

Council18th June, 2015PRESENT:-

The Lord Mayor (in the Chair).
 Deputy Lord Mayor (D. C.);
 Councillor J. F. Abbott, Councillor P. Allen, Councillor S. Armstrong,
 Councillor R. Barrett, Councillor S. J. Bayes, Councillor S. Belcher,
 Councillor A. K. Bell, Councillor J. A. Black, Councillor M. Brabazon,
 Councillor S. Brady, Councillor D. Brown, Councillor L. Chambers,
 Councillor A. Clark, Councillor P. D. Clark, Councillor C. A. Clarkson,
 Councillor J. Conner, Councillor D. A. Craker, Councillor J. Dad, Councillor
 A. M. Dorton, Councillor J. L. Fareham, Councillor L. Fudge, Councillor N.
 Fudge, Councillor A. D. Gardiner, Councillor T. Geraghty, Councillor M. E.
 Glew, Councillor D. R. Hale, Councillor D. Hatcher, Councillor H. Herrera-
 Richmond, Councillor J. A. Hewitt, Councillor C. Inglis, Councillor R. M.
 Jones, Councillor G. Kennett, Councillor G. Lunn, Councillor M. C. Mancey,
 Councillor E. Mann, Councillor K. E. Mathieson, Councillor T. J. McVie,
 Councillor G. R. Nicola, Councillor M. H. O'Mullane, Councillor R.
 Pantelakis, Councillor C. E. Payne, Councillor R. D. Payne, Councillor L. M.
 Petrini, Councillor C. Quinn, Councillor M. J. Ross, Councillor H. J. Spencer,
 Councillor C. Thomas, Councillor M. Thompson, Councillor A. Williams and
 Councillor S. Wilson.

APOLOGIES:-

Councillor H. R. Clay, Councillor T. E. Keal, Councillor J. I. Korczak Fields,
 Councillor D. J. McCobb, Councillor C. A. Sumpton, Councillor K. W. Turner
 and Councillor P. J. Webster,

Minute No.	Description/Decision	Action By/Deadline
PROCEDURAL ITEMS		
17	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillor Lunn declared a personal interest in minute 25, insofar as she had been a member of the City Council's Independent Remuneration Panel which had reviewed the City Council's Member Allowances Scheme, prior to being elected as a member of the City Council, and did not speak or vote on this matter.</p> <p>Councillor Hale declared a personal interest in minute 25, insofar as he was a member of the Local Government Pension Scheme.</p> <p>Councillor Fareham declared a personal interest in minute 25, insofar as he had previously been a</p>	Members and Council Information Team Leader

	member of the Local Government Pension Scheme.	
18	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Agreed – That, the minutes of the meeting of the City Council, held on 21st May, 2015, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and correctly recorded and be signed by the Chair.</p>	
19	<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>	
20	<p>MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND JOINT COMMITTEES</p> <p>Moved by Councillor McVie and seconded by the Deputy Lord Mayor:</p> <p>That Councillor Thompson be appointed to a Labour vacancy on the Planning Committee.</p> <p>That Councillor Herrera-Richmond be appointed to the Labour vacancy on the Hull History Centre Board.</p> <p>That Councillor Pantelakis be appointed as a trustee of the Charterhouse.</p> <p>That Councillor Brown replaces Councillor Glew on the Mother Humber Memorial Fund.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
NON-EXEMPT ITEMS		
21	<p>EXCLUDED PETITION</p> <p>The Town Clerk submitted details of a petition that had been presented to the City Council, but had been excluded from the City Council’s Petition Scheme. The petition was entitled “We are Seeking the Help of Hull City Council to Resurface the Road/Pathway Leading to the Houses of Rutland Terrace in Sutton Village”. Section 11 of the Scheme stated that a petition “must relate to something the Council has responsibility for or</p>	Town Clerk

	<p>can reasonably and proportionately influence to create an improvement in the economic, social or environmental well-being of the local area". The Highways Section had advised that, as the road/pathway was unadopted, this was not a matter the Council could influence. The lead petitioner and the Ward Councillors had been informed.</p> <p>Agreed – That the excluded petition be noted.</p>	
22	<p>LEADER'S STATEMENT</p> <p>The Leader began his statement and commented on his visit to Hessle Road to commemorate the gaining of rights for Trawlermen; the recent sad death of Charles Kennedy MP; the recently agreed planning applications for the Siemens development on Greenport Hull; the City's proposed cruise terminal; how an improving economy would drive poverty out of the City; the jobs and opportunities provided by an improving economy; City of Culture 2017; the exciting planning applications for the City which would soon become public knowledge; new hotels in the City; the Government's emergency budget due in July, 2015, and the devolution of power from Westminster.</p> <p>Councillor Fareham replied to the Leader's statement and commented on the general feeling of the Leader's Statement; future structures in the City; the devolution of power from Westminster; the proposals for a Mayor for the whole of Yorkshire; the optimism for the future of Hull, and the recent sad death of Charles Kennedy MP.</p> <p>Councillor Ross replied to the Leader's statement and commented on the recent sad death of Charles Kennedy MP; the spate of recent arson attacks in the City; Combined Authorities, and the Government's emergency budget due in July, 2015.</p> <p>Agreed – That the Leader's Statement, and the responses to that Statement, be noted.</p>	
23	<p>QUESTIONS (WITH WRITTEN NOTICE) TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET, CHAIRS OF COMMITTEES AND OTHERS</p> <p>Questions concerning the vetting of teachers and other staff using the Disclosure and Barring Service; recent</p>	

	<p>issues raised regarding Private Hire licensing; the continuation of the Independent Commission of Inