

COUNCIL

MINUTES OF MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, 28 NOVEMBER 2022

Present:

Councillor Diana Ruff (Chair) (in the Chair)
Councillor Martin E Thacker MBE JP (Vice-Chair)

Councillor Nigel Barker	Councillor Jayne Barry
Councillor Pat Antcliff	Councillor William Armitage
Councillor Joseph Birkin	Councillor Stephen Clough
Councillor Andrew Cooper	Councillor Charlotte Cupit
Councillor Alex Dale	Councillor Lilian Deighton
Councillor Peter Elliott	Councillor Michelle Emmens
Councillor Angelique Foster	Councillor Mark Foster
Councillor John Funnell	Councillor Kevin Gillott
Councillor David Hancock	Councillor Lee Hartshorne
Councillor Maggie Jones	Councillor Jeremy Kenyon
Councillor Pat Kerry	Councillor Tony Lacey
Councillor Barry Lewis	Councillor Heather Liggett
Councillor Gerry Morley	Councillor Paul Parkin
Councillor Stephen Pickering	Councillor Alex Platts
Councillor Maureen Potts	Councillor Alan Powell
Councillor Tracy Reader	Councillor Oscar Gomez Reaney
Councillor Carolyn Renwick	Councillor Jacqueline Ridgway
Councillor Michael Roe	Councillor Kathy Rouse
Councillor Ross Shipman	Councillor Lee Stone
Councillor Bentley Strafford-Stephenson	Councillor Kevin Tait
Councillor Richard Welton	Councillor Pam Windley
Councillor Brian Wright	Councillor Philip Wright

Also Present:

L Hickin	Managing Director – Head of Paid Service
M Broughton	Director of Growth & Assets
J Dethick	Director of Finance & Resources (Section 151 Officer)
S Sternberg	Assistant Director of Governance & Monitoring Officer
S Lee	Assistant Director Regeneration, Programmes & SIRO
L Ingram	Legal Team Manager – Contentious Team
C Terry	Environmental Health – Team Manager (Licensing)
D Stanton	Senior Scrutiny Officer
A Bond	Governance Officer
T Scott	Governance & Scrutiny Officer
A Maher	Interim Governance Manager

COU Apologies for Absence

/45/2

2-23

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D Drabble, P Wheelhouse, S Cornwell, B Hill, J Lilley, R Hall and A Hutchinson.

COU **Declarations of Interest**

/46/2

2-23

Councillors A Dale, C Cupit, A Foster, M Foster, K Gillott, B Lewis and C Renwick declared interests in Item 7 on the Agenda, Devolution Deal Update, as Members of Derbyshire County Council. They indicated that they would participate in Council's discussion and determination on the Item.

Councillor A Dale declared an interest in Item 18, Northwood Update, as a Member of the Board of Northwood Group Ltd. He indicated that he would participate in Council's discussion and determination on the Item.

Councillors M Foster, D Ruff, B Lewis and R Welton indicated their membership of the Stonebroom Community Governance Review Working Group. They indicated that they would participate in Council's discussion and determination on the Item.

COU **Minutes of the Last Meetings**

/47/2

2-23

The Minutes of the meetings held on Monday 12 September 2022 and on Monday 3 October 2022 were approved as a true record.

COU **Chair's Announcements**

/48/2

2-23

The Chair of the Council, Councillor D Ruff, updated Members on the recent civic events which she had attended. These included a tree planting ceremony as part of the Queen's Green Canopy initiative. Members were reminded that this was originally a nation-wide initiative to mark the Platinum Jubilee of her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. The initiative would now run until March 2023 in order to give people the opportunity to plant trees as a memorial to her Late Majesty.

The Chair explained that she intended to hold a Memorial Service for the Late Queen in February 2023, to commemorate what would have been the seventy-first anniversary of her accession to the throne. She also highlighted the Armed Forces Family Fun Day which she intended to hold in May 2023.

RESOLVED

That Council noted the announcements of the Chair of the Council, Councillor D Ruff (by acclamation).

COU **Leader's Announcements**

/49/2

2-23

The Leader of the Council, Councillor A Dale, explained that the Group Leaders had worked together to respond locally to the Cost of Living Crisis by exploring new opportunities to assist the District's residents and businesses. He informed Members that a supplement had been produced, offering practical advice on how to save energy and reduce bills, which had been included with the latest edition of the NEDDC News.

