



This information is available free of charge in electronic, audio, Braille and large print versions on request.

For assistance in understanding or reading this document or specific information about these Minutes please call the Committee Team on 01629 761300 or e-mail committee@derbyshiredales.gov.uk

COUNCIL

Minutes of a Virtual Council Meeting held at 6.00 pm on Thursday, 18 March 2021.

Under Regulations made under the Coronavirus Act 2020, the meeting was held virtually. Members of the public were able to view the virtual meeting via the District Council's website at www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk or via our YouTube channel.

PRESENT

Councillor Richard Fitzherbert - In the Chair

Councillors, Jacqueline Allison, Robert Archer, Jason Atkin, Richard Bright, Matthew Buckler, Sue Bull, Martin Burfoot, Sue Burfoot, Neil Buttle, David Chapman, Tom Donnelly, Graham Elliott, Steve Flitter, Helen Froggatt, Chris Furness, Clare Gamble, Alyson Hill, Susan Hobson, David Hughes, Stuart Lees, Tony Morley, Michele Morley, Peter O'Brien, Garry Purdy, Mike Ratcliffe, Lewis Rose OBE, Mark Salt, Andrew Shirley, Peter Slack, Andrew Statham, Alasdair Sutton, Colin Swindell, Steve Wain and Mark Wakeman.

Paul Wilson (Chief Executive), James McLaughlin (Director of Corporate & Customer Services), Karen Henriksen (Director of Resources), Steve Capes (Director of Regeneration and Policy), Rob Cogings (Director of Housing), Angela Gratton (Democratic Services Officer).

This meeting was recorded and broadcast live on YouTube

APOLOGIES

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors: Paul Cruise and Claire Raw

295/20 - PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In accordance with the procedure for public participation:

STATEMENT from Mrs Christina Porter, a Derbyshire Dales resident on the proposal of Motion.

"Dear sir/madam

I do not wish to speak at the meeting on Thursday but I would like to comment on Cllr Jason Atkin suggestion to use the Covid 19 additional burdens money received from central government to be shared with all staff at a rate of £150 each.

This money should not be used for a staff payment. This should be used for the purpose it was given and only used for that.

There is still money to be spent relating to Covid 19, we are not out of this pandemic and the money must be available to be used for that purpose not to top up wages for staff.

Staff are paid to do their job and whilst I appreciate many have worked extremely hard during this pandemic so has everyone else in lots of other jobs.

If the money is not required currently it should be protected and rolled over to the next financial year and if that is not possible it should be returned to the government.

Christina Porter”

RESPONSE

Thank you for your statement. I'm sure the issues raised will be considered by Members as part of the motion to be debated later on this agenda. I can't pre-empt the outcome of that debate, but it will be interesting to hear the views of Members on the matter.

QUESTION from Mr Peter Dobbs, an Ashbourne resident, on the draft recommendations impact on service delivery.

Ref Item 16 LGBCE Draft Report

Para 2.4 in the officer report reads;

2.4 Officers have reviewed the draft recommendations and have not identified any implications which would impact negatively upon service delivery.

I am concerned therefore that the consequences of the following aspect of the LGBCE proposals may have been overlooked. I do appreciate that this is a long and complex report with many important documents on the LGBCE website and not in this report itself, so the following comment is made in order to achieve accuracy and is not a criticism.

In the Ashbourne Town Council warding arrangements (p24 of the draft report) LGBCE are suggesting halving the number of Town Councillors for the largest and fastest growing ward (Hilltop). This is currently represented by 4 Cllrs for a current electorate of about 2,726. LGBCE suggest 2 Cllrs for a projected electorate of about 2,800 by 2026.

This makes no sense and would, I believe 'impact negatively on service delivery' although I would appreciate a clarification on what is meant by that.

Qn. *Would it be possible for Council to note that the broad statement in 2.4 might be a little premature, and that perhaps a review of data supplied to LGBCE should be undertaken when staffing permits?*

RESPONSE

Thank you for your question. The Council has received a request from Ashbourne Town Council to review the data supplied to LGBCE. This review is underway and officers will respond to the Town Council in due course.

