** On the motion of the Chairman, duly seconded,

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 16 September 2020 be confirmed as a correct record.

79/20 **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS** The following announcements were made:

The Chairman reported on the deaths of former County Councillor Kath Trueman, former Director of Social Services John Jillings and Sergeant Matt Ratana of the Metropolitan Police Authority.

All Members were invited to pay tribute and to observe a Minute's silence.

The Chairman announced the forthcoming retirement of Simon Hobbs, Director of Legal Services and invited Members to respond.

The Chairman referred to the challenges and issues faced by the Council over the past year and recognised the tremendous efforts made from staff to rise to the challenges and continue to adopt working practices and procedures to ensure that essential services continued to be delivered flawlessly.

He reported that the efforts of staff had been recognised with a National Award for their crisis response work before the pandemic had hit. The Crisis Response Team had been named the winner in the Best Council Services' Team category at the MJ Local Government Achievement Awards in 2020 in relation to the Toddbrook Reservoir incident at Whaley Bridge in 2019 and the severe flooding that had followed across large parts of the county a few months later.

Councillor Lewis also paid tribute to all staff involved.

80/20 **REPORT OF THE LEADER** Councillor Lewis confirmed that the county was now out of lockdown and had entered a new tiering arrangement where Derbyshire had emerged as Tier 3. The second lockdown had seen Derbyshire in Tier 2 with rising case numbers around certain parts of the county.

It had been a tough fight from the start in terms of trying to keep numbers down. Derbyshire Dales had seen one of the lowest counts in the county and was recently at 156/100,000 crude rate. It was felt that the County had been unfortunate to come out in Tier 3, just as numbers were going down in Derbyshire. Councillor Lewis felt that a reasonably cogent case for coming out in Tier 2 had been made to Government, however the result had been Tier 3.

The Council would continue to work hard to ensure it emerged into Tier 2 in the future. The next review was scheduled for 16 December.

By remaining in Tier 3, people could go about and do retail, get their hair cut, have their nails done and go to the gym however, they could not go to a pub or a restaurant and have a meal or go and stay in an hotel. This was unfortunate for industry here in Derbyshire. Tourism was a big deal, as was hospitality. Those industries had been hit particularly hard. Shopper confidence, in terms of people going out on the High Street would be impacted.

A lot of work had taken place with Districts and Boroughs. A scheme called ShopAppy had been launched. This was an online platform that allowed retail businesses to put their goods and services online for people to order, to Click and Collect or have deliveries made. It helped those businesses who didn't have an online platform for sales of their products. It had cost £64,000 between the local authorities to

roll out and was free for a year for all those businesses taking part. Councillor Lewis understood that an awful lot of businesses across the County had signed up to the scheme and hoped it would make a difference to retail in Derbyshire whilst still in Tier 3.

With regard to the vaccination, the Council had made an announcement that morning that 800,000 vaccines would arrive in the UK next week to be rolled out in health settings first of all and be rolled out to care homes and care home staff soon. Mass vacs vaccination would be rolled out over the course of the coming months for the rest of the country. Centres throughout the County had been identified where that work would take place; these would be publicised in due course.

Testing was also very much on the agenda, with lateral flow testing work with communities to be rolled out as quickly as possible. It was hoped that Derbyshire would be one of the pilot areas - these would get additional support to help the county get out of Tier 3 as quickly as possible. The Director of Public Health had had a conversation that morning with the Minister, with more detail coming out over the course of the next few days.

Councillor Lewis reported on the approved Pfizer vaccine. The first 800,000 would arrive in the UK from Belgium the following week. It required freezing at -70° and was the one most difficult to manage in terms of roll-out, however it was 95% effective. It required two doses and so hospitals and NHS staff would be the first to have access to give them maximum protection. This would be followed by care home settings staff and residents so they can start to see their families.