Members also heard that as part of the Council's response to the cost of living crisis a Community Outreach Service would be developed. This would deliver

individual support to residents on maximising income, making referrals for debt management, advising and assisting with fuel debt, general budgeting and accessing services. As part of this, external funding had now been secured for two new community outreach workers as part of the Environmental Health team who would be able to provide support to any residents who required it.

The Leader gave thanks to all members of staff for their work. He made clear that along with the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor C Cupit, he had recently spent time working a shift with the refuse team and that he had also shadowed staff at the Dronfield Leisure Centre. He reflected that the staff were friendly, versatile and were a real credit to the Council. He would be spending time with more teams in the coming weeks.

RESOLVED

That Council noted the announcements of the Leader of the Council, Councillor A Dale (by acclamation).

COU Armed Forces Employer Recognition Scheme - Gold Award

/50/2

2-23

Bruce Spencer, Ministry of Defence East Midlands Regional Employer Engagement Director, informed Council that it had been awarded its Employer Recognition Scheme, Gold Award. Mr Spencer explained the purpose of the Employer Recognition Scheme and how important it was to the Armed Forces Community. He praised the Council for its work and made clear that it was one of only 638 employers to have received the Gold Award.

Mr Spencer then presented the Gold Award to the Council's Armed Forces Champion, Councillor M E Thacker. Councillor M E Thacker thanked Mr Spencer on behalf of the Council and stressed the strong cross-party support for the Armed Forces Community. In particular, he highlighted the Council's work to help veterans faced with homelessness.

Councillor M E Thacker highlighted the numerous events that he had attended over the course of the year as the Council's Armed Forces Champion. These included the armed forces hub in Chesterfield, the Buxton Military Tattoo and various events for the poppy appeal.

Councillor A Dale thanked Mr Spencer for the award and for attending the meeting. He also thanked Councillor M E Thacker and the Assistant Director - Regeneration and Programmes, Steve Lee for their work as Member and Officer Armed Forces Champions.

Councillors N Barker and M Roe echoed these sentiments.

RESOLVED

That Council receives the Employer Recognition Scheme, Gold Award in recognition of its continuing support for the Armed Forces Community in the District (by acclamation).

COU Devolution Deal Update

/51/2

2-23

The report to Council explained that the Derby City, Derbyshire County, Nottingham City and Nottinghamshire County (D2N2) 'Upper Tier' authorities had proposed that an East Midlands Mayoral County Combined Authority covering these areas be established. This Combined Authority would be comparable to those in other areas which had already established Directly Elected Mayors, such as South Yorkshire. The report made clear that these arrangements would also ensure that the greatest transfer of powers and resources from a national level to the region could now take place.

Members were informed that the Upper Tier Authorities had put these proposals out to public consultation, which was scheduled to run until 9 January 2023. They would then decide whether or not to proceed with them. The report proposed that following Council's discussion of the proposals, the minutes on this Item be submitted to the Upper-Tier authorities, as the Council's response to the consultation. This would enable all those Members who wished to speak on the report to have their views taken into account by the Upper Tier Authorities, in deciding on whether to proceed.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor A Dale, supported this approach. He moved that the recommendations be approved. He then set out his own views on the proposals.

The Leader of the Council made clear his reservations about the inclusion of a directly Elected Mayor within the proposed governance arrangements and highlighted possible alternatives to this. However, Councillor Dale reminded Members that under the Government's Devolution Framework the region could only receive the greatest transfer of powers and resources from a national level if the proposals included a Directly Elected Mayor. He also contended that the Mayoral County Combined Authority would put the region in a better position to potentially unlock access to further funding and devolution of powers in the future.

The Leader of the Council sought to address the concerns which had been raised about the proposed arrangements. In particular, he emphasised that the new Combined Authority would be directly elected from across the whole East Midlands region. This meant that it could be expected to use its powers and resources to benefit all of the region's counties and communities, rather than to concentrate on the two large city areas. He also pointed out that under the proposals, power and responsibilities would be devolved downwards from national government. He stressed that no functions or resources would be taken away from the existing local authorities, including the District Councils.