However, as these proposals come from LGBCE, any concerns held by an elector or interested party should be directed to the Boundary Commission as part of their consultation before 12 April.

STATEMENT from Mr Nigel Lee, a Derbyshire Dales resident, on the views sought from DCC and the PDNPA.

As a Derbyshire resident, admirer of Derbyshire Dales District Council's (DDDC) excellent information by email service, and member of the public with, as far as I can recall, no prior knowledge of Peaks and Dales Railway (P&DR) and its proposals, I was interested to learn from you that "There's an interesting report at our full council meeting this Thursday (18 March) advising Members about proposals being advocated by P&DR to re-open the railway line from Matlock to Manchester".

Clicking through to the meeting agenda I first noted:

Agenda Item 17

PEAKS AND DALES RAILWAY – MANCHESTER AND EAST MIDLANDS RAIL ACTION PARTNERSHIP

To note a report of the views of Derbyshire County Council and the Peak District National Park Authority, over the proposals being advocated by Peaks and Dales Rail to re-open the railway line from Matlock to Manchester

and then the aforementioned report itself, in particular its sections,

- **PURPOSE OF REPORT**
- **RECOMMENDATION** - *That the views of Derbyshire County Council and the Peak District National Park Authority are noted.*
- **VIEWS OF NATIONAL PARK AUTHORITY AND COUNTY COUNCIL**

My immediate thought on reading the DDDC report was that councillors are being asked to note the views of Derbyshire County Council (DCC) and the Peak District National Park Authority (PDNPA), as so authoritatively set out in section 3, with almost no attempt to provide any traceability. No references are given as to whom in DCC and PDNPA has expressed such views, when they did so and in what form they did so. No background papers (section 8) are provided and the sole attachment (section 9) is P&DR's own report. There only traceability at all of any of the stated views is, going back to October 2020, the P&DR report saying "DCC is currently unsupportive of the reinstatement, but has not offered any evidence in support of its position and for the environmental damage cited as its concern".

My next thought was to wonder if the DDDC report excludes citations for the views it attributes to DCC and PDNPA because these views are so unequivocal, so well reported and so well known among DDDC councillors and the general public (myself sadly excluded) that the author believed such enlightenment to be unnecessary. The facts appear to be the opposite though. As far as my searches reveal:

- *DCC's website (where I used its search engine and also read recent council meeting agendas and minutes) is silent on the matter (it's hardly relevant that one*

can find a report on Derby/Matlock-Manchester rail reopening commissioned by DCC back in 2004).

- *PDNPA's website (where I used its search engine and also read meeting agendas and minutes) is silent on the matter, other than for a feature (evidently written when the Monsal Trail improvement opened) entitled "Monsal Trail - Effect on the Railway Line" which starts "The new route has no negative impact on plans to reinstate the railway in the future. In fact it helps preserve the line. Current and future planning policies safeguard the route of the railway".*
- *DDDC's website has no further information on DCC and PDNPA views.*
- *The web as a whole has no more relevant information than BBC reports saying that:*

A spokesman for the Peak District National Park Authority said any proposal would need to ensure that a rail line was "not detrimental to the landscape features of the national park", as well as providing a cycling and walking trail'

and,

Peak District National Park Authority's conservation and planning director John Scott said the railway line and the trail were "incompatible"."It's hard to see how you can have the railway back and have the trail experience as it is at the moment," he said.

Please be clear that here I am not criticising the nature of DCC's and PDNPA's views on P&DR's proposals. My criticism is that DDDC is seeking to note the views of DCC and PDNPA without giving any citations to its descriptions of those views. I would expect councillors to seek such citations before agreeing to note anything. Any citations that DDDC can share with me would be welcome please.