It was assumed that of the 10 million ordered from Pfizer, it would rapidly become available over the coming weeks and months and administered in order of priority to those at the highest risk of infection from Covid-19 or highest risk of bad outcomes. This would not be an overnight event, with expected roll out from early December.

He confirmed that the Council was also well on top of local test and trace work and he referred to the work being undertaken by the Director of Public Health and his team.

Councillor Lewis also reiterated the words of the Chairman regarding the huge amount of work going on by staff in public health doing the track and trace work. He also praised all staff across all departments for their previous and on-going hard work and commitment to delivering services.

81/20 **PUBLIC QUESTIONS** None received.

82/20 **PETITIONS** None received.

(a) Question from Councillor S Brittain to Councillor S A Spencer, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Infrastructure

Can Councillor Spencer now tell us: what use of the Crow Lane cycle route has been made by hospital workers? Secondly, what are the results of traffic counts recorded by the remote cameras erected by DCC? And finally, if an evaluation has been made, as I requested at the last Council meeting, of the use of Dark Lane as a cycle route rather than Crow Lane given the advantages for cyclists compared to Crow Lane?

Councillor Spencer responded as follows:

As you will know, we have been carrying out surveys on Crow Lane. We carried out surveys for two days in June and we carried out a two-week survey between the 15 and 29 September. We also intend carrying out further surveys at the beginning of next year.

I do not have the information to hand with regard to the details of those surveys because we don't monitor where people travel to, but we have a significant number of letters which I can make available to you from individuals who work at the hospital who have made representations and desire to wish to support the measures we have put in place on a temporary basis.

Of course you will know, Councillor Brittain, and you requested at the last meeting that we considered the opportunity of using Dark Lane as an alternative, but you will know also that that is not as direct a route to the town centre. It goes quite a lot further out to the eastern direction than Crow Lane itself although the geography of that road in particular is slightly different. It is not as steep.

Of course, what you are hoping to get, and I accept that, is a definitive answer about the future. I can tell you, Councillor Brittain, as I did in the last meeting of Council that took place, that we had submitted a bid to the Active Travel programme, tranche 2. Of course, we have been successful in that bid. That bid is particularly focused at areas where there is urban density, of which Chesterfield is in one of those areas here in Derbyshire. As a consequence of that, Councillor Brittain, I think it is £1.7m has been allocated to Derbyshire. As a condition of that bid we have to carry out a full consultation process to facilitate the usage of that funding in an appropriate way.

What I can tell you today - and I know discussions have taken place between Chesterfield Borough Council, I know the Leader of Chesterfield Borough Council expressed some views at the last meeting - what I can tell you today, Councillor Brittain, our intention is that very shortly we will be starting a public consultation process about the route, the Active Travel route which includes Crow Lane and it will take into account and consider the issues related to Dark Lane also. We will carry out that public consultation process, as I promised, and discuss all the issues related to it. Of course, the data we have already got in place and the representations we already have will feed into that consultation process. Obviously people will have an opportunity when their representation is heard throughout it and the implementation of that scheme will start sooner rather than later because the expenditure has to be carried out in the early part of next year so we need to get on with this work. I am sure you will be pleased to hear that. We will be carrying out our public consultation and following that consultation we will be making a decision on what direction of travel this particular project will take.

I sit here with a very open mind. I have told you before I don't have a particularly strong view in either direction. The Council's position will remain neutral while this consultation takes place and we will all have a clear indication from the public what their views are.

Councillor Brittain asked the following supplementary question:

I am interested that you have had letters from hospital workers because I have to tell you, the vast number of letters I have received for the closure have not been from hospital workers, they have been from members of the cycle campaign (most of whom do not live in the area nor work at the hospital) so yes, I would be quite interested to have those, Councillor Spencer. That would be of interest to me.

The point about Dark Lane, which I would put to you, is are you convinced that the advantages of that, given it links to the cycle route across the East Midlands, are not better than using Crow Lane which no hospital workers will want to ride up because it is terribly steep? It is almost off the tree.

