

Council23rd November, 2017(10.20 a.m.)PRESENT:-

The Lord Mayor (in the Chair).

Deputy Lord Mayor (D. C.);

Councillors Abbott, Belcher, Black, Brabazon, Brady, Bridges, Brown, Chambers, Chaytor, A. Clark, P. Clark, Clarkson, Conner, Coward, Craker, Dad, Fareham, L. Fudge, N. Fudge, Gardiner, Geraghty, Hale, Harrison, Hatcher, Herrera-Richmond, Inglis, Jones, Langley, Lunn, Mancey, Mathieson, McCobb, O'Mullane, Pantelakis, Petrini, Quinn, Robinson, Ross, Spencer, Sumpton, Thomas, D. Thompson, M. Thompson, Tock, Webster, Williams and Wilson.

APOLOGIES:-

Councillors Bayes, Bell, Glew, Keal, Korczak Fields, C. Payne, R. Payne and Turner.

Minute No.	Description/Decision	Action By/Deadline
PROCEDURAL ITEMS		
	<p>PRESENTATION</p> <p>The Lord Mayor explained that the Ministry of Defence had awarded the City Council the Employer Recognition Scheme Gold Award, the highest honour for organisations which had signed the Armed Forces Covenant and demonstrated outstanding support for those who served and had served. The award recognised employers who actively supported the Armed Forces community in their workplace and also encouraged others to follow their lead.</p> <p>The Lord Mayor then presented the award to Councillor Gardiner, Tracy Harsley (City Safe and Early Intervention Manager) and Lt. Col. Hinton (CO for 150 Regiment at the Londesborough Barracks).</p>	
55	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillor Fareham declared a pecuniary interest in minute 62, insofar as he would, in the future, be in receipt of a pension from the Local Government</p>	

	Pension Scheme, did not speak or vote, and left the Chamber when this item was discussed.	
56	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Agreed – That the minutes of the meeting of the City Council, held on 21st September, 2017, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and correctly recorded and be signed by the Lord Mayor.</p>	
57	<p>COMPOSITION OF POLITICAL GROUPS</p> <p>The Town Clerk reported that there had been no changes to the composition of the political groups within the City Council.</p> <p>Agreed – That the report be noted.</p>	
58	<p>MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND JOINT COMMITTEES</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Sumpton and seconded by Councillor Dad:</p> <p>People and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Commission – Councillor Chaytor be appointed to the vacancy.</p> <p>Hull History Centre Board – Councillor Hatcher replaces Councillor R. Payne.</p> <p>Corporate Parenting Board - Councillor Tock replaces Councillor R. Payne.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
NON_EXEMPT ITEMS		
59	<p>DEBATE OF PETITION</p> <p>Mr. Little addressed the Chamber concerning the petition entitled “The Mick Ronson Arena/Venue”.</p> <p>Councillors Hale, A. Clark, Wilson and Jones then asked questions of Mr. Little concerning the petition.</p> <p>The Lord Mayor explained that the debate on the petition would now take place.</p>	Louise Hawkins

	<p>Councillors Ross, D. Thompson, Fareham and Chaytor then took part in the debate.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Sumpton and seconded by Councillor Hale:</p> <p>That the petition, “The Mick Ronson Arena/Venue”, be received and referred to Cabinet for further consideration.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	
60	<p>LEADER’S STATEMENT</p> <p>The Leader began his statement and commented on Councillor Black’s recent inclusion in Inside Housing’s “Who’s Who in Local Authority Housing”; the annual Apprentice Award Ceremony; that Hull City Council had been awarded ‘Local Authority of the Year’ at the Insider Yorkshire Property Industry Awards; the increasing amount of private sector investment in Hull; that Humber Street had won the ‘Great Street Award’ at the Academy of Urbanism Awards; that the Council had won the ‘Most Enterprising Place in Britain’ and ‘Improving the Business Environment’ awards at the Enterprising Britain Awards 2017; employment and investment levels in the City; that the City Council had been shortlisted at the Local Government Chronicle Awards for ‘Driving Growth – The Hull Approach’ in the Driving Growth category; the City Council being named as the most improved Authority 2016/17 at the National Highways and Transport Network; that the City Council’s ‘Eco Housing Programme’ had been the subject of a feature in Social Housing; that the City Council and the NHS Hull Clinical Commissioning Group had been shortlisted at the Local Government Chronicle Awards in the Health and Social Care category for shaping future health and social care, and visits to the City by Her Majesty the Queen and the Mayor of London around City of Culture 2017.</p> <p>Councillor Ross replied to the Leader’s Statement by thanking all those involved in the City of Culture. He then commented on Beverley Gate; Argyle Street Bridge; the Government’s forthcoming budget; potential cuts to public health funding by the Government, and the legacy of the City of Culture</p>	

