

PUBLIC

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL** held on 14 July 2021 at the Casa Hotel in Chesterfield.

**PRESENT**

Councillor T Ainsworth (In the Chair)

Councillors R Ashton, K S Athwal, J D Barron, B Bingham, S Bull, S Burfoot, A M Clarke, D Collins, C Cupit, C Dale, J E Dixon, D Du Celliee Muller, R Flatley, E Fordham, A Foster, M Foster, R George, A Gibson, K Gillott, N Gourlay, D Greenhalgh, A Griffiths, L Grooby, C A Hart, A Hayes, G Hickton, S Hobson, N Hoy, R Iliffe, J M Innes, G Kinsella, T A Kemp, T King, B Lewis, W Major, P Moss, D Murphy, G Musson, J Nelson, P Niblock, R A Parkinson, J E Patten, L Ramsey, R Redfern, C Renwick, P Rose, J Siddle, P Smith, S A Spencer, A Sutton, S Swann, D H Taylor, J Wharmby, D Wilson, J Woolley and M Yates.

**51/21**            **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**            Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors D Allen, N Atkin, A Dale, M Ford, R Mihaly, A Stevenson, and B Woods.

**52/21**            **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**            There were no declarations of interest.

**53/21**            **CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**            The Chairman referred to the following points in his announcements:

The NHS had been awarded the George Cross by the Queen. The extract below had been taken from a letter produced by the Queen and had been sent to a member of the public.

“This award recognises all NHS staff, past and present, across all disciplines and all four nations. Over more than 70 decades, and especially in recent times, you have supported the people of our country with courage and passion and dedication demonstrating the highest standards of public service. You have our heartfelt thanks and appreciation.”

The Chairman congratulated the NHS and those of this county.

Sadly the recent passing of Gregory McDonald had been announced. Gregory was born in 1940. He became a qualified teacher and practised his profession in the local area. At one time he was the Head of Denby Primary School.

Politically he was the County Councillor for the Horsley Division long-term. He was also an Amber Valley Borough Councillor for which he was the Leader twice. He was also a member of Shipley Parish Council for many years.

The Srebrenica Memorial Day was on Sunday 11 July. The theme for 2021's commemoration 'Rebuilding Lives' had been launched on the 1-4 February at an online launch event. The theme sought to highlight the way in which survivors of the Bosnian genocide had rebuilt their lives.

The Council observed a minute's silence as a tribute to the victims of the genocide and for the life of Greg McDonald.

**54/21**            **MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL MEETING**    On the motion of Councillor B Lewis, duly seconded,

**RESOLVED** that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 26 May 2021 be confirmed as a correct record.

**55/21**            **REPORT OF THE LEADER**            Councillor Lewis gave his report and referred to the following topical issues:-

- The football had been at the forefront of many discussions over the last few weeks and the fantastic achievements of the England team in getting to the European final at Wembley on Sunday; Just what was needed as an antidote to the last 18 months to lift the national mood. It had been a great shame that the moment had been marred by racist comments on social media and by graffiti of a mural of Marcus Rashford. Those responsible should hang their heads in shame. It was utterly reprehensible. Another great positive had been the outpouring of support for those players who had been targeted by that abuse and the wise words and actions of those players. There was no place for racism in our society, a message that needed to keep being reaffirmed and, of course, let's not forget their achievements in all of this, celebrate them and wish them well on the journey to, we hope, a successful World Cup next year.
- In relation to COVID restrictions, the country would move to Step 4 next week, as outlined by the Prime Minister and Ministers in recent announcements, and whilst individuals would be very much looking forward to the easing of restrictions there was a note of caution as cases continued to rise. Derbyshire was no different in this regard with cases rising right across the county. That being said, there were far lower hospital admissions and ICU admissions compared to the last peak at comparable infection

rates and it was this that made the cautious move to Step 4 possible. It was also because of the amazing vaccination programme roll-out that had made this possible, despite the rise of cases of the Delta variant. Tribute was paid to the staff of the local NHS once again for their role in this.

The latest accurate figures told us that Derbyshire had administered nearly 1.4 million vaccines; 757,000 first doses and 621,000 second doses with the roll-out now concentrating on those of the 18+ age group. The significance of the vaccines and the reduction of hospital admissions and in developing serious complications as a consequence of contracting Covid could not be understated. That is why it was important that when people were called, they get the vaccine.