Councillor Dale concluded by making clear that he would be prepared to support the proposals, including the creation of a Directly Elected Mayor for the Combined Authority, as a price worth paying to ensure that the East Midlands region could finally access the funding necessary to improve the Education, Transport and other Infrastructure, which had lagged behind that of other regions over many years and under different national governments. He contended that the Council and the North East Derbyshire District had much to gain from the proposed Combined Authority and nothing to fear.

Councillor B Lewis welcomed the opportunity for the Council to discuss the proposals. He emphasised the opportunity which they offered for significant devolution of powers and resources to the region and the way in which this devolution could help left-behind communities, by funding the social and physical improvements which they need to prosper.

Councillor Lewis explained the role that would be played by the proposed Mayor and how this would complement rather than conflict with the role of the District Councils. The Districts would be genuine partners in the new arrangements, retaining their existing responsibilities and funding and would play a key role in helping to shape and deliver any new initiatives. He stressed the cost effectiveness of the proposed arrangements. They would not create an expensive additional tier of local government, but rather would unlock benefits and to help achieve transformative change across the East Midlands region.

The Vice Chair of the Council, Martin Thacker MBE, reminded Council of previous initiatives to create larger unitary local authorities, the benefits that had been suggested for them and the disruption which they had caused. In this context, Councillor Thacker queried the effectiveness of the existing region-wide working arrangements, including the Local Enterprise Partnership, in helping to meet the needs of the Districts across the region. He also pointed out how similar proposals for Mayoral County Combined Authorities had now been abandoned elsewhere, because of concerns about whether they would be effective.

Councillor Thacker discussed the perceived lack of engagement with Second-Tier authorities, such as the Council, in developing the proposals. He also raised concerns that a Mayoral County Combined Authority for the region might not be able to deliver the economic and other benefits claimed for it. He highlighted examples from elsewhere to help illustrate these concerns.

Councillor Thacker questioned the size of the proposed Mayoral County Combined Authority and whether it would be able to adequately represent and serve the many different communities that it would cover. He also highlighted the damage which a Combined Authority might cause to local democracy, by weakening the link between local government and the local communities which it represents. He concluded by calling on all Members to stand up for the interests of the Council and for the North East Derbyshire District.

The Leader of the Labour Group, Councillor N Barker, welcomed the devolution of powers and resources to a local level. He questioned whether this devolution ought to require the creation of a new body, but rather suggested that additional funding should be made available to existing local authorities. He felt it likely that the focus for any additional resources would be on the major Cities, rather than the Districts. He believed that in the long run a Mayoral County Combined Authority would make use of its precept powers. This would lead to further local government reorganisation and the likely abolition of District and Borough Councils within the region. The abolition of North East Derbyshire and other local District Councils, he argued, would fundamentally damage the democratic link with local communities.

Councillor Barker contended that the proposal to share the minutes of the meeting as the Council's response to the proposals did not go far enough, but rather that the Council ought to make clear that it opposed the proposals. He moved an Amendment to the Substantive Motion

(1) That Council note:

1.1 The details of the draft Devolution Deal that was signed on 30 August 2022.

1.2 The process for establishing the East Midlands Mayoral County Combined Authority, which is currently undergoing consultation.

(2) That Council responds to the currently live consultation on the draft Devolution Deal by requesting that the Leader submit a response on behalf of Council:

2.1 Expressing Council's opposition to the Devolution Deal as currently drafted as not being in the best interests of the residents of North East Derbyshire.

2.2 Expressing Council's support to the devolving of powers to a local level but that this Council believes those powers should be devolved to existing local councils and that it does not support creating a Mayor for Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire.

2.3 Expressing Council's opposition to the proposed geographical basis of the Devolution Deal linking Derbyshire to Nottinghamshire to form a Combined County Authority.

The Amended Motion was seconded by Councillor J Barry, who reserved her right to speak.

Councillor Dale reiterated the benefits of Council debating the issue and for the minutes of the debate to form the Council's response to the consultation. He indicated that he intended to abstain on the Amendment, but would comply with its request to inform the Upper Tier authorities on the position of the Council, if the Amended Motion was passed.

Councillor K Gillott indicated that he would abstain on the amendment in his capacity as a Member of Derbyshire County Council. He briefly summarised what he felt were the key issues about the proposals that would need to be addressed.