	<p>2017.</p> <p>Councillor Fareham replied to the Leader's Statement and congratulated all those involved with the various awards the Leader had mentioned in his statement. He then commented on City of Culture 2017; new Area structures; future funding arrangements; arrangements for devolving powers from central government; HullBID and the City Centre; the lack of a Christmas Market in the City; the role of HullBID, and the City's night time economy.</p> <p>Agreed – That the Leader's Statement, and the responses to that Statement, be noted.</p>	
61	<p>QUESTIONS (WITH WRITTEN NOTICE) TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET, CHAIRS OF COMMITTEES AND OTHERS</p> <p>Councillor Mancey asked the Leader of the Majority Opposition Group, in 2006, when the Liberal Democrats took control of the Council, officers were preparing plans for the construction of a 'Northern Park and Ride' at the Dunswell Roundabout but those plans were stopped due to objections primarily from Councillor McCobb. Recently when it was announced that sites were being looked at for such a development the Chair of the Kingswood Residents' Association and a local Liberal Democrat Councillor were clear that they wanted the Park and Ride at the Dunswell Roundabout site. So, could Councillor Ross explain whether his Group now would or would not support this development should the site prove the most viable one?</p> <p>The Leader of the Majority Opposition Group replied that he was quite shocked to see Councillor Mancey asking a question at full Council given Councillor Mancey's views on questions in the past. He was afraid Councillor Mancey was quite incorrect. His understanding was that the plans were actually stopped in 2005, by a predecessor of Councillor Mancey, former Councillor Wareing, who was the Portfolio Holder at the time. Councillor Mancey had said it was Councillor McCobb who had stopped it</p>	

but he thought it was former Councillor Wareing. He understood Councillor McCobb had simply raised concerns that many residents in the area had raised with him around issues to do with that. The more important point as Councillor Mancey in his introduction to his question which was not part of the written question, of course a Park and Ride was something that many members in the Chamber supported. It had to be in the right place and until it was clear where that would be it was impossible to say where the Park and Ride site should be. There were concerns around this. He understood there were drainage issues but fundamentally it had to be on the right site. If that was one that worked best both for Hull and the East Riding then that was what should happen. He thought Councillor Mancey sometimes needed to do his research a bit better.

Councillor Langley asked had the Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning set out a “legacy” plan to invest in road repairs, should extra money be allocated to road and footpath repairs? Could the Portfolio Holder provide details about the mechanism by which he proposed to allocate funds, and did the Portfolio Holder agree that Wards should have a say on how repair monies were spent so that community priorities could be taken into account?

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning replied by reiterating what the Leader had said in his statement earlier, that it was gratifying that the national Highways and Transportation Public Satisfaction Survey acknowledged that Hull was the most improved Local Authority when it came to footpaths and pavements. In that context he said ‘yes’, to answer the question specifically, what mechanism by which to allocate funds. Members should be aware that in previous years, as Portfolio Holder, he had asked officers to seek the views of each Ward on the three most important carriageways and three most important footways. Officers would then consider those alongside the survey information that they had. Recently he had asked officers to do that again. So, yes, there would be the opportunity for Wards to input into the determination of the programme as there had been previously. At the end of the day, how the Highways budget was spent

must be largely determined by the professional advice of the Council's officers to ensure that the funding which, despite his efforts to increase, would still not go far enough purely because Government funding had been inadequate for years. One particular point he had made to officers for the forthcoming years was that he would like to see a slight shift in emphasis, to get more of that limited budget spent on dealing with some of the worst problems on some of the residential roads. The Administration's policy up to date had been to concentrate on the main arterial and traffic routes.

Councillor Mancey asked, given the Leader of the Majority Opposition Group's concern over the state of the highways, did he now regret that his Group, in 2002, cancelled the £30m Highways Repairs Programme which at the time would have resolved the backlog of repairs?