Tribute was paid to Derbyshire frontline staff who throughout the pandemic had got on with the work of looking after Derbyshire residents in care homes and right across our communities.

Step 4 would be a big relief for the hospitality and tourism sectors in Derbyshire. Hotels, restaurants and pubs had found the last 18 months a particular challenge and they needed a good season ahead to help them recover. Tourism had been returning to something like normal under Step 3 but meeting certain stringent and necessary requirements, and with restricted numbers, it had been a challenge.

- Derbyshire's £1m Cultural Recovery Fund had been mentioned previously. The aim was to have this open for bids in early autumn to provide the cultural and tourism's sectors access to funding to enable them to extend their offer.

The following issues and questions were raised by councillors to which Councillor Lewis duly noted and responded:

- A member of the Majority Group's posts on Facebook relating to anti-vaccination material.
- Footballers 'taking the knee'.
- The Landscapes Review and the implications for the Peak District National Park.
- The recent passing of ex-Chesterfield FC player, Ernie Moss.
- The re-opening of Council buildings, maintaining restrictions and new ways of working.

Finally, it was hoped that the next full Council would be held at County Hall, albeit perhaps with some mitigations in place for the September full Council. Term ends soon for Derbyshire schools and as

we enter the quieter month of August, politically at least, Councillor Lewis wished everyone a good summer break.

## **56/21            PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

### **a)    Question from Olivia Ramsbottom to Councillor K Athwal, Cabinet Member for Highways Assets and Transport**

DCC's mission includes the following:

'to listen to, engage and involve local people ensuring we are responsive and take account of the things that matter most to them; to create an environment for 'happy, safe and healthy people '.

In Matlock, the noise and safety issues caused by excessive speeding are having a detrimental effect on lives. Children and the less mobile are 'running the gauntlet' as they try to crossroads or walk along the town's narrower pavements. Sleep and normal life are being impacted by speeding traffic that causes houses to vibrate and road furniture to rattle. Many are wary of pulling out of side roads and driveways because of their expectation of speeding motorists.

Whilst the proposed extension of the 30mph zone on Chesterfield Road is welcome, it is not as a result of planning and foresight but after 19 collisions, including 1 fatality.

How can residents supply sufficient evidence for the need for improved signage and other speed mitigation in 30mph areas, to encourage you to take strategic, proactive action to create the environment as set out in your objectives? The local CSW group is happy to assist in any data collection exercise.

Councillor Athwal responded as follows:

As you will appreciate this Authority receives hundreds of requests for consideration here each year and all the residents making these enquiries believe they have a genuine need for some form of action.

Clearly it is not practical, nor sustainable, to accede to every single request that is received. Given this demand a system of prioritisation must be employed using information, including the number and severity of collisions. This helps ensure that the resources available are firstly used in those locations where there is the greatest need and where most benefits can be achieved.

How we implement. Measures are identified on an evidence-

based need. The limited funds that are available must therefore predominantly be directed to those locations where there is a history of reported injury collisions and where a Highway Improvement Scheme can effectively reduce the number of injury collisions. The use of identifiable known hard facts and figures provides robust and transparent justification for the investment of public funds that are available. It is understood that this can often be received as having to await road collisions prior to action being considered, but prioritising locations that are already experiencing road injuries ensures that the resources are being invested as effectively as possible.

In terms of the speed limit review on the A632, the collision figures relate to the whole of the route between Matlock and Chesterfield and other intervention measures have been deployed in the specific blackspots along the route. For example, interactive signing at Spancarr crossroads etc.

Although grateful for your offer of assistance in data collection via your Community Speed Watch Group this Authority is constantly monitoring collisions on the network, identifies areas for investigation based on these studies. The statistics surrounding the County Council's performance in respect of casualty reduction can be found in the Derby and Derbyshire Annual Casualty report which is on the website.

There was no supplementary question.

**b) Question from Lisa Hopkinson to Councillor B Lewis, Cabinet Member for Strategic Leadership, Culture, Tourism and Climate Change**

On 14 June the Council leader was interviewed by the BBC and challenged about having a climate denier, Cllr Rose, on the Council's Climate Scrutiny Committee. On 23 June I asked the Chair of that Committee to investigate the allegation and was assured that Cllr Rose doesn't hold that view. On 25 June I sent the Chair a number of tweets from Cllr Rose's personal twitter account from 2015 to 2019 that indicate a fairly consistent pattern of climate denial. While Cllr Rose is free to hold those views or express those privately, it is totally inappropriate for that Councillor to be appointed to a Committee set up to hold the Council to account on climate action. It is essential that all Climate Scrutiny Committee members believe that DCC can help to reduce emissions across Derbyshire and that climate change is serious and human-caused.