Councillor Spencer responded as follows:

Provided we are able to share those letters with you, Councillor Brittain, I have no objection to you seeing them whatsoever. I want to be totally transparent about this.

I don't think it would be appropriate, given the fact I will have to make a judgment call on the consultation process that is due to take place very shortly on any decisions for Crow Lane, to have a view on

which is the preferred route. I think that would be inappropriate. I have to keep an open mind and I intend to do so. I would rather not answer that question, that is the honest answer Councillor Brittain, and I am not going to either for the reasons I have just stated, but what I will say to you is this: I am not going to pre-empt any decisions. I have promised you that Dark Lane's preference can be added into that consultation process. I know the Director of ETE, or the new name of place very shortly, the Director is listening to this conversation and I am sure everything I have requested will be included in that consultation process which I hope will start soon. It will be at the beginning of next year.

(b) Question from Councillor S Marshall-Clarke to Councillor A Foster, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services

What happens to the Council's surplus personal computers and laptops?

Councillor Foster responded as follows:

Many PCs and laptops that come back to the Council are usually in poor condition but we do try to get as much as we can out of them. The equipment that comes back goes to the Asset Management in the ICT Services as no longer required and they go through the disposal or repurpose process.

If the device is under five years old then this is processed for reuse within the organisation. If the device is under five years old out of warranty and beyond repair, the field engineers will mark this for disposal. If they can be repaired, they usually will be put back in use within the organisation.

The laptops which are over five years old and still have some life in them are put to one side and we use them as part of the Council's Thriving Communities work. We try to retrieve as many of those as possible, but like I said before a lot of the PCs and laptops that come back to us and go through the Asset Management are not in good quality or good condition enough to be passed on anyway.

The PCs and laptops which are over five years old and are damaged or faulty or are considered too slow to be of any use to us go to a disposal company for refurbishment or they use them as spare parts.

From that Derbyshire County Council actually receives 80% of any resale value recovered by the company and the income we do get back is usually put forward to help towards getting new equipment.

Councillor Marshall-Clarke asked the following supplementary question:

We have now transferred around a thousand employees to the Joint Venture company. I assume all the PCs and laptops post-transfer are surplus? Can Councillor Foster confirm this and, if so, can we ensure that they and any other surplus equipment is recycled and reused? I notice you say some of them are. It is about a judgment which ones are recyclable.

I have been informed by employees of this Authority that perfectly usable laptops have been scrapped and we receive £5 for them. Can you confirm that?

Councillor Foster responded as follows:

Like I said any equipment that is coming back to the Council will go through the process I have just described. They go through the process of either disposal or refurbished. The specific pieces of equipment that Councillor Marshall-Clarke identified I would say will go through that process and if it can be reused by the organisation they will be reused by the organisation. Those which are sent for disposal, as I said, the company that we use then use them as parts or refurbish them. Obviously, they wouldn't go to that company if they thought they would be of any use to them, as I have described earlier.

Can I just suggest, because we keep getting questions from our Opposition councillors, that staff come to them with a specific complaint or comments and then they wait until Council to put it across to us. If they could come to us in between Councils so we could actually see what each complaint from the staff or comments from the staff are when they are received we can deal with them and address them if we can. If we can change things we can change things accordingly. I would suggest any comments from staff please pass them on don't wait until the next full Council I would say, pass them on to me before as you get them. We can see where that has come from and we can actually check whether or not the information you have received is accurate. I think that is what I am trying to say.

(c) Question from Councillor R George to Councillor S A Spencer, Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Infrastructure

I, and our local communities, are concerned that the recent lockdowns and reduction in traffic have led to a higher proportion of vehicles speeding, which seems to continue even when traffic levels are higher. More people are keen to walk and cycle in accordance with government guidelines, but many are concerned that our roads are not

safe for them to do so. Has the Cabinet Member reviewed the recent evidence on the effectiveness of 20mph zones in reducing speeds and casualties on roads to enable more people to be able to walk and cycle safely, and in light of this, where does the Council propose to implement 20mph zones in response to the many requests from local communities?