The Leader of the Majority Opposition Group replied that if Councillor Mancey was going to answer his own questions he did not see the point of him asking them at all. In terms of his comments around the programme in 2002, again Councillor Mancey was actually wrong. He knew 2002 was not a great year for Councillor Mancey, as awkward things had happened in his life. In terms of the actual detail around the question, with the issues relating to it, actually, it had not been cancelled, it was paused. It was paused and reprocessed because the previous Labour Administration was deemed to be the worst Council in the country. So when the Liberal Democrats came in and had to clean up Labour's mess, it meant they had to review a lot of schemes. This had simply been one of those. That programme had to be paused and reassessed because it was one of many failed schemes that had been left by the previous Labour Administration. The Liberal Democrats commitment to roads was in no doubt. The Liberal Democrats actually did want more money investing in roads and had always wanted more money investing in roads than the Labour Administration. The Liberal Democrats had done so when in administration. The Liberal Democrats invested more when they came in in 2006 than their previous plans were again left on the table before that. Councillor Mancey had a real cheek to stand there and say more money was needed to be invested in roads. What had

Councillor Mancey been doing as Portfolio Holder over the last years? What was his record? It was all very well coming up with a legacy plan now that he was almost out of the door. Councillor Mancey had actually had years and years and years to solve this problem. If Councillor Mancey wanted to talk about backlogs that backlog fell on Councillor Mancey's desk and his desk alone. So, yes, the Liberal Democrats wanted to see more. Councillor Mancey had had opportunity, after opportunity, after opportunity to talk the problem out. So, to come up with this grand plan now, which when you looked at the numbers did not actually stack up, was a real, real fraud. He thought 'fraud' was a good word. Councillor Mancey was trying to commit a real fraud on the people of Hull trying to say he was now the saviour of the roads. Councillor Mancey had talked about potholes when actually the pothole scheme had been nicked by the Government in their budget plans yesterday. What that showed was that the Government's commitment to make sure roads across the City and across communities of Hull would actually be dealt with. Whereas the Councillor Mancey approach and attitude was if you lived in the neighbourhoods forget it. If you wanted your roads repaired was a real affront and shame to the many residents of this City who wanted to see their roads and their local neighbourhoods brought up to a good standard. If Councillor Mancey was going to keep asking questions he really ought to try harder.

Councillor Quinn asked if the Portfolio Holder for Housing thought that enough was being done to tackle rogue landlords in Hull given that a Freedom of Information request had revealed that only eight had been prosecuted in the last year, despite 474 "category one" hazards being found during inspections?

The Portfolio Holder for Housing replied that he thought the statistics without any doubt proved that the Housing staff had been extremely active in that area. They had concentrated on the informal works and the statutory notices and had approached it in a very constructive and effective manner. The way to get the best results was to try and work with the landlords that were prepared to work with the Council and bring about the improvements as quickly as possible. It was a sledgehammer to crack a nut if you concentrated on the ones who would be

the worst landlords. However, safety was always paramount and where safety was concerned the Authority took steps. He wanted to remind members that new legislation had been enacted which gave new powers through the Housing and Planning Act. This enabled the Council to be able to issue Civil Penalty Notices on rogue landlords and anybody who did not keep to their timetables to carry out the improvements. The Council would issue them expeditiously. There were also other tools at their disposal. There would be a national database on rogue landlords which he welcomed. He had been briefed on that and he thought it was the intention of Housing staff to brief members of the Council who had that type of rented accommodation in their Ward. Those tools and enforcement powers would be robustly used by Council staff. Again, he thought members needed to look at the wider picture, the number of people who were contacting the Department and the work which was carried out in an informal way.

Councillor Herrera-Richmond asked if the Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning would like to comment on the award presentation to Hull City Council today in Leeds by the Minister for Transport which recognised the improvements in public satisfaction regarding maintenance of pavements and footpaths?

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning replied that he had already commented on the award for the most improved or the Local Authority showing the most improvement in pavements and footpaths. What he would like to do was set that in the context of some of the comments that Councillor Ross had made about the fact that, as Portfolio Holder, he had allegedly failed. He did not think it was a failure to be the most improved Local Authority for footpaths and pavements, quite the opposite. He thought it was a clear demonstration of success. Councillor Ross unfortunately started getting personal in his response when he had referred to 2002. He would not normally sink to Councillor Ross' level but reminded Councillor Ross that in 2002 one of the biggest scandals was the fact that six Liberal Democrat Councillors were in significant arrears with their Council Tax when setting the budget.

Councillor Dad asked what update the Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services and Performance could give on the progress being made towards ensuring that all Council buildings, not just the Guildhall, were accessible to members of the public who were deaf or hard of hearing, as well as any Councillors or Council staff who may also be affected?