Please could you inform the Council (a) why the serious allegations of climate denial first learnt about on 14 June were not followed up on? And (b) if Cllr Rose will not publicly denounce his stated

views that climate change is a hoax will he be asked to step down from the Climate Scrutiny Committee?

Councillor Lewis responded as follows:

You have written to me and the Chairman of the Committee, Councillor Major, gave you an answer to this at that time and nothing has changed in a sense.

Thank you too for supplying a list of social media posts that Councillor Rose shared that dated back from 2015 up to 2019. I looked through his tweets last night. Councillor Rose has some strong views and shares some interesting thoughts here and there on many issues (including the occasional one on climate change) but they did not seem to be the main event in terms of the volume of his tweets. I don't necessarily share all of his views on a wide range of topics that he tweets about and I am sure he doesn't share all of mine.

I don't know Councillor Rose that well. I am afraid Covid-19 hasn't helped much of late in that process but I am sure we will have some lively discussions about many topics over the coming years. We might even strongly disagree with each other on one or two topics, maybe to the point of shouting or wagging our fingers at each other, but there is one thing I am sure of, is that we will walk away from those discussions respecting each other's point of view or opinion, remain on good terms and remain strong colleagues getting on with doing our jobs for our residents. I might even change his mind on some topics, he might change mine. That is the joy of being human.

From my perspective it is perfectly reasonable the views he may have had between 2015 and 2019, or even views that may predate that may not be the views he holds now. In choosing to write to me and not to him you are not seeking to get to the key matter which is what is his view now, because if that is what we are really talking about or caring about then that is what I would do, so you may wish to write to Councillor Rose and ask him his views on climate change and if he has changed his views on that at all. I am not here to speak for him and I am reassured by his words and actions to-date that he will approach this Committee's work with a fully open mind and be keen to engage in its work, which is to drive down the CO2 of DCC as an Authority, to get to net zero by 2032 or sooner, and to make sure we do so as a county economy by 2050.

The following supplementary question was asked:

I did have a reply from the Chair of that Committee who suggested that I was trying to silence or not allow people to express

their views. I am not trying to do that. Councillor Rose, I don't know him, I don't even know where he is, I am not trying to silence him but what I am saying is I think it is inappropriate for a climate denier to be sitting on a Climate Scrutiny Committee. I didn't write to him I wrote to the Chair of the Committee because I think it is the Chair's role in charge of that Scrutiny Committee to make sure that all his members fully accept that climate change is human caused and that DCC can impact the emissions.

I can go away and I can write to Councillor Rose but if he does not hold those views any more then he should publicly state that, and if he still believes climate change is a hoax do you accept that somebody who thinks climate change is a hoax does not have a position on a Committee that is supposed to scrutinise the Council?

Councillor Lewis responded as follows:

As I say he may not hold those views and I suggest the first port of call is that you write to him and ask Councillor Rose his views. On your latter part of the question I can only answer that when he responds to your question.

**c) Question from John Geddes to Councillor K Athwal, Cabinet Member for Highways Assets and Transport**

You are quoted as hoping to give rural communities "cheaper and more regular" bus services. Currently, most rural services are provided by operators of home-to-school transport. The Council is already funding the fixed costs of the vehicles, so the middle-of-the-day services are relatively cheap to add on.

The Council's experiment with on-demand minibuses is hard to evaluate because only the most basic data has been collected. But from my analysis of the Ashbourne service, it seems that, outside of school runs, the vehicles are spending most of their time moving just one passenger or family group at a time. This matches the experience elsewhere: for those who can score a ride, the minibuses offer a service just like a taxi - but using a bigger, more expensive, more polluting vehicle. The costs only balance if many fewer people get to travel.

So will you please rule out any further replacement of timetabled services by on-demand transport until DCC can show the results of a proper independent evaluation demonstrating that the move to demand-responsive transport really would offer a better and cheaper service, without a major reduction in the number of people who will be able to travel?