Related observations

It would serve democracy better if any views that DCC and PDNPA do have on P&DR's proposals or on the re-opening of the Derby/Matlock to Manchester rail route more generally are shared with the public via their websites.

The search engine on DCC's website is not fit for purpose and should be replaced. My search on "rail" produced a 19-page list of items the majority of which clearly have nothing to do with rail. My close inspection of one of the silliest ones, namely "Banana Loaf Recipe" (one of many recipes flagged), failed even to find the letters "rail" embedded within any of its words.

RESPONSE

Officers have asked both Derbyshire County Council and the Peak District National Park Authority if they are willing for their letters on this matter to be made public. Should they allow it, we will place them on the District Council's website.

296/20 – INTERESTS

Councillor David Chapman declared a personal interest in Item 9.

297/20 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Councillor Richard Fitzherbert seconded by Councillor Andrew Shirley and

RESOLVED	That the Minutes of the Derbyshire Dales District Council held on	
	Council	21 January 2021
	Council – Extraordinary Meeting	4 February 2021
	Council – Budget	4 March 2021

be approved as a correct record:

RESOLVED (unanimously) That the minutes of the Council Meetings listed in the Minute book for the period 21 January 2021 to 9 March 2021 be received

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

Councillor Colin Swindell joined the meeting 18:07

298/20 - LEADERS' ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Gary Purdy Leader of the Council, made the following statement:

"I first of all want to thank Paul and the CLT Team for the Organisational Update recently circulated. Once again it reveals the extensive amount of work that is being carried out by Staff in this Authority and during very difficult times.

Whilst we might be celebrating the success of the Government Vaccination programme, the recent out-break of the Covid infection at HMP Sudbury reminds us not to be complacent and to be always on our guard. Unfortunately a number of staff in our Clean & Green Team have reported symptoms of the virus and this of course has a knock on effect and team isolation.

There are still very many challenges ahead before we can consider that life is back to normal. Plans are in place to help follow the Government guidelines on the gradual re-opening of businesses in the next few weeks.

I also want to re-emphasise a message circulated by our Communications Manager, Jim Fearn, with regard to the scam recently discovered in Wirksworth. People should be aware that our Revenues Team have received calls from Council Tax payers in the Wirksworth area about phone calls and emails claiming to advise of a Council Tax refund. This is a SCAM so please beware.

Excellent and quick footed work by our Community Development Team resulted in a £110,000 award that DDDC will pass on to Freedom Leisure. Very well done to the team involved.

The Chief Executive and CLT are closely examining the recent announcement on further grant funding from Government under the Levelling up scheme. Please be assured that we are looking very closely at what can be achieved in the timescale, which is very tight and according to the Prospectus which has to be rigidly followed.

At Lunchtime on Tuesday 2nd March I had the pleasure of meeting up with Rob Cogings, Cllr Steve Flitter and Father Brian Smith acting on behalf of Matlock Town Council at the historic Almshouses on Causeway Lane, Matlock. Derbyshire Dales District Council has invested £250,000 grant funding into an innovative project to upgrade the Almshouses. It was really

pleasing to see the fantastic change to these properties not only with modern appliances, but with superb green energy improvements including 32 solar panels, insulated floors and triple glazed windows.

The properties were built in 1895 so one can imagine the amount of work required to bring the properties up to modern living standards. One only has to look at the beaming smile of Father Brian Smith to see what it meant to help keep the memory of Margaret Harrison's gift to the community alive.

Well done once again to Rob and the Housing team and I know that Rob is already working on improving the other Almshouses in our area."

299/20 - CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Councillor Helen Froggatt advised the Council there were no announcements

300/20 – COMMITTEES

It was moved by Councillor Richard Fitzherbert seconded by Councillor Andrew Shirley and

RESOLVED That the non-exempt minutes of the Committees listed in the Minute
(unanimously) book for the period 21 January 2021 to 9 March 2021 be received

301/20 - QUESTIONS (RULE OF PROCEDURE 15)

Questions from Councillor Clare Gamble to Councillor Garry Purdy, Leader of the Council:

“Q1. The council received a complaint on 5th November 2020, that councillors in the Conservative group voted in a predetermined fashion in choosing a location for the Traveller site, when they voted through the Knabhall Lane, Tansley, site as the only site for consideration at the meeting held on 3rd September 2020. I understand other complaints are progressing, so could the council provide an update on the progress of this complaint?”