The Portfolio Holder for Corporate Services and Performance replied that she was disappointed that the case had not been referred to her because obviously she would have taken action. She did not even know which building was being referred to. Generally there were measures and facilities in place to ensure that all Council buildings with public access complied with the Disability Discrimination Act. Reasonable adjustments should be made for any staff. In addition, hearing loops were available at Customer Service Centres such as the Wilson Centre and in various specific rooms and areas of buildings that historically required such facilities. For example, at Hull New Theatre, there was an induction loop in the main customer area; an infrared system in the auditorium, and in the City Hall there was an induction loop. She thanked Councillor Keal who had raised that with her originally. In the Guildhall there had been a recent review of hearing facilities in the various meeting rooms and reception areas and plans were in place to upgrade and replace certain systems. The contractor who fitted the new hearing loop at the main reception was to carry out further tests given that there had been some complaints about its effectiveness. She also thanked Councillors Keal and Conner for their help and involvement. Officers would continue to work closely with the Council's Access Officer to ensure that they continued to address those particular issues. This would ensure that, where hearing loops were required in meeting rooms and buildings, they could be fitted and that the portable versions were not only working but that people knew how to use them. Finally, members would know that there was a demonstration of the hearing loop units today at 2.00 p.m. in room 77. Anyone who wished to test their devices they were very welcome to do so. Once again she would be very grateful if Councillor Dad could raise the issue with her after the meeting. Councillor Dad knew her

email address and phone number.

Councillor P. Clark asked if the Leader of the Council would remind the Council of the amount of awards the City and Council had received recently that recognised the transformation that had been achieved in image and reputation of our City across the country?

The Leader replied that he had gone through a real run of awards received in the City during his earlier statement. He knew how many people had worked so hard to get the City to that place. The most recent award was last Thursday night in a glittering occasion at the KCOM Stadium, where the City had won an award for City of Culture and all that had come from that. So that was a great accolade from the Hull Daily Mail. It was more enjoyable when it came as a surprise and very infrequent. That was the 22nd award for the City and long may it continue.

Councillor Coward asked if the Portfolio Holder for Learning, Skills and Safeguarding Children agreed that when a child or young person experienced mental health difficulties, early intervention and access to services should be a key priority? What steps was the Portfolio Holder taking to tackle the long waiting times and poor responses that parents across the City had reported when trying to secure support from the Children and Adolescents Mental Health Service (CAMHS) for their child?

The Portfolio Holder for Learning, Skills and Safeguarding Children replied that on Monday at the Early Support and Lifelong Learning Overview and Scrutiny Commission there had been a presentation from HeadStart. That presentation had actually laid out all the work that had been done as far as mental health was concerned in the City and helping with transition to CAMHS, so a lot of work had been done. The Council was also working with the local Clinical Commissioning Group through joint commissioning. What disappointed him was that the national view of mental health had been poor. The MP for East Hull had actually raised it in Parliament after the sad suicide of his nephew, which was absolutely appalling. The MP for East Hull had done some really good work but there was nothing in the budget again and that really disappointed him.

There was nothing for mainstream education or for looked after children. What had also disappointed him, and more so after the comments that Councillor Ross had made earlier, was when Vince Cable had stood outside after the budget and the media had asked him which part he agreed with in the budget and Vince Cable had replied 'all of the above', which he thought was absolutely appalling. Vince Cable should be commenting because those areas affected people all the time. He had a full and complete answer to the transition and all the work that had been done, which he would circulate amongst members after the meeting to ensure they had all the information.

Councillor Herrera-Richmond asked if the Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning could indicate what was being done to maintain pressure on Highways England and the Department for Transport to ensure there was no further slippage on the Castle Street bridge and the main road scheme?

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning replied by reminding members that for the last six years he had been pursuing the Castle Street improvement at a local level. This had been with the former MP for West Hull and Hessle, Alan Johnson, and, more recently, with Emma Hardy, the current MP for West Hull and Hessle. Members would be aware of the recent announcements regarding the timetable for the footbridge. With regard to that and importantly with regard to the main scheme, he had had a conversation with Emma Hardy earlier regarding conversations that she had had in the last few days with Chris Grayling, the Secretary of State. The pressure they were applying seemed to be having a considerable effect. His next step in continuing with that pressure was meeting with Emma Hardy and Highways England senior management at the House of Commons next Tuesday when they would be seeking further, more detailed, assurances on a number of aspects.

Councillor Langley asked the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods, Communities and Environment, the Council spends £670,000 per year on water. The Council's Annual Carbon

Report 2016/17 showed an increase in water consumption of 22.5% against the Council's performance target of a 2% per year reduction. Could the Portfolio Holder update Council on measures already taken to reduce water consumption, as well as any further plans to achieve year on year reductions?