Councillor Athwal responded as follows:

Yes, as part of the Bus Service Improvement Plan it is my aim that we work towards providing our residents and visitors to Derbyshire with a transport network system that better connects our villages and towns with cleaner modes of transport along with better flexibility of ticketing and value for money for all.

The Government's National Bus Strategy for England "Bus Back Better" makes it clear that there needs to be a greater use of new and alternative forms of public transport provision such as demand responsive transport. This Council is currently developing an ambitious Bus Service Improvement Plan and its response to the National Bus Strategy.

If we are to reverse this cycle of long-term decline of bus usage in Derbyshire, we need to develop better transport solutions which work for all. It is also essential that solutions must be appropriate for local transport needs as well as catering for current needs and future demand.

Whilst it is likely that we will see a greater use of demand responsive transport in Derbyshire, particularly in the deeply rural areas and other areas where there is very low demand for public transport at the moment, I can assure you that it is not our intention to implement demand responsive transport as a county wide solution.

There was no supplementary question.

**57/21**            **PETITIONS** There were none received.

**58/21**            **ELECTED MEMBER QUESTIONS**

**a) Question from Councillor R George to Councillor B Lewis, Leader of the Council**

What is the reason for the County Council having failed to submit a bid to Round 1 of the Levelling Up Fund, and what plans are there to submit a bid in Round 2?

Councillor Lewis responded as follows:

I have to say I am hoping this question has been put as a genuine misunderstanding rather than a wilful misrepresentation of the fact that this simply is not the case.

Firstly, the Levelling Up Fund is directed at TF2 and Unitary



Authorities predominantly and as a county we could only ever submit one bid based upon a transport bid only and as you will hear we did. Indeed, my colleague Councillor Renwick, approved some kick-start funding to enable that work to get underway relatively recently.

Levelling Up Fund proposals will mostly come from the Districts and Borough Councils and I was happy to support a Round 1 application for £20m from Chesterfield Borough Council for town centre regeneration work. We will work proactively with other Districts and Boroughs on Round 2 applications once that process opens. Indeed, you might describe High Peak Borough Council as having failed to submit a Round 1 bid. I assumed you have asked that question of them? Anyway, to be clear I don't see that them not putting in a Round 1 bid is in any way a failure as I intend to do one for Round 2 and we will certainly be willing to support them in that bid as we have with Chesterfield recently. There is nothing partisan in this so again I go back to your point about being a "failed" part in this.

We were eligible to submit our own proposal for a transport project and indeed did submit an application form for Round 1 for the infrastructure to support the delivery of the South Derbyshire Growth Zone. The Council did not therefore fail to submit a bid. We do recognise that it is an expression of interest and it does require further development but nonetheless it is in.

The County Council will be in discussion with the Department for Transport on progressing that bid over the period of the summer and I will be happy to update members on any future developments at the appropriate time.

Councillor George asked the following supplementary question:

I thank Councillor Lewis for his words, very sensible based on the facts about the Levelling Up Fund, the fact that Councils of any tier can only make one bid to both the rounds of that Levelling Up Fund and that not submitting one is not a failure, but would he therefore condemn the words of the MP for High Peak who circulated on social media, in the regional media and a newsletter to thousands of constituents saying that "High Peak Council failed to submit a Levelling Up Fund bid" because they did not do so in Round 1 but chose, as he says very sensibly, to have waited for the support funding and collective work with this Authority for Round 2?

Councillor Lewis responded to the supplementary question as follows:

I cannot speak for the MP of High Peak on this. I can only tell you

what I have just said which is that they weren't ready at that point and that we are willing, as a local authority, to continue to work with High Peak Borough Council to ensure that they do put in a good bid for Round 2 and we will do everything we can to support them, as we will any local authority in Derbyshire.

**b) Question from Councillor C Dale to Councillor C Renwick, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Environment**

The Government proposes to reform the planning laws to remove local residents rights to object to individual planning applications. The House of Commons has passed a motion calling on the government to protect residents rights to have a say over individual planning applications. What are the views held by the Council on the governments proposed reforms?

Councillor Renwick responded as follows:

This was actually a consultation nearly twelve months ago, but just by way of background on the 6 August 2020 the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government published a consultation on its Planning White Paper entitled 'Planning for the Future' which sets out Government's proposed reforms to the planning system in England, which I think we would all agree does need improving.