Councillor Spencer responded as follows:

I can't comment on the recent articles or the recent evidence you refer to because I don't know which evidence you are referring to so perhaps you could enlighten me with regard to that in your supplementary.

Obviously, the Council has carried out reviews on the 20 mph zones/limits in the past. I as an individual sat on a Scrutiny Review that took over a year and ascertained information from across the country, from different organisations, about 20 mph zones/limits over a considerable period of time. This information was varied. It was very different in many cases. The conclusions that were reached were not conclusive in many cases and there is a varied opinion on the effectiveness of those limits and zones.

What I can tell you, Councillor George, is that as far as I am aware there has been no further Government evaluation since the 22 November 2018 when the Government published a comprehensive review of the effectiveness of 20 mph zones/limits. Off the back of that review - that was carried out by DfT - off the back of that review this Council then undertook its own evaluation of trials that had taken place here in Derbyshire. That took place on the 31 January 2019. Cabinet papers are available. All the detail is represented within those Cabinet papers and all the facts and information that was presented at that particular time is available for everybody to see, which I have shared with many people over the years.

Of course, off the back of that evaluation the Council reached conclusions and agreed a policy that we have at this moment in time, which has been supported by the Speed Management Plan and the Highways Network Management Plan also, so those are all tied together. That policy says quite clearly that "20 mph zones/limits should be used sparingly, where appropriate, when all other processes and approaches have been looked at closely." In other words we will look at other options first before we implement a carte blanche approach of introducing some 20 mph zones/limits across Derbyshire as a whole.

You will know that a trial in Padfield took place and that trial strangely enough unfortunately brought about more accidents during the trial period than took place prior to it. I am not saying that was the

reason for it but that was a consequence of that trial. It took place during that period of time and the speed reduction element was insignificant, to say the least. That report is available for you to look at when you see fit.

There is a huge amount of different views on this particular subject, as you know. As far as I am aware there is no Government evaluation that has taken place recently. That is the answer to the original question Chairman, thank you.

Councillor George asked the following supplementary question:

I will try to include the Request for Information made from Councillor Spencer there as well.

There has been more recent evidence from West Yorkshire in particular which has found there has been considerable reduction in both collisions and injuries from 20 mph zones and from the Bristol zones as well.

The Padfield example, which is the only example that was identified in the reports which Councillor Spencer mentioned, which I have indeed read and gone through, is not a typical village but the Parish Council have pointed out how badly that 20 mph zone was actually signed. I don't think you can at all say that the zone brought about more accidents because those accidents that occurred were not speed related but I think from the evidence where speeds are lower and it did reduce speeds by between 1 and 2 mph, as all the national evidence shows happens, then the injuries that occur from them are reduced.

I have communities, particularly in Whitehough where we have been requesting speed reduction and round the Chinley area for many years and has been consistently refused with no other actions put in place. I would not mind if we tried other things first but that does not seem to have been happening. I have just had a request for a 60 mph zone on Elnor Lane in Fernilee to be reduced to 30 mph because of pedestrians and high levels of traffic speeding and that has been refused as well.

Our communities feel that they have no support against the speeds that vehicles are travelling at and I am asking Councillor Spencer what the Council propose to do about that lack of action. Thank you.

Councillor Spencer responded as follows:

I would disagree that there has been a lack of action by this Council on issues that are raised by the public. That is not the case. Our officers diligently look at any request for any alteration in Traffic Regulation Orders across the county.

What Councillor George will not be aware of, at this moment in time there is a re-evaluation of the purposing of the Derby and Derbyshire Road Safety Partnership. We are going through a process of evaluation on the effectiveness of that particular partnership and how it should work in the future. I for one believe that that is an essential part of how we address the needs of the public moving forward but there are quite a few elements to that particular process that Councillor George should be made aware of.