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods, Communities and Environment confirmed that an Action Plan had been developed with a review to address the high water consumption on sites which had developed, and to look at measures to reduce that water consumption. However, members may also wish to note that several new water features had been installed in recent years and that had led to increased water consumption.

Councillor Sumpton asked if the Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning could describe how he personally engaged with businesses, both large and small, to discuss their needs and how the Council could assist them?

The Portfolio Holder for Economic Investment, Regeneration and Planning replied that there was a range of platforms or measures by which he engaged with businesses. To start off he was a member, on behalf of the Council, of the HullBID Board and attended Board meetings where issues relating to businesses in the City Centre and the implications of wider issues in the City for the City Centre were regularly discussed. He also frequently met with Dr. Kelly of the Hull and Humber Chamber of Commerce. Officers had arranged with him for him to visit a number of businesses. He had already made two visits, and he had a programme of visits over the next few months that would continue. He was also the Council's representative on the Local Enterprise Partnership Investment and Regulation Board. Again, this was a Board that had private sector business representation on it. On civic issues, such as the problems with Castle Street, he had had a number of meetings with Hedon Road businesses who were concerned about the traffic problems on Hedon Road and Castle Street. So, he had had a whole range of engagements with business. He had also made it clear, or tried to make it clear, that any business which had a

problem where the Council could assist, his door would always be open.

Councillor McCobb asked the Leader of the Council, given recent statements by officers at Area Committees that there would be no Ward budget carry forward from 2017/18 to 2018/19, could the Leader confirm whether this was a one-off position due to the ward boundary changes or a permanent shift in policy that would always prohibit annual carry-forwards of Ward budgets?

The Deputy Leader, on behalf of the Leader, replied that that was a very good question. He was quite clear that it was a one-off situation because of the Ward changes. He and the Leader had just had a debate about every single Ward change and they thought about it, even a change by fifty two houses, because the formula was based on the deprivation index as well as head counts. Where you losing an area that had got you that money in the first place? So, it would be really difficult to try and carry that forward. If you were talking about the elected representatives having the right to basically spend that money, it had to be their money. On a wider note he hoped that people were aware of that and would make the necessary arrangements. It was not a case of wasting money, and he was sure no member in the Chamber would waste any money, it was ensuring everyone was aware of that. He had spoken to the Director of Finance and Change Management, obviously the new members would be in from May, and whether leeway on schemes would be allowed for Councillors who were into the new financial year. Come the new boundaries that money would come back but that future policy of previous administrations would persist which would be trying to get away from short termism and encourage people to plan sensibly. If you had to plan over the year end there would be no reason why that could not be carried forward. That would certainly be their stance as an Administration going forward.

Councillor Chaytor asked if the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods, Communities and Environment would outline the impact of the roll out of Universal Credit in the City on his service area and what steps he and his staff were taking

to address this?

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhoods, Communities and Environment replied, speaking from the Customer Service side of things, when Universal Credit came out of the previous Coalition Government's proposals many people advised them against doing that and the impact on the poorest families and single people. Hull was now preparing its Customer Service Centres and the Housing staff had been trained but were, at present, unable to assess the level of demand on services. It would be very difficult to predict the demand but they expected an increase in footfall at the Wilson Centre. Customers could seek help and support from Customer Service Centres to help claim online and seek help regarding the budget and support. Customer Services would also be able to support the customers in the use of Universal Credit full service and identify any issues regarding their claim to a Universal Credit portal that was coming up. Customer Services; other Council services, and organisations who supported customers across the City, worked closely with the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) and were ready for the roll out including staff training and joint awareness presentations. Customers could also seek help and advice in the general service for the Welfare Rights Team regarding the support to challenge the DWP decisions. Additionally, capacity within the Team, from January, 2018, would increase to help with service demand. The Council may be in a position to launch a number of self service facilities in September, 2018, for customers who were unable to access the services on-line, there would be staff to actually support them in doing that. There were currently 370 Universal Credit cases in Housing and a number of measures had taken place in response to the 'live' roll out. The service currently scheduled in Hull for September, 2018, he dreaded that time, was going to be a very difficult time, brought about by the Coalition Government's agreement in the first place. That included reviewing the reduced duplication processes of frontline Housing staff so they could spend more time with customers. Frontline Housing services were also restructured in order to respond. They included the introduction of six Tenancy Sustainable Officers to help maintain the tenancies and provide assistance to increase income for tenants. Other measures included staff

training, exploring information and management systems to prioritise individual officer's workloads. This was an absolutely enormous piece of work. Universal Credit's roll out in 2018 would mean customers on a particular benefit, Child Tax Credit, Housing Benefit, Income Support, Job Seekers' Allowance, Working Tax Credit would be moved on to Universal Credit. There would be changes in circumstances, changes on how they would be paid their rent, their rebate accounts, and their rent allowances. Customers would need help to claim Universal Credit on-line. Universal Credit payments would be a difficult thing to do, but what they would include there may be help from the Council, obviously, to be able to budget to include how their rent accounts and tax payments were handled.