Councillor M Foster highlighted the possible devolution of responsibility for National Development Management Strategies and the implications this would have for the Council's own Local Plan. Councillor M Foster felt that too great a level of power and control would rest with the Combined Authority. He feared that it would become a tier of local government in its own right, which could result in further reorganisation and the abolition of the District Councils. He also questioned the long term value of the resources to be devolved and the way in

which they would be allocated.

Councillor M Roe reflected on his experience of those areas covered by Directly Elected Mayors and their apparent lack of effectiveness. He expressed concern about the implications of the proposals for District Council areas and highlighted the relatively low levels of resources to be devolved, given the size of the area that would be covered by the Combined Authority.

Councillor A Foster indicated that she preferred the approach proposed by Councillor A Dale, that the minutes of the meeting, illustrating the views of Members, should be submitted as the Council's response to the consultation. Councillor A Foster expressed reservations about whether a Mayoral County Combined Authority would be the most appropriate governance arrangement for devolution. In this context, she highlighted the decision by Leicester City Council and Leicester County Council not to recommend participation in a Combined Authority and their likely concerns about a Directly Elected Mayor.

Councillor A Foster highlighted the impact of the proposals on democratic accountability, by creating a further tier of local government which would be detached from local people. She questioned the likely cost of the proposals and the potential implications for the future governance of Police and Fire Services across Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire.

Councillor J Kenyon made clear his reservations about the proposed Mayoral County Combined Authority. He regretted that the case for a Directly Elected Mayor had not been made, he also expressed concerns about the size of the proposed East Midlands region that the Combined Authority would cover. He indicated that he would support the proposed Amendment, as a way to feedback the concerns about the proposals which had been raised.

Councillor B Lewis welcomed the debate. He reiterated his view that the original approach, of sharing the opinions of Members through the minutes of the meeting, would be a more effective way for Council to respond to the public consultation exercise. He also sought to address some of the concerns which had been raised about the level of funding to be devolved.

Councillor J Birkin referred to the amount of money to be devolved and its value over time. He questioned the purpose of the consultation exercise and whether a binding referendum to find out the views of local people would have been better. The Seconder of the Amendment to the Motion, Councillor Jayne Barry, then exercised her right to speak. She questioned whether the proposed Devolution Deal would improve the lives of people in North East Derbyshire and noted that the Leader of the Council had only said that it 'could' do this. She regretted that neither the Council nor the people of North East Derbyshire had been asked if they did or did not agree with the proposal.

Councillor C Cupit expressed disappointment with the Amendment. She felt that the debate provided Members with an opportunity to have their say on the proposals and for the outcome of this debate to then inform the consultation. She indicated that she would abstain on the Amendment, as she would wish to comment on the final proposals following on from the consultation.

At the conclusion of the debate the Amendment to the motion was put to the vote and was approved. It then became the Amended Substantive Motion.

Councillor R Welton spoke on the Amended Substantive Motion, in order to record his opposition to what he regarded as a top-down government proposal. He felt that there was no local support for a Directly Elected Regional Mayor, that, if established, the Combined Authority would make use of its tax raising powers and would ultimately lead to the abolition of the District Councils, which would damage the good links which currently exist between local councils and local communities. He also expressed concerns about the potential lack of accountability for mayoral decisions on future development and the Greenbelt.

Councillor R Shipman welcomed the amended motion, which he thought would make clear what the views of the Council on the proposals were. He felt that all Members would support devolution, but argued that this could be done through existing local authority structures, rather than requiring Combined Authority Mayors.

The Substantive Motion (as amended) was then put to the vote and was approved.

RESOLVED

- (1) That Council noted:
 - (i) The details of the draft Devolution Deal that was signed on 30 August 2022.
 - (ii) The process for establishing the East Midlands Mayoral County Combined Authority, which is currently undergoing consultation.
- (2) That the Leader of the Council be requested to submit a response by the Council to the currently live consultation on the draft Devolution Deal, expressing:
 - (a) Council's opposition to the Devolution Deal as currently drafted as not being in the best interests of the residents of North East Derbyshire.
 - (b) Council's support to the devolving of powers to a local level but that this Council believes those powers should be devolved to existing local councils and that it does not support creating a Mayor for Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire.
 - (c) Expressing Council's opposition to the proposed geographical basis of the Devolution Deal linking Derbyshire to Nottinghamshire to form a Combined County Authority.