One element of part of the process which I am totally unhappy with, and find totally unacceptable, is when this Authority puts forward a proposal under a Traffic Regulation Order to reduce speed, from whatever speed down to another speed, say 50 to 60, 40 to 30 whatever the case may be, in every single incident without exception Derbyshire Police Force object to it. Now perhaps that is something you could take up with the Police and Crime Commissioner and ask him why that is policy because it is not acceptable and it is not a proper evaluation of the request from the Highway Authority.

We as an Authority have a responsibility for the implementation of Traffic Regulation Orders and enduring measures to make a road safe, but of course it is the responsibility of the police to enforce those Traffic Regulation Orders, which is something that gets lost in translation when we are talking to the public in general. I wish to make sure that that relationship with the Derbyshire and Derby Road Safety Partnership is enhanced where we work more closely together.

I cannot accept that 20 mph zones or 20 mph limits are purely the solution to all the issues that Councillor George raises. There is a raft of evidence that does not support that speed in its entirety is the only factor that brings about injury to individuals on the highway from accidents. There is a lot more evidence to support other elements of that. For example how cars are designed; the speed the impact takes place at. There is a lot of evidence out there with lots of arguments for one argument against another, so without a proper evaluation carried out by the Government and the DfT it is very difficult - and the last one like I say was carried out in November 2018 - it is very difficult to reach a conclusion, but what I can say to you is this Authority takes its responsibilities of road safety very seriously. We have a laid down protocol and process for dealing with all requests and applications. Sometimes those requests are not the answers they wish to hear but we follow that diligently and this Authority takes its responsibilities of road safety extremely seriously.

84/20 REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S SENIOR OFFICER LEADERSHIP MODEL

The Director of Legal Services and Monitoring Officer presented a report which outlined proposals to temporarily amend the Council's current operating model and introduce a role of Managing Executive Director, which would be undertaken by one of the existing Executive Directors, for a temporary period of 12 months.

The report gave extensive details in respect of the current operating model and how this supported the Council, progress made since the current models introduction and detailed proposals to strengthen and enhance the current model in light of recent significant organisational changes.

On the motion of Councillor B Lewis, duly seconded,

RESOLVED to (1) approve the proposed temporary changes to the Council's operating model and the introduction of a temporary Managing Executive Director (CCP) for a period of 12 months;

(2) approve the variation to contract process;

(3) note the intention to review the temporary arrangement during the next 12 months and submit a further report to Council; and

(4) note the commencement of the recruitment process to the role of Executive Director, Place.

85/20 THE SCRUTINY REVIEW The Executive Director for Commissioning, Communities and Policy presented a report which sought approval of the Scrutiny Review findings, recommendations and action plan following consideration by Cabinet, the Improvement and Scrutiny Committees, the Governance, Ethics and Standards Committee and the Member Workshop.

The Scrutiny Review had commenced in 2019 at the request of Cabinet and Chairs of Scrutiny and a workshop had been held for the Chairs and Vice Chairs of the four Improvement and Scrutiny Committees. A lack of officer capacity had prevented the review from being progressed further at that time, and, to resolve this, a Programme Director had been appointed in March 2020 to progress a range of projects, including the scrutiny review.

It had been determined that the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (formerly known as the Centre for Public Scrutiny - CfPS) would be commissioned to undertake the review, bringing

independence, a substantial experience of scrutiny from across the country and a ready-made scrutiny review methodology.

The report contained details in respect of the process undertaken along with the relevant parties involved throughout the process.

A Scrutiny Review Steering Group had been established and this group had been used to lead the review process.