The proposals seek to streamline and modernise the planning process; improve outcomes on design and sustainability and reform the system of developer contributions to name just a few. On the whole many of the reforms proposed are to be welcomed although this was a very high-level document, it was a consultation of around 25 questions and there was not enough detail to fully consider.

However, I suspect the councillor is probably referring to some of the reformed new zoning in the Local Plans whereby Planning Authorities would be required to zone all their land in three zones. That is growth areas which are suitable for large scale sustainable development; renewal areas which are for smaller scale development, and areas which are protected where stringent development controls would apply. Once designated in Local Plans - I think that is the key - land within the growth areas would be deemed to have permission in principle or a presumption in favour of development and that would negate the need to have outline planning application for development on land in those areas.

As I have said, the consultation was nearly twelve months ago and they had to have a response by October 2020 so perhaps you are a little late bringing this to our attention. However, this Council was not

late. We did get a robust reply in. It is quite a long lengthy document but basically this was reported to the Council's Cabinet meeting for Highways and Transport on the 8 October and a formal response was agreed and submitted in time. Whilst there was no specific reference to any company consultation being curtailed, we picked up on members' concerns and we set out clearly that any impact or apparent democratic deficit on reforms of local democracy, and specifically limited opportunities for active elected member and local community engagement, would be a concern and the proposed new planned system after planning making stage of the process should include member and community engagement and more opportunity for engagement in the planning decision making would be reduced significantly for large scale developments that would impact most on local communities. That is what we would be concerned about. We went on to say it is considered that the proposed reforms as set out undermine local democratic accountability and do not provide sufficient opportunity for effective engagement and that the White Paper should be amended in future to ensure the democratic deficit for elected members and local communities addressed, particularly in respect of a new proposed development management decision making process.

We said that then and we still stand by that. We hope that goes some way to satisfy Councillor Dale of our position. Suffice to say we have a close eye on what will be coming in the next stage of the development of the White Paper.

Councillor Dale asked the following supplementary question:

I agree the significance hit me last year when a residents' petition objected to a development, not the fact of the development but the quantity of housing. I went along to the Council and said about the impact on the environment - obviously the Planning Committee agreed and reduced the number of houses - but my concern was there were conditions put on that planning permission because on the site there was a registered public footpath; there was an old Roman road and ruins; there was a bat corridor, everything you can think of was on that site, so they imposed conditions and the developers completely disregarded them.

Now nobody would have been aware properly in the local community if we hadn't have put the objections in because it brings it to your attention. I notice the developers were carrying on and they just disregarded it so we had to get in touch with Highways, it is now Places, in the time to get the registered footpath unblocked so we could use it. I had to get in touch with the archaeologists in the Planning Department. They had already chopped the trees down so they couldn't do the survey for the bat corridor. It brought home to me the significance of

why it is important because of local knowledge and things to stop this kind of blatant disregard.

So are we intending to do any more action-wise or are officers just writing, or are we going to do anything as a Council? That was my question, are we going to be a bit more proactive?

Councillor Renwick responded to the supplementary question as follows:

I have sympathy. I have issues with my own local Council and the fact that the previous Labour administration haven't even actually delivered a Local Plan since 2005 which has left us in quite difficult circumstances with local housing plans that we have had to deal with currently.

I don't know if you have read the document. It is 84 pages long. I think you will find that a lot of the issues you have raised have been addressed which is why I said in my opening remarks whilst you have raised issues about public consultation your supplementary question didn't go on to demonstrate your concerns around that, it is really more about the individual Planning Authority.

Now we are a statutory Authority at DCC so we do comment on applications but actually it is your own Local Planning Authority. I think you will find that as part of this consultation the issues you have raised will be raised by many and the hope is the new planning system going forward, which I think we would all agree needs to be improved, would address some of those queries that you have.

**c) Question from Councillor K Gillott to Councillor K Athwal, Cabinet Member for Highways Assets and Transport**

The A61 Derby Road, between Stretton and Chesterfield, has huge problems with congestion and traffic, particularly at peak times or when the M1 is busy. The main road through Clay Cross and into Chesterfield is now massively busy, over-congested and a burden on people and businesses getting around their daily business in our area.

Can the Cabinet Member outline what has been done in the last 2 years to develop practical solutions for the congestion afflicting the A61 south of Chesterfield, to reduce congestion, improve traffic flows and journey times for local residents?