Moved by Councillor McCobb and seconded by Councillor Ross:

That the second part of paragraph 14.8 of the Council Procedure Rules, limiting the time for questions to 40 minutes, be suspended.

Motion lost.

On the completion of the above vote the remainder of the 40 minutes allocated for questions was taken.

Councillor Williams asked if the Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Tourism was aware of the consultation that had taken place over the potential relocation of the Holderness Road Library in recent months. Holderness Road Library was a very well used facility and he was sure the Portfolio Holder would agree that it was vital to preserve library provisions in communities across the City. Could the Portfolio Holder give assurances that he would support the continuation of a library service on Holderness Road when this issue was brought to Cabinet?

The Portfolio Holder for Leisure and Tourism replied that as far as Labour were concerned they had always been very keen to maintain a very good library service and that had been the case over the last four or five years. Unlike Councillor Williams, when the Liberal Democrats had been in power for four or five years, there had been a mass reduction

	<p>in the Library Service. If Labour had not put another £250,000 back into the pot then Labour would have been looking at closing not just Mount Pleasant but also other libraries in the City. That had not happened because Labour had taken very decisive action because they believed libraries were a very vital part of the community. More and more people used them and that was why Labour was in discussions with the James Reckitt Library Endowment Trust to look at a way forward for the next twenty years. Labour were very keen on maintaining the Library Service in the City and he thought the public now acknowledged what Labour was doing. As far as the Holderness Road Library was concerned, consultation was on going, with a report to be submitted to Cabinet on 18th December, 2017, for a final decision. The decision was whether there was going to be a community library. He thanked the three Ward Councillors for their letter which said that they wanted library provision on Holderness Road and not on Mount Pleasant. As far as he was concerned there were two options, one in community centres and one in East Park. Therefore, Labour could give a 200% guarantee that there would be a library in that vicinity when the consultation phase had taken place.</p> <p>Agreed – That the questions and answers be received.</p>	
	<p>SUSPENSION OF MEETING</p> <p>The Lord Mayor suspended the meeting between 11.50 a.m. and Noon.</p>	
62	<p>REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES SCHEME</p> <p>(Councillor Fareham declared a pecuniary interest in minute 62, insofar as he would, in the future, be in receipt of a pension from the Local Government Pension Scheme, did not speak or vote, and left the Chamber when this item was discussed.)</p> <p>The Town Clerk submitted the report of the City Council's Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) which explained that the Council reviewed its Members' Allowances Scheme every four years. The last review had taken place in 2015. At the time</p>	Town Clerk

of that review the IRP advised minor amendments to the scheme. In addition the IRP recommended that the scheme be the subject of an interim review in 2017 in relation, in particular, to Special Responsibility Allowances to ensure that the impact of the deferment of consideration of Special Responsibility Allowances in 2011 was maintained under review. The purpose of the report therefore was to set out the conclusions arising from the interim review undertaken in 2017.

The intention in 2015 had been that the focus of the review would be on Special Responsibility Allowances as these were not reviewed at the point that the Local Government pay freeze was brought to an end in 2011. At that time, on the recommendation of the IRP, it was agreed that Basic Allowances would be increased in line with the annual pay award for local authority staff. The absence of any increase in 2015 led the IRP to determine that there should be a review of the Special Responsibility Allowances in 2017.

However, in addition, an elected member with a disability, in a recent Employment Tribunal, argued that the current Members' Allowances Scheme's provision for transport for Disabled People did not adequately prevent discrimination against members with a disability. This issue was therefore also a matter upon which the IRP deliberated.

Finally the IRP was requested to review their advice that there be no change to the Allowances paid to elected members consequent to the removal, in 2014/15, of access to the Local Government Pension Scheme to elected members.