Cabinet had considered and approved the Scrutiny Review findings and proposed actions at their meeting on the 19th November. They had also considered the draft report and draft action plan on the 8th October 2020 and commended them for consideration at a scrutiny member workshop and by the four Improvement and Scrutiny Committees (special combined I&S meeting for Resources, Health and Places on 3 November and the People I&S Committee on 4 November) and Governance, Ethics and Standards Committee (22 October).

Cabinet had noted that this review commenced a programme of continuous review and development of scrutiny at Derbyshire County Council.

The Scrutiny workshop had taken place on the 12th October 2020 and the report from the workshop was appended to the report at Appendix 1.

Fifteen recommendations had been identified by the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny (formerly known as the CfPS), and these were set out in their report, which was appended to the report at Appendix 2.

A further three actions had been identified by senior officers and the Scrutiny Steering Group.

The Scrutiny Steering Group had prepared an Action Plan in response to the recommendations which had been approved by Cabinet at its meeting on 19 November and this was attached to the report at Appendix 3.

The workshop, Governance, Ethics and the Improvement and Scrutiny Committees had reviewed the action plan and no changes to it had been required.

On the motion of Councillor A Foster, duly seconded,

RESOLVED to approve the Scrutiny review findings, recommendations and action plan, as recommended by Cabinet on 19 November 2020.

86/20 REPORT FROM CABINET AND MEMBERS QUESTIONS
ON THE REPORT

The Council gave consideration to a report which provided information on issues which had been considered by the Cabinet at meetings held between 31 January 2019 to date and that enabled Members to ask related questions.

The Council Procedure Rules as detailed in the Constitution (Appendix 3), sets out the order of business for Council meetings. This includes provision for a Cabinet Report to Council detailing the activities of Cabinet and affording Members the opportunity to ask questions on the report.

After February 2019, the Cabinet Report to Council was no longer presented to Council. However, this change had not been ratified by the Council or considered by the Governance, Ethics and Standards Committee and therefore the provision remained in the Constitution.

It has been determined therefore, that the situation should be rectified and a report would be produced covering the Cabinet meetings which had not been considered by Full Council.

The meetings since the last AGM were reported in detail and links to the previous meetings were included.

The following questions were received in relation to the report:

(a) Question from Councillor C Dale to Councillor J Wharmby regarding item 7 on 19 November 2020 - Scrutiny of the Next Steps in relation to Direct Care Homes for Older People

Does the Cabinet Member for Adult Care agree with the comment made by the scrutiny chair that he no longer has any concerns about the safety of residents in our care homes?

Councillor Mrs J Wharmby responded as follows:

I am pleased with the Scrutiny Chairman that he agrees that the mitigations we have put in place are correct.

Councillor Dale asked the following supplementary question:

What is the future investment strategy? Looking at the marketplace we have issues there haven't we with numbers and things, including marketing for Adult Social Care to help the Council continue its high quality service provision and create a sustainable income to run our residential homes because I realise what the market is like. Also,

the private sector is very fragile, and we have a statutory duty to provide care.

Councillor Mrs J Wharmby responded as follows:

The report will be coming to Cabinet on the 10 December. Hopefully the answers to your questions will be in that Cabinet report.

(b) Question from Councillor D Allen to Councillor J Wharmby regarding item 7 on 19 November 2020 - Scrutiny of the Next Steps in relation to Direct Care Homes for Older People

What is the update on the strategy for long term residential care?

Councillor Mrs J Wharmby responded as follows:

Again, my response to your question is that a report is coming to Cabinet on the 10 December. That should have all the information in there that you will need.

Councillor Allen asked the following supplementary question:

Can you give us some assurance that the homes will in future be fully open for residents and not be running at a very small number of residents as it is at the present time because in the future it is important for the people of Derbyshire that they have that choice? Our homes when they have been refurbished will be an excellent facility for future use.

Councillor Mrs J Wharmby responded as follows:

We will try and do the utmost we possibly can. Naturally with the position we are in at the moment with Covid and other situations, I can't guarantee anything at this moment in time but naturally we will do as much as possible to put things in place.