Councillor Athwal responded as follows:

The issue that you raise has been decades in the making and this

has certainly increased by years of lack of planning control by the then Labour Controlled North East Derbyshire District Council, for which I believe you were a member in those days, which allowed developers to build thousands of dwellings without adequate S106 infrastructure contributions. Ultimately this has and continues to put many extra cars onto this already congested road adding to the challenges we face today.

Whilst through the A61 Growth Corridor Strategy this Council has continued over the last two years to deliver a range of interventions to assist with both the demand for car travel and the management of traffic along the corridor. These measures include upgraded walking and cycling routes; the provision of real-time information for bus passengers and the installation of traffic signal controllers to allow the introduction of an urban traffic management and controlled system. This system is expected to be fully operational by the end of 2021 and will provide better co-ordination between traffic signals and improve the highways' observability to respond to incidents or congestion and to inform road users of possible problems in this area.

With the forward-looking approach the Leader of this Council, Councillor Barry Lewis, holds regular meetings to consider longer term workable measures with Lee Rowley, the local MP, and the representatives of North East Derbyshire District Council to find ways to minimise traffic issues in this area. This includes allocating £200,000 towards a comprehensive traffic study to explore the options available to us as a first step in the process of finding a longer-term solution. Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Councillor Gillott asked the following supplementary question:

This is an issue, as you have hinted at, that affects not just me but affects several councillors in that area and it is of great concern to the community.

I have to confess I didn't actually write the question. I had some help. The first part was written - well I lifted it virtually word for word from a Conservative leaflet put out just over two years ago and the second part was lifted virtually word for word, just changed into a question, from your manifesto pledge for May of this year.

By the time of the next election your Group will have run this Council for eight years. That is six years since you were first talking about it. People ask me about this almost on a daily basis so what reassurance can I give them? What will the A61 look like in terms of congestion in four years' time? Will it still be congested or more free flowing? What impact will it have in terms of the local businesses and

local communities as well, or are these just words to keep the local people happy without any real action?

Councillor Athwal responded to the supplementary question as follows:

You will be provided with a detailed written answer, but my short answer at this stage to you is this: I hope in four years' time the situation on the road will be far better than it has been for a while now.

**59/21 APPOINTMENT OF EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR – CHILDREN'S SERVICES**

The Council had been informed that Jane Parfremment, Executive Director had tendered her resignation in order to take up a new post outside of the Council. Her last day of employment with the Council would be Sunday 3 October 2021.

In accordance with the Council's constitution, the Director of Organisation Development and Policy had progressed arrangements to form a recruitment panel comprising of three Elected Members which must include one Cabinet Member and Shadow Cabinet Member. Councillors Alex Dale, Julie Patten and Ruth George had been nominated as members of that recruitment panel.

It was anticipated that the Panel would have identified the successful candidate and be in a position to propose his/her appointment to the role on 18 August 2021, however the next Council meeting was not scheduled until 15 September 2021. Waiting for the approval until the meeting on 15 September would likely prevent any candidate from tendering their resignation with their current employer prior to the Council meeting and delay the candidate starting. The role was a critical role to the Council and was part of the Council's Senior Leadership structure. The Executive Director Children's Services was a statutory role, and it had therefore been considered necessary that a decision to approve the appointment should be made quickly to enable the post to be filled as soon as possible on a permanent basis.

Council was asked to delegate the appointment to the role of Executive Director Children's Services to the recruitment panel to ensure the role was filled as soon as is practicably possible. A report would be brought to Full Council at its meeting on 15 September 2021 that confirmed the details of the appointment.

Whilst it was not a legislative requirement for Council to approve the appointment of an Executive Director, the statutory guidance issued under section 40 of the Localism Act 2011 did require Council or a meeting of members to vote before salary packages over £100,000 were offered.

On the motion of Councillor B Lewis, duly seconded,

**RESOLVED** to (1) approve the salary package for the role of Executive Director Children's Services as Grade 20, £117,869 to £129,655 per annum; (2) delegate the appointment of the Executive Director, Children's Services to a recruitment panel, comprising Councillors Alex Dale, Julie Patten & Ruth George; and (3) receive a report confirming details of the successful candidate to the meeting on 15 September 2021.