Councillor Purdy provided a verbal response:

Thank you for your question. The assessment of such complaints is delegated to the Monitoring Officer or his deputies, in consultation with one of the Council's Independent Persons. The Deputy Monitoring Officer, following consultation with the Independent Person, decided that there was insufficient evidence to suggest a direct breach of the Code had taken place in respect of the complaint to which you refer and no further action should be taken as a result of the allegations.

“Q2. Can the leader of the Conservative Group answer the question.....? Has your group taken a predetermined position on the Gritstone Road planning application in Matlock?”

Councillor Purdy provided a verbal response:

Thank you for your question. As you know, every planning application must be determined according to its merits and various planning policies and representations received from statutory consultees. Members of any political group or none, when considered a planning application as a member of the Planning Committee, should not participate if they have pre-determined the matter. I am not aware of any Member having stated that they have pre-determined this matter, although I am aware of a number of Members across the authority whose views on this application are well known and would likely be considered by a reasonable observer to be biased in respect of this matter.

“Q3. Last week was International Women’s Day, this year, celebrating women in leadership positions. It was completely ignored by this council. Can the council say whether this is reflective of the lack of women in senior roles in this authority, having only one female member of the Corporate Leadership Team, and all male group leaders? Also, is it reflective of the ambivalent attitude it appears to have to sexist behaviour when exhibited within the council?”

Councillor Purdy provided a verbal response.

Thank you for your question. The focus of the Council’s leadership has been on responding to the pandemic, but I think in future years we could do more to join the global celebrations of the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women.

The facts that we should not ignore are that the Deputy Leader of the Council and the Chair of the Governance and Resources Committee, which are both key political offices within this Council, are held by women. The Council’s previous Chief Executive was also a woman and the previous Monitoring Officer was a woman. The Council also publishes equality information which shows a Gender Pay Gap of £234.83 in favour of female staff. These facts demonstrate that the District Council is an organisation which is not ambivalent on gender equality.

302/20 – PROPOSAL OF A NOTICE OF MOTION (RULE OF PROCEDURE 16)

MOTION

The Council debated the following Motion, submitted by Councillor Jason Atkin, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 16

Motion:

“That this Council recognise the commitment shown by all staff at this Authority.

And that a one off payment is made to every employee of the Authority irrespective of position or pay scale, by way of recognition of their hard work and commitment.

The payment suggested being £150 and is payed at the next cycle of salary payments. This payment will be met out of the Covid-19 Additional Burdens Monies we have received from Central Government and will not impact on the financial burden to this Authority.”

Councillor David Chapman left the meeting for this Item. All officers present at the meeting, other than the Monitoring Officer, left the meeting during consideration of the motion.

Councillor Jason Atkin introduced the Motion and requested a recorded vote.

Members debated the motion and all Members expressed their appreciation to staff for their hard work and goodwill during the challenging last 12 months.

It was moved by Councillor Jason Atkin seconded by Councillor Chris Furness and

RESOLVED

- Voting:**
- For:** Councillors, Jason Atkin, Richard Bright, Sue Bull, Neil Buttle, Tom Donnelly, Graham Elliott, Richard Fitzherbert, Helen Froggatt, Chris Furness, Alyson Hill, Susan Hobson, Stuart Lees, Tony Morley, Michele Morley, Peter O'Brien, Garry Purdy, Mike Ratcliffe, Mark Salt, Andrew Shirley, Peter Slack, Andrew Statham, Alasdair Sutton, Colin Swindell, and Mark Wakeman.
- Against:** Councillors, Jacqueline Allison, Robert Archer, Martin Burfoot, Sue Burfoot, Steve Flitter, Clare Gamble, David Hughes, Steve Wain
- Abstain** Councillor Matthew Buckler