(c) Question from Councillor Coyle to Councillor A Dale regarding item 21 on 10 September 2020 – Financial Support to Derbyshire Foodbanks

Many Councils are issuing food vouchers to families qualifying for free school meals to cover the school holidays. Why is this administration choosing not to do so?

Councillor Alex Dale responded as follows:

I would say as we will come on to discuss at the next item, the Government has announced a £170m Covid Winter Grant Scheme, of

which Derbyshire County Council's allocation is just under £2.2m. The funding is to support vulnerable households with food and bills until March 2021 and therefore importantly covers the Christmas and February half-term holiday periods. Thereafter the Government has announced it is expanding its holiday activities and food programmes to Christmas 2021.

While the details of our delivery of that grant are still to be finalised, and will be announced shortly, I am happy to confirm to Councillor Coyle and this Council that the bulk of the funding will be concentrated on vouchers to support vulnerable families. I am also pleased to say that we won't just be stopping at those who are eligible for free school meals but going even further than that to cover those entitled to the additional 15 hours of childcare; children in need; children on child protection plans and to other vulnerable groups, including care leavers. We will also be supporting a number of third-party organisations, including those in the community and voluntary sector to support any residents who find themselves on hard times over the winter but aren't otherwise eligible according to the criteria that I described just then. Thank you.

Councillor Coyle asked the following supplementary question:

I welcome that announcement, Alex. Obviously, it is good news, but it is actually nowhere near enough. It is £2.18m, 80% of which has to be spent on vulnerable families or families with vulnerable children as you have just described. The total number of those children when you take into account the ones you have just added on top of the free school meals is something round about 35,000 children.

If we take each child, and bear in mind what has happened during Covid, there are thousands of job losses. People have been furloughed. People have been losing money hand over fist and particularly the ones who are the lowest paid seem to always be the ones who suffer the most. If you look at that £2.18m, and if you take 80% of it which has to be spent on vulnerable families, free school meals etc, that works out at £12 per month per child. It is something that is actually worth having, I agree, but it is not going to solve any problems because it is actually going to be spent on gas bills, on electric bills, on light, on water, maybe even on rent, on things that people have to do just to try and maintain a roof over their heads.

I ask the Controlling Group - who keep on telling us that it is an Enterprising Council and a member led Authority - I ask that members of the Controlling Group lead the Council in helping our most vulnerable at this most vulnerable time. Can I please have your assurance that you will reconsider this because £12 a month per child is better than nothing but not much better than nothing?

Councillor Dale responded as follows:

As I said in the answer to the question, we will be announcing the details of the fund very shortly. I don't recognise the figures that you gave precisely there. My understanding is that the cost of doing free school meal vouchers solely to the free school meal cohort is about £350,000 per week so actually the £2.2m is quite substantial. As I say the intention of that scheme is that we expand it out to a wider group, not just cover those families, and also to try and make sure that it covers other key pressures on families like bills.

I personally welcome the scheme. I do recognise the comment around is it enough? I think it is a fair challenge but I would add to that that we have been doing a lot of work over a long period of time to support the voluntary and community sector in terms of supporting residents. We have obviously been supporting families through the Derbyshire Discretionary Fund. We have given a quarter of a million pounds to Foundation Derbyshire to support the food bank distributions around the county. We work closely with Feeding Derbyshire and Rural Action Derbyshire initiatives. We have provided food boxes ourselves. The Covid Winter Grant Scheme should not be viewed in isolation. It is part of a package of measures but I do think it is welcome and I think it is welcome it expands beyond just free school meal vouchers. It is wider than that and so it should be. Thank you for the question and I will certainly announce the details as soon as we are possibly able to in terms of the scheme.