To facilitate the process a meeting of the Panel was organised for 21st July, 2017, to which the IRP invited Group Leaders and the individual members who had raised the concerns in relation to the application of the current scheme. The Group Leaders of the Majority Labour Group and the Liberal Democrat Opposition were consulted upon the proposals together with Councillors Inglis and Korczak Fields. The Group Leader of the Conservative and Unionist Group did not attend. The report detailed the outcome of the Interim Review undertaken by the IRP of the issues identified above and its recommendations were

	<p>submitted to Council for consideration.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Inglis and seconded by Councillor O’Mullane:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That the annual uplift to Special Responsibility Allowances be brought in line with the annual uplift of the Basic Allowances and to adjust the allowances that relate to the Chairs of the primary Committees of the Council which exercise regulatory functions delegated to them by Council so that they are in accord with the Special Responsibility Allowance applicable to the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee; b) that the grounds on which members with disabilities can make claims for travel and subsistence be clarified, and c) that a policy upon how decisions will be made in relation to applications by individual members for waiving the reduction of actuarial benefits on compassionate grounds be adopted. <p>Moved by Councillor Inglis and seconded by Councillor O’Mullane as an amendment:</p> <p>The motion with the amendment that the Chair of Health and Wellbeing Board be provided with a 63% uplift.</p> <p>Councillors Ross and Allen also spoke on this matter.</p> <p>Councillor Inglis then exercised his right of reply on the amendment.</p> <p>Amendment carried. Substantive motion carried.</p>	
63	<p>DELEGATION OF RETURNING OFFICER FOR ELECTION DUTIES</p> <p>The City Human Resources Manager submitted a report which explained that the duties of the Returning Officer for elections had traditionally been</p>	City Human Resources Manager/Town Clerk

	<p>allocated to the Chief Executive, the Head of Paid Service. When the Council decided to have a part time Chief Executive a temporary arrangement was put in place for the Monitoring Officer/Town Clerk to undertake those duties. Now that there was a full time Chief Executive in place, it was proposed to re-allocate those duties back to the Chief Executive post.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Brady and seconded by Councillor Sumpton:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That the Chief Executive undertakes the duties of the Returning Officer, with immediate effect, be approved, and b) that the Town Clerk be the nominated deputy for the duties of the Returning Officer for elections in the absence of the Chief Executive. <p>Motion carried.</p>	
64	<p>HULL LOCAL PLAN: ADOPTION</p> <p>The City Planning Manager submitted a report which asked Council to adopt the Hull Local Plan as part of the Development Plan for the City when determining planning applications.</p> <p>The report explained that the Local Plan had been through an extensive preparation process involving the compilation of a detailed evidence base and several rounds of public consultation. It had been subject to a public examination process where the soundness of the Plan had been considered by a Planning Inspector. Having an up-to-date Local Plan meant that the Council, as the Local Planning Authority, was best placed to determine planning applications and guide investment and development to the most appropriate locations within Hull in the best interests of the City. The Plan would replace the last Local Plan adopted in 2000 and would provide the delivery framework for the physical projects in the City Plan.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Mancey and seconded by Councillor Gardiner:</p>	City Planning Manager/Town Clerk

That the findings of the Inspector's report be accepted, and the Hull Local Plan be adopted as part of the Development Plan for the City.

Moved by Councillor Fareham and seconded by Councillor Abbott as an amendment so the motion reads:

Council notes that it agreed the Local Plan's final draft which went out to consultation over the summer. Council notes the very low response from the public in terms of commentary but that where a proposal is in line with public views they would not expect people to necessarily comment – people usually comment to object.

Council notes that, after the examination by the externally appointed Planner, certain proposals were made which reversed a long-established status quo and went against local opinion that had been supported by the Council. Council is therefore disturbed to notice that the Local Plan, as amended, did not appear on any Area Committees for expert local comment and, more worryingly still, the public seen to have been totally excluded from any effective ability to comment on the proposals made by the sole externally appointed Planner, in a manner commensurate with their ability to comment on the Council's proposals. This would seem to make the decision less than Wednesbury compliant, and possibly in breach of human rights.

Nevertheless Council resolves to defer the adoption of the Local Plan until the comments of the external Inspector have been considered by all the Area Committees in the interests of natural justice and compliance with the Wednesbury principles of decision making. Specifically the requirement to take all relevant matters into consideration, which is best demonstrated through the same mechanism used when considering the Council's proposals.

To avoid prolonged delay Council also authorises such extra meetings of Area Committees as may be considered necessary, and instructs the Officers to present proposals for ensuring effective, and speedy, public consultation are brought forward.