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED

303/20 – MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2021/22 TO 2025/26 (Deferred Item 11 from 04/03/2021)

Council considered a report seeking approval of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2021/22 to 2025/26 and agreement that when setting budgets for 2021/22 and beyond, wherever possible, spending be focused on the Council's corporate priorities. And also considered approval for the approach, as set out in the MTFS, for achieving the savings required to set balanced budgets i.e. that there would be a hold on any significant service reductions until the outcome of the funding / business rates reviews were known

It was moved by Councillor Andrew Statham, seconded by Councillor Alasdair Sutton and

RESOLVED (Unanimously)

1. That approval is given to the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2021/22 to 2025/26, attached as Appendix 1 to this report;
2. That Council agrees that, when setting budgets for 2021/22 and beyond, spending should be focused on the Council's corporate priorities, wherever possible;
3. That approval is given to the approach set out in the Medium Term Financial Strategy for achieving the savings required to set balanced budgets i.e. that there will be a hold on any significant service reductions until the outcome of the funding / business rates reviews is known.

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

Councillor Rose left the meeting 19:22

304/20 – CAPITAL STRATEGY REPORT FOR 2021/22 (Deferred Item 12 from 04/03/2021)

Council considered a report seeking approval of the District Council's Capital Strategy Report for 2021/22

It was moved by Councillor Andrew Shirley, seconded by Councillor Alyson Hill and

RESOLVED That the Capital Strategy Report for 2021/22 is approved.
(unanimously)

Voting	In favour	33
	Against	0
	Abstain	0

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

305/20 – TREASURY MANAGEMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT 2021/22 (Deferred Item 13 from 04/03/2021)

Council considered a report seeking approval of the Treasury Management Strategy Statement, the Annual Treasury Management Investment Strategy and the MRP policy and Prudential indicators (as set out in Appendix 1) for 2021/22.

It was moved by Councillor Jason Atkin, seconded by Councillor Mark Wakeman and

RESOLVED 1. That the Corporate Investment Strategy for 2021/22 be approved.
(Unanimously) 2. That the Commercial Investment Strategy for 2021/22 be approved.

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

306/20 – CORPORATE INVESTMENT STRATEGY AND COMMERCIAL INVESTMENT STRATEGY FOR 2021/22 (Deferred Item 14 from 04/03/2021)

Council considered a report seeking approval for the Corporate Investment Strategy and Commercial Investment Strategy for 2021/22.

It was moved by Councillor Tony Morley, seconded by Councillor Michelle Morley and

RESOLVED 1. That the Corporate Investment Strategy for 2021/22 be approved.
(Unanimously) 2. That the Commercial Investment Strategy for 2021/22 be approved.

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

305/20 – CHANGES IN POLITICAL BALANCE AND POLITICAL GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Council received a report updating Members of the membership of political groups on the Council and report on the change to the political balance of the authority

On 19 January 2021, Councillors Richard Bright and Graham Elliott confirmed that they had formed a group with the existing Conservative Group, made up of 19 councillors. The new group would be known as the ‘Conservative Group and Councillors Richard Bright and Graham Elliott’. This group was made up of 21 Members, which meant that it was the majority group on the Council.

On 27 February 2021, Councillor Joyce Pawley sadly passed away and the Council paid silent tribute to the memory of Councillor Mrs Pawley at its meeting on 4 March 2021. It was also verbally reported to that meeting that Councillor Elisa McDonagh had resigned as a councillor on 3 March 2021. The arising two vacancies has reduced the Labour Group to 3 Members

Given that there were two vacant seats on the Council and the relative proximity to the Annual Meeting of the Council, it was not recommended that the Council review the entitlement to seats on committees at the meeting. A report would be presented to the Annual Meeting, following the by-elections to fill the vacancies, which will invite the Council to agree a new seat entitlement for each political group.