(d) Question from Councillor C Dale to Councillor J Wharmby regarding item 37 on 30 July 2020 – Reshaping and Reconfiguring the Derbyshire Homecare Market – Transferring Long-term Packages of Care from Direct Care to the Private Care Home Sector

What is the latest expectation of the fees to be paid to Newton-Europe who carried out consultancy on this change of approach, and what savings are going to be achieved as a result?

Councillor Mrs J Wharmby responded as follows:

The project savings for such a large programme is in the framework report that went to Cabinet on the 11 July 2019. We continue to be on target to deliver both improvements for our residents and also the financial savings.

Councillor C Dale asked the following supplementary question:

We have funding available for apprenticeships. Is this going to be taken up by Adult Care in developing a career strategy for apprenticeships in Adult Social Care to develop well qualified social care, Adult Social Care workers for the future, because with the increase in the elderly population this is a growth industry and a source of future employment for people?

Councillor Wharmby responded as follows:

I think we will be doing because we have been doing a lot of work on that anyway. I agree with your question, it is a very good question. We are going to support apprenticeships because we do need those people in places and I can assure you we are doing a lot of work on that at the moment.

87/20 **MOTION** Council considered Notice of Motions as set out below:

Motion submitted by Councillor E Atkins

This Council recognises the great burden placed on underprivileged families - especially in the current troubling times - and fully supports the efforts of Marcus Rashford MBE to persuade the Government to introduce free school meal vouchers for use by children during school holidays.

This Council further expresses its regret that the House of Commons recently turned down a motion to introduce free school meal holiday vouchers.

Bearing in mind the overwhelming need for this measure, backed by massive public support, this Council will move to set up its own free school meals holiday vouchers scheme without delay.

Councillor R George moved the following amendment to the motion which was duly seconded:

To add the following words to the original motion submitted by Councillor B Atkins:

The Council recognises that direct payments are the most effective means to assist families in poverty with food, bills and heating costs, as the Covid Winter Grant Scheme requires, and will aim to therefore set up this support as direct payments to families of children on free school meals and other vulnerable families and households to support them as best we can through this difficult winter, to enable them to spend their funding in local independent shops if they wish and to alleviate the stigma of poverty that prevents too many families from

seeking the support they need.

The amendment to the motion was duly voted on and declared to be LOST.

The original motion was duly seconded, voted upon and declared to be carried.

This was put to the vote and declared to be carried.

In accordance with standing order 4.1 on the Council procedure Rules in the Council's Constitution, the following motion was moved and duly seconded:

RESOLVED to agree that the meeting continue beyond 5pm in order to allow business on the Council agenda to be concluded.

Motion submitted by Councillor J Innes

This Council calls upon government for an end to abuse, both verbal and physical, against shop workers and public facing workers. We urgently need new legislation to provide these workers with more protection and we need the means to enforce it. We need stiffer penalties for those who do assault workers.

Abuse should not be part of the job for these people who deserve our respect as they perform their duties. Ensuring these people are protected requires action by politicians as well as employers and the police. We need to work together to provide practical solutions to prevent abuse and violence to these workers. Last year every minute of every of day a shop worker was verbally or, even worse, physically abused. Just for doing their job!

This government asked for evidence of these abuses and it is well over a year since the closure of the call for evidence. Nothing has been done.

Now these key workers have been at the frontline during the pandemic and have faced even more abuse to ensure the public has food on the table. They have asked customers to keep to government guidelines regarding social distancing and panic buying, all within government guidelines. But this same government has let them down.

Councillor S Swann proposed the following amendment to the motion which was duly seconded,

This Council recognises the invaluable contribution to society of shop workers and public facing workers, noting with much gratitude their

immense efforts during the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic and calls for an end to any abuse to which they may be subjected.

Abuse should not be part of anyone's job and practical solutions are required from employers, the police and the Government to ensure retail workers are protected and receive the respect they deserve and this Council calls for urgent action from these bodies to deliver this.

The amendment to the motion was duly voted on and declared to be carried.