COU Cost of Living Response - Update

**/52/2
2-23**

The Assistant Director - Regeneration Programmes provided an update on the actions taken by the Council to help residents and businesses with the Cost of Living Crisis. He highlighted the collaborative approach taken by the Group

Leaders, the support and advice to local businesses and communities and the introduction of Energy Champions across the Council, to help reduce its own costs.

Members also heard that the District's UK Shared Prosperity Fund Investment Plan had been modified, in order to include additional measures such as double glazed windows for shop fronts.

Councillors A Dale, N Barker, D Hancock, T Reader, J Ridgway, A Dale and the Chair, Councillor D Ruff, thanked the Assistant Director for his presentation and their support for the work which had taken place to help respond to the Cost of Living Crisis. Cllr Dale gave particular thanks to the Portfolio Holder for Economy, transformation and Climate Change, Councillor J Kenyon, for his contribution.

RESOLVED

That Council noted the Update (by acclamation)

COU Treasury Management Update

/53/2

2-23

Members were asked to consider a report setting out details of the Council's Treasury Management activities for the period April to September 2022. This had been prepared in line with the Chartered Institute of Public Finance Accountants (CIPFA). Treasury Management Code of Practice.

The report explained that Treasury Management function covers the borrowing and investment of Council money, including the management of the Council's day to day cash position. Members heard how Good Treasury Management played an important role in ensuring the sound financial management of the Council's resources. The report illustrated how good Treasury Management had continued to be achieved during the period.

Councillor A Dale and Councillor C Cupit moved and seconded a Motion to approve the recommendations as set out in the report. The Motion was put to the vote and was approved.

RESOLVED

That Council noted the Treasury Management activities undertaken during the period April to September 2022 as outlined in Appendix 1 to the report.

COU Allocation of Places to Committees

/54/2

2-23

The report to Council asked Member to review the appointments to Committee for the remainder of the 2022/23 Municipal Year, following recent changes to the composition of the Conservative and Independent Groups. The report proposed specific changes to the composition of the Council's committees, which would be in compliance with Section 15 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and the Local Government (Committees and Political Groups) Regulations 1990.

Members agreed to the proposed changes to the composition of the Council's

Committees. The relevant group Leaders agreed to inform the Assistant Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer of their specific named changes. The Monitoring Officer would then implement these changes as a Delegated Decision, as provided for under the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

Subject to this, Councillor A Dale and Councillor C Cupit then moved and seconded a Motion to approve the recommendations as set out in the report. The Motion was put to a vote and was approved.

RESOLVED

That:

1. Council accepted the new allocation of places on Committees contained in the report.
2. Following on from this new allocation of places:
 - a. The Independent Group nominates two Members in total to serve on the Planning Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - b. The Independent Group nominates one Member in total to serve on the General Licensing and Licensing and Gambling Acts Committees for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - c. The Conservative Group removes one member from the Standards Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - d. The Independent Group nominates one Member in total to serve on the Standards Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - e. The Conservative Group removes one Member from the Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - f. The Independent Group nominates one Member in total to serve on the Audit and Corporate Governance Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - g. The Conservative Group removes one Member from the Communities Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - h. The Independent Group nominates one Member in total to serve on the Communities Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - i. The Conservative Group removes one Member from the Growth Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.
 - j. The Liberal Democrat group nominates one Member in total to

serve on the Growth Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.

k. The Conservative Group removes one Member from the Organisation Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.

l. The Liberal Democrat Group nominates one member in total to serve on the organisation Scrutiny Committee for the remainder of the municipal year.

3. That the Conservative, Independent and Liberal Democrat Group Leaders inform the Assistant Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer of their specific named changes to the Committee Memberships. The Assistant Director of Governance and Monitoring Officer to then make these changes as a Delegated Decision, as provided for under the Council's Scheme of Delegation.

COU Stonebroom Community Governance Review

/55/2

2-23

Members were reminded that the Council had received a valid Petition requesting that a separate Parish Council for Stonebroom should be established. Under Section 83 of the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, it was then required to carry out a Community Governance Review of the area. A Working Party had been established, which had put in place appropriate public consultation arrangements to find out the views of local people.