The effect of these changes means that no political group is in overall control of the authority and the political balance of the Council was presently:

Name of Group	Designated Leader	Number of Members
Conservative and Councillors Richard Bright and Graham Elliott	Councillor Purdy	21
Green and Independent	Councillor Buttle	5
Labour	Councillor Ratcliffe	3
Liberal Democrat	Councillor Flitter	7

It was noted that Councillor Swindell was not in a political group and for the purposes of the report he was described as a non-aligned Member.

Under the Members’ Allowances Scheme, special responsibility allowances are paid to the two largest minority group leaders. With the Labour Group now having 3 Members, Councillor Ratcliffe would no longer be in receipt of a special responsibility allowance as a minority group leader.

The change in group membership arising from Councillor Bright and Elliott’s decision to form an alliance with the Conservative Group to become a single political group also had the effect of increasing the allowance paid to Councillor Purdy from £11,331 from £11,793, and consequently the allowance paid to Councillor Hobson from £5,781 to £5,897.

Councillors Neil Buttle, Steve Flitter, Susan Hobson, Garry Purdy, and Mike Ratcliffe declared an interest and did not vote on this item.

It was moved by Councillor Sue Bull, seconded by Councillor Andrew Shirley and

RESOLVED

1. That the operation of four political groups on the Council and the detail of their designated Leaders be noted:
 - (a) Conservative Group and Councillors Richard Bright and Graham Elliott – Councillor Garry Purdy (Leader of the Council)
 - (b) Green and Independent Group – Councillor Neil Buttle
 - (c) Labour Group – Councillor Mike Ratcliffe
 - (d) Liberal Democrat Group – Councillor Steve Flitter

2. That the following special responsibility allowances be paid:
 - (a) Councillor Purdy - £11,793 (effective from 19 January 2021)
 - (b) Councillor Flitter - £1,617
 - (c) Councillor Buttle - £1,115
 - (d) Councillor Hobson - £5,897 (effective from 19 January 2021)

Voting	In favour	28
	Against	0
	Abstain	1

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

19:47 The Chairman declared an 8 minute comfort break

Councillors Steve Flitter and Mike Ratcliffe left the meeting

Meeting re convened 19:55

306/20 – DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY – TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS TO PARISH COUNCILS

Council considered a report seeking approval to delegate authority to the Director of Corporate and Customer Services to make temporary appointments to Birchover and Mappleton parish councils, which were inquorate and unable to act.

The quorum for any meeting of either Birchover or Mappleton Parish Council was three. Birchover Parish Council required three temporary councillors to be appointed and Mappleton Parish Council was in need of one temporary councillor to become quorate again.

Birchover Parish Council had not yet signed off its Statement of Accounts for the previous financial year, and was therefore at risk of a Public Interest Report being published if the Parish Council was not able to act. Similarly, Mappleton Parish Council had financial matters that need to be transacted by a quorate council. On this basis, it was necessary for the District Council to consider delegating authority to the Director of Corporate and Customer

Services to make temporary appointments to the parishes until the vacancies were filled under the power it has under Section 91 of the Local Government Act 1972. The use of this power is a function reserved to Council, which had not been delegated to an officer. The decision to delegate authority therefore had to be made by the Council.

Councillor Atkin raised the question on what provision there was for meetings after 7 May 2021.

The Director of Corporate and Customer Service informed Members:

“The current position is that the Government has done nothing to date to suggest that virtual meetings will be able to continue after 7 May 2021.

The Association of Democratic Services Officers and Lawyers in Local Government have issued a claim in the High Court to allow the continuation of remote meetings. The claim also included an application to expedite the proceedings before 6 May 2021. From conversations I’ve had with colleagues at ADSO in the past 48 hours, I do not think we are likely to see a rapid consideration of the case and it may be very late before the deadline before any conclusion is reached. I will be bringing a paper to the Council meeting on 22 April setting out how we intend to manage this situation at the District Council.”