Councillors Williams, A. Clark, McCobb, Gardiner, Sumpton, Mancey and Herrera-Richmond also

<p>spoke on the amendment.</p> <p>Councillor Fareham then exercised his right of reply on the amendment.</p> <p>At the request of Council, the voting on the amendment was recorded as follows:</p> <p>FOR</p> <p>Councillors Abbott, Brown, Chambers, Coward, Dad, Fareham, Hatcher, Langley, Mathieson, McCobb, Quinn, Robinson, Ross, Thomas, Tock and Williams. (16)</p> <p>AGAINST</p> <p>Councillors Allen, Belcher, Black, Brabazon, Brady, Bridges, Chaytor, A. Clark, P. Clark, Clarkson, Conner, Craker, L. Fudge, N. Fudge, Gardiner, Geraghty, Hale, Harrison, Herrera-Richmond, Hewitt, Inglis, Jones, Lunn, Mancey, O'Mullane, Pantelakis, Petrini, Spencer, Sumpton, D. Thompson, M. Thompson, Webster and Wilson. (33)</p> <p>NOT PRESENT</p> <p>Councillors Barrett and Dorton. (2)</p> <p>Amendment lost.</p> <p>At this point Councillor Williams moved the following further amendment so the motion reads:</p> <p>Council resolves to refer the Local Plan back to Cabinet expressing concern at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) That the changes made to the plan (in particular Goddard Avenue and Legarde Drive) by the Inspector without proper public consultation, andb) that the allocation of only one potential site for the proposed cruise terminal, despite the volume of responses to the consultation either proposing alternative sites or opposing specifically the site at The Deep/Victoria Dock.	
--	--

	<p>Council resolves to ask Cabinet to consult all members on the draft as tabled, and then open dialogue with the Planning Inspectorate, if necessary taking independent legal advice beforehand, to ensure that all options open to the Council to resolve these concerns are explored.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Sumpton and seconded by Councillor Hale:</p> <p>That, under paragraph 15.3 of the Council Procedure Rules, as Councillor William's further amendment was in similar terms to Councillor Fareham's amendment that had been rejected earlier in the meeting, and the further amendment had not been signed by at least 12 members, the further amendment could not be moved within the next six months.</p> <p>Councillors Ross and Fareham also spoke on the above procedural motion.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p> <p>Following the rejection of the further amendment, Councillors Inglis and Abbott then spoke on the original motion.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Sumpton and seconded by Councillor Webster:</p> <p>That, under paragraph 19.11 of the Council Procedure Rules, the original motion be put to the vote.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p> <p>Following the above vote, Councillor Mancey exercised his right of reply on the original motion.</p> <p>Original motion carried.</p>	
65	<p>NEXT BUSINESS</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Sumpton and seconded by Councillor Inglis:</p> <p>That the motion relating to the debate of the Council's 2017/18 budget be taken as next</p>	

	<p>business.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor McCobb and seconded by Councillor Ross:</p> <p>That paragraph 24.2 of the Council Procedure Rules be suspended to allow sufficient time for all the business on the agenda to be considered, or the meeting finishes at 4.00 p.m., whichever is the earliest.</p> <p>Motion lost.</p>	
66	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Sumpton and seconded by Councillor Inglis:</p> <p>That the Council meeting fixed for the Budget Debate (including the budget for the Housing Revenue Account) be 18th January, 2018, in accordance with the Forward Plan Notice issued by the Leader of the Council.</p> <p>Councillors Williams, Ross, Fareham and Hale also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	Director of Finance and Change Management (Section 151 Officer)
67	<p>COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY</p> <p>That, as the item regarding the Community Infrastructure Levy, was not considered by 2.20 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council.</p>	City Planning Manager
68	<p>STREET TRADING – APPROVAL OF DRAFT POLICY</p> <p>That, as the item regarding the Street Trading Policy, was not considered by 2.20 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council.</p>	Licensing Manager

69	<p>REFERRAL FROM THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD – UNIVERSAL CREDIT (MINUTE 15(I) REFERS)</p> <p>That, as the referral from the Health and Wellbeing Board regarding Universal Credit, was not considered by 2.20 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council.</p>	Antony Spouse
70	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>That, as the motion regarding the Kingswood Development (Castle Street site), was not considered by 2.20 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
71	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>That, as the motion regarding the Kingswood Development (Albion Street site), was not considered by 2.20 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
72	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>That, as the motion regarding child poverty, was not considered by 2.20 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
73	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>That, as the motion regarding harassment, was not considered by 2.20 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
74	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>That, as the motion regarding the Police and Crime Commissioner at Council, was not considered by 2.20 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe

Start: 10.20 a.m.
Finish: 2.20 p.m.