**60/21**      **HONORARY ALDERMAN AND ALDERWOMAN**      At the Council Annual General Meeting on 26 May 2021, it had been agreed to confer the title of Honorary Alderwoman upon former Councillors E Atkins, L Chilton, I Ratcliffe, J A Twigg and A Western and Honorary Alderman upon former Councillors K Buttery, P Murray, P Smith, G Wharmby and D Wilcox. It had also been agreed to convene a special meeting of the Council on 14 July 2021 to formally consider the nominations. At the time the date was proposed it had been expected that the Covid-19 restrictions would be lifted in June in accordance with the government's roadmap out of the current lockdown. Ms Alexander, the Managing Executive Director, pointed out that the report refers to the 29 June throughout, however it should say the 21 June.

The Covid-19 restrictions did not cease as expected on 21 June 2021. It was usual practice for invitations to be extended to family and friends of those nominated to allow them to attend the special meeting of Council and observe the conferring of the title of Honorary Alderman and Honorary Alderwoman. If the special Council meeting proceeded as agreed on 14 July, restrictions would still apply and the celebratory event would not be able to take place in the usual way.

It was therefore proposed that the convening of a special meeting of the Council would be deferred until such time as the Covid-19 restrictions were lifted so that an appropriate celebratory event, in the presence of their family and friends, could be held to recognise those individuals who had rendered eminent service as past members. Those nominated to receive the title of Honorary Alderman and Honorary Alderwoman would be contacted by Officers in respect of the date of the special meeting.

On the motion of Councillor Lewis, duly seconded,

**RESOLVED** to agree to convene a special meeting of the Council either before or after a future scheduled meeting of the Council after such time when Covid-19 restrictions were lifted.

**61/21      DECISIONS TAKEN AS A MATTER OF URGENCY AND KEY DECISIONS AND SPECIAL URGENCY**

On occasion there was a necessity for decisions to be taken urgently, most recently predominantly as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic and the need to respond to changing government guidance in a timely fashion.

Under the Local Authorities (Executive Arrangements) (Meetings and Access to Information) (England) Regulations 2012, before the Council made a key decision certain information needed to be published 28 clear days in advance. This was usually known as the 'Forward Plan'. The Regulations recognised that in the case of urgent decisions, this was not possible. As a result:

- a) where a key decision needed to be taken and publication of the information was impracticable, the decision could be made as long as five clear days' notice of the decision was given to the relevant Improvement and Scrutiny Committee Chairman;
- b) in cases of special urgency, a key decision could be taken with less than five clear days' notice if agreement was obtained from the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee Chairman that the making of the decision was urgent and could not reasonably be deferred.

The Regulations required a report to Council at least once a year detailing each key decision taken where it had been agreed that the special urgency provisions applied. The Access to Information Procedure Rules included in Appendix 6 to the Constitution required this report to be submitted on a quarterly basis to full Council.

In accordance with the above requirement, Appendix 2 set out the key decisions taken where special urgency provisions had been agreed since the last report to Council.

Members would be familiar with the Council's Improvement and Scrutiny Procedure Rules included at Appendix 5 to the Constitution which set out the call-in procedure. The call-in procedure did not apply where the executive decision being taken was urgent: that is where any delay likely to be caused by the call-in process would seriously prejudice the Council's or the public interest. In such cases call-in could be waived if the Chairman of the appropriate Improvement and Scrutiny Committee agreed both the decision proposed was reasonable in all the circumstances and to it being treated as a matter of urgency.

The Improvement and Scrutiny Procedure Rules required such urgency decisions to be reported to the next available meeting of the Council, together with the reasons for urgency.



In accordance with the above requirements, details of urgent decisions where the call-in process was waived since the last report to Council and the reasons for urgency were set out in Appendix 3 to the report.

On the motion of Councillor Lewis, duly seconded,

**RESOLVED** to note (1) the key decisions taken where special urgency provisions were agreed as detailed in Appendix 2; and (2) the urgent decisions taken where the call-in procedure was waived under the Improvement and Scrutiny Procedure Rules as detailed in Appendix 3.

**62/21**        **MOTION**     Council considered a Notice of Motion, as set out below:

**Motion submitted by Councillor J Dixon**

Motion proposed by Councillor J Dixon, which was duly seconded:

**Motion to Declare a Climate Emergency in Derbyshire**

This Council notes the findings of the World Meteorological Organisation in April 2021 that the global average temperature in 2020 was around 1.2C above pre-industrial levels and the warning from the United Nations that the world is on the edge of a climate 'abyss'.