The report to Council set out the consultation arrangements. These included leaflet drops, targeted social media posts and a public meeting. However, Members were informed that comparatively few people in the area had participated in the consultation. Based on this, the Working Group had concluded that although some people did support strongly a separate parish council for Stonebroom a significant proportion of the very limited proportion of local residents who had actually responded did not support change.

The Chair of the Working Group, Councillor M Foster and the other Members of the Group, Councillors D Ruff, R Welton and B Lewis, all spoke about the review, the limited response to the public consultation and the Working Group's conclusions that, given the low response to the consultation, the case for a separate Parish Council for Stonebroom had not yet been established. In this context, Councillor R Welton highlighted suggested that the existing Shirland and Higham Parish Council might call a referendum to determine whether Stonebroom residents wanted their own parish council.

The Chair of Council briefly recessed the meeting, so that two people could address Members on the issue. Councillor Lomax of Shirland & Higham Parish Council spoke in favour of a separate Parish Council for Stonebroom. A local resident suggested that there were mixed views within the community and that residents required more information on the proposal and its implications.

Members discussed the report. During the discussion Councillors C Cupit, T Reader, K Gillott, D Hancock, R Shipman, J Funnell, M E Thacker MBE and J Barry expressed their reservations about the Working Group's recommendations. They felt that a separate Parish Council should be established, if there was significant community support for this.

At the conclusion of the discussion, Councillor C Cupit and Councillor D Ruff proposed and seconded a Motion that the Working Group be asked to carry out further public consultation to determine the views of local people on whether to establish a separate Parish Council for Stonebroom.

The Motion was put to the vote and was approved.

RESOLVED

- (1) That based on the views of Council and the consultation responses received, the Council asks the Stonebroom Community Governance Working Group be asked to undertake further, more extensive, consultation into the possibility of a separate Stonebroom Parish Council.

That as part of this, the views expressed by Council be relayed to the consultant so that Council can re-consider the original petition.

COU Public Participation

/56/2

2-23

There were no questions from the public.

COU To answer any questions from Members asked under Procedure Rule No 9.2

/57/2

2-23

No questions were submitted.

COU To consider any Motions from Members under Procedure Rule No 10

/58/2

2-23

MOTION 'A'

Members considered a motion submitted by Councillor A Dale which called on the Council to reaffirm its opposition to the use of 'Hydraulic Fracking' technology to extract gas and to support the moratorium on this which is currently in place nationally. The full text of Councillor A Dale's motion, set out as Motion 'A', was included on the Agenda for the meeting.

Councillor A Dale agreed to amend his Motion to include additional points contained within Motion 'C' proposed by Councillor R Shipman and in particular, that the Council should support a permanent end to the use of Hydraulic Fracking.

Councillor M E Thacker MBE spoke in favour of the Motion. He explained his opposition to Fracking. In particular, he felt that it would have no place in a zero carbon future, posed a threat to the environment and was not a solution

to the energy crisis.

Councillor N Barker spoke on the Motion. He argued that Fracking should be banned throughout the whole country. He then moved an amendment to the motion, calling on all Group Leaders to write to the District's Members of Parliament expressing their opposition to fracking throughout the entire United Kingdom (UK). The amendment to the substantive Motion was circulated to Members. Councillor S Pickering then seconded the Amended Motion. He also took the view that an outright ban on Hydraulic Fracking across the whole UK was needed.

Councillors A Dale, R Shipman, D Hancock and M E Thacker MBE called for the amendment to be withdrawn as the substantive Motion now called on the UK Government to ban fracking throughout the country.

At the end of the discussion the amendment to the substantive Motion was put to a vote and was rejected.

The substantive Motion was then moved by Councillor A Dale and seconded by Councillor R Shipman. The Motion was put to the vote and was approved.

RESOLVED

That Council:

1. Called upon the Government to make permanent the ban on the use of Hydraulic Fracking throughout the United Kingdom
2. Reaffirmed in the strongest possible terms its opposition to Fracking and our commitment to opposing any application to allow hydraulic fracturing or exploratory drilling for fracking within the boundaries of North East Derbyshire District, should there be any future changes in national policy.
3. Noted that Fracking will not produce enough gas to significantly affect the short term energy situation (price or quantity), it is not proven safe in a highly densely populated country such as England (with 12x the population density of the USA) and we have not got the road or pipeline infrastructure to support it without huge additional disruption.
4. Noted that the long term use of fossil fuels must be reduced and that can be better achieved through improved insulation, energy savings and continuing the last ten years of the rapid increase in renewable energy production. North East Derbyshire District Council will continue playing our part to reduce our energy usage as well as our carbon footprint, by continuing to follow our successful Climate Change Strategy.

MOTION 'B'

Members considered a motion submitted by Councillor P Windley which called on the Council to establish a lottery scheme in order to provide additional resources to local community groups and charities. The full text of Councillor P Windley's motion, set out as Motion 'B', was included on the agenda for the meeting.

Councillor M Foster spoke against the motion. He argued that gambling could cause addiction and lead to great hardships within society.

Councillor R Welton also spoke against the motion as they did not believe that the District Council should be encouraging residents to engage in gambling.

Councillors J Barry, N Barker, T Reader, M Jones and M E Thacker MBE argued that they could not support the Motion, but that they did support the sentiments behind it and believed it could be discussed and explored through one of the Council's Scrutiny Committees.

Councillor G Morley suggested that fundraising schemes should be explored by the Parish Councils and, if appropriate, implemented by them rather than by the District Council.

Councillor D Hancock seconded the Motion. He hoped that the ideas expressed by Members throughout the debate could be developed further if Council chose not to support it.

At the conclusion of the debate the Motion, as moved and seconded by Councillors P Windley and D Hancock, was put to a vote and rejected.

MOTION 'C'

Councillor R Shipman and Councillor D Hancock as mover and seconder of the Motion agreed to withdraw it, as Motion 'A' had already been approved.

MOTION 'D'

Members considered a Motion submitted by Councillor D Hancock which called on Council to look at a range of options to provide residents with environmentally friendly options for disposing of their green waste. The full text of Councillor D Hancock's motion, set out as Motion 'D' was included on the Agenda for the meeting.

Councillor D Hancock agreed to include an amendment to the motion, proposed by Councillor C Cupit, which included working with the County Council on this issue and supporting plans to extend the garden waste collection period. The full amended motion was read out to Council.

Councillor N Barker indicated his support for the amendments to the Motion.

The Motion, as moved and seconded by Councillors D Hancock and C Cupit was put to a vote and approved.

RESOLVED

That Council:

1. Noted that between November and March, green bin collections are

- halted by North East Derbyshire District Council.
2. Noted that many residents ask members for improvements to our system during the autumn / winter months, particularly given the changes in our climate.
 3. Resolved to support plans to extend the garden waste collection period next year as well as looking at a range of options to provide residents with environmentally friendly options for their green waste, which may include, but not limited to, working with the County Council on discouraging food waste and encouraging the use of compostable bags for food waste/peelings; support with creating compost bins; and further advice on alternative ways to reduce and dispose of green waste in a way which is good for the environment.

COU Chair's Urgent Business (Public)

/59/2

2-23 There was no urgent business.

COU Exclusion of the Public

/60/2

2-23 RESOLVED – That the public be excluded from the meeting during the discussion of the following item of business to avoid the disclosure to them of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3, Part 1 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, (as amended by the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006).

COU Senior Management Review

/61/2

2-23 Council received an Update in relation to previous approval to implement the proposed senior management changes as outlined in the report to Council in October 2022.

Following the discussion, Councillor A Dale and Councillor C Cupit moved and seconded a Motion to approve officer recommendations. The Motion was put to the vote and was agreed

RESOLVED

That:

1. Following the implementation of the Council's Policy and Procedure for Organisational Review, Council noted:
 - a. That Mathew Broughton had been assimilated to the post of Director – Growth and Assets
 - b. That Steven Lee had been assimilated to the post of Assistant Director – Regeneration and Programmes
 - c. That following a successful internal recruitment process, Nicola Astle had been appointed to the post of Assistant Director – ICT
2. Following the implementation of the Council's Policy and Procedure for Organisational Review and a successful internal recruitment process, Jayne Dethick be appointed to the post of Director – Finance and

Resources & S151 Officer.

COU **Northwood - Update**

/62/2

2-23 With the agreement of the Chair, the Item was deferred

.

COU **Chair's Urgent Business (Private)**

/63/2

2-23 There was no urgent business.