It was moved by Councillor Helen Froggatt, seconded by Councillor Chris Furness and

RESOLVED
(Unanimously)

That authority be delegated to the Director of Corporate and Customer Services to make the necessary order to appoint temporary Parish Councillors to serve on Birchover Parish Council and Mappleton Parish Council that are inquorate and unable to act until such time as an election or co-option can be held and those elected or co-opted have taken up office;

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED

307/20 – LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOUNDARY COMMISSION FOR ENGLAND’S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEW ELECTORAL ARRANGMENTS AND WARD BOUNDARIES IN THE DERBYSHIRE DALES

Council received a report to note the draft recommendations of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England’s (LGBCE) in respect of proposed electoral arrangements for Derbyshire Dales District Council..

The LGBCE had reported that it received 51 submissions in response to the consultation on ward boundaries. In making its recommendations, the LGBCE had stated that it had taken into account local evidence received, as well as individual and collective submissions from political groups and parties.

The draft recommendations were for four three-councillor wards, five two-councillor wards and 12 one-councillor wards, and the Commission considered that its recommendations would provide for good electoral equality whilst reflecting community identities and interests based on the evidence received during the consultation.

On 2 February 2021, the LGBCE commenced the consultation on its draft recommendations for electoral arrangements in the Derbyshire Dales. The consultation was due to cease on

12 April 2021, after which the LGBCE would analyse submissions and begin to form its final recommendations, which would then be published formally on 29 June 2021.

Councillor Gamble questioned why the Authority wasn't making any recommendation.

The Director of Corporate and Customer Services informed Members that the proposals had been considered from a service delivery perspective, which had not presented any concerns, but it was not considered likely that a unified position on the recommendations could be agreed between the political groups of the Council. However, if Members were able to reach a consensus and agreed that by way of a vote, then that would enable the Council to submit a response.

Councillor Purdy encouraged Members to reply to the consultation before 12 April 2021 if they had not already done so.

It was moved by Councillor Garry Purdy, seconded by Councillor Susan Hobson and

RESOLVED That the draft recommendations of the Local Government Boundary Commission for England in respect proposed electoral arrangements for Derbyshire Dales District Council be noted.

Voting	In favour	26
	Against	4
	Abstain	2

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

308/20 – MOTION TO CONTINUE

It was moved by Councillor Jason Atkin, seconded by Councillor Michelle Morley and

RESOLVED That, in accordance with Rule of Procedure 13, the meeting continue beyond 2 hours 30 minutes to enable the business on the agenda to be concluded.
(Unanimously)

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

Councillor Mark Salt left the meeting at 20:33

309/20 – PEAKS AND DALES RAILWAY – MANCHESTER AND EAST MIDLANDS RAIL ACTION PARTNERSHIP

The Council received a report to note the views of Derbyshire County Council and the Peak District National Park Authority, over the proposals being advocated by Peaks and Dales Rail to re-open the railway line from Matlock to Manchester.

Members debated the report and supported Derbyshire County Council and the Peak District National Park Authority views and requested the wording to be changed to 'Endorse and note'

The Chair asked the Proposer and seconder if they accepted the wording and it was moved with the change of wording.

It was moved by Councillor Helen Froggatt, seconded by Councillor Jason Atkin and

RESOLVED That the views of Derbyshire County Council and the Peak District
(Unanimously) National Park Authority be noted and endorsed.

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED

Prior to the vote Councillor Andrew Statham left the meeting at 20:40 and Councillor Andrew Shirley left the meeting at 20:45

310/20 – SEALING OF DOCUMENTS

It was moved by Councillor Stuart Lees, seconded by Councillor Colin Swindell and

RESOLVED That the common seal of the Council be affixed to those documents,
(Unanimously) if any, required to complete transactions undertaken by Committees or by way of delegated authority to officers since the last meeting of the Council.

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED

MEETING CLOSED 20:50

CHAIRMAN