Council therefore resolves to:

Declare a 'Climate Emergency' that requires urgent action in line with the vast majority of all Local Authorities.

Reaffirm the commitment to make the Council's activities net-zero carbon by 2032 with a role of the Improvement and Scrutiny Committee – Climate Change, Biodiversity and Carbon Reduction to scrutinise the targets set and report at least annually on progress achieved.

Ensure that all strategic decisions, budgets and approaches to planning decisions are in line with a shift to zero carbon by 2032.

Requests that all Council Committees and Scrutiny Panels consider the impact of climate change and the environment when reviewing Council policies and strategies;

Support and work with all other relevant agencies towards making the county of Derbyshire zero carbon within the same timescale;

Work with, influence and inspire partners across the county to help deliver this goal through all relevant strategies, plans and shared resources;

Support strategies for cleaner air in all our towns and villages, especially in town centres and around schools;

Set up a Climate Change Partnership Group, involving Councillors, businesses, local sustainability groups and other relevant parties. Over the following 12 months, the Group will consider strategies and actions being developed by the Council and other partner organisations and develop a strategy in line with a target of net zero emissions across Derbyshire by 2032 and recommend ways to maximise local benefits of these actions in other sectors such as employment, health, agriculture, transport and the economy.

Councillor Lewis proposed the following amendment to the original motion, which was duly seconded:

This Council notes the findings of the World Meteorological Organisation in April 2021 that the global average temperature in 2020 was around 1.2C above pre-industrial levels and the warning from the United Nations' Secretary General that the world is on the edge of 'the abyss'.

Council therefore:

Recognises there is a 'Climate Crisis'.

Backs Prime Minister Boris Johnson and the Government in, amongst other things, establishing the UK in a world leading position in terms of reducing carbon emissions;

Reaffirms the commitment to make the Council's activities net-zero carbon by 2032 or sooner;

Acknowledges the role of the newly established Improvement and Scrutiny Committee – Climate Change, Biodiversity and Carbon Reduction in monitoring and reporting the progress achieved by the authority;

Continues to ensure that all strategic decisions, are in line with a shift to zero carbon by 2032 or sooner;

Recognises that all Council Committees have an important role in considering the impact of climate change and the environment when reviewing Council policies and strategies;

Supports, works with, influences and inspires, where possible, all other relevant agencies and partners towards making the county of Derbyshire zero carbon within the timescale mandated by Government;

Carries on work to support strategies for cleaner air in all our towns and villages, especially in town centres and around schools;

Supports the key role of Elected Members in representing residents, businesses, voluntary groups, and other relevant parties within their divisions while helping to develop a strategy in line with a target of net zero emissions across Derbyshire County Council by 2032 and seeking to maximise the benefits locally of these actions in other sectors such as employment, health, agriculture, transport and the economy.

A point of order was raised and advice was sought from the Monitoring Officer. The Monitoring Officer advised that the amendment to the motion did not negate the original motion and was therefore permissible under the Constitution.

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

The Labour group members in attendance left the meeting at 3.58pm.

The substantive motion was duly voted on and declared to be carried and Council:

**RESOLVED** that Council therefore:

Recognises there is a 'Climate Crisis'.

Backs Prime Minister Boris Johnson and the Government in, amongst other things, establishing the UK in a world leading position in terms of reducing carbon emissions;

Reaffirms the commitment to make the Council's activities net-zero carbon by 2032 or sooner;

Acknowledges the role of the newly established Improvement and Scrutiny Committee – Climate Change, Biodiversity and Carbon Reduction in monitoring and reporting the progress achieved by the

authority;

Continues to ensure that all strategic decisions, are in line with a shift to zero carbon by 2032 or sooner;

Recognises that all Council Committees have an important role in considering the impact of climate change and the environment when reviewing Council policies and strategies;

Supports, works with, influences and inspires, where possible, all other relevant agencies and partners towards making the county of Derbyshire zero carbon within the timescale mandated by Government;

Carries on work to support strategies for cleaner air in all our towns and villages, especially in town centres and around schools;

Supports the key role of Elected Members in representing residents, businesses, voluntary groups, and other relevant parties within their divisions while helping to develop a strategy in line with a target of net zero emissions across Derbyshire County Council by 2032 and seeking to maximise the benefits locally of these actions in other sectors such as employment, health, agriculture, transport and the economy.

The meeting closed at 4.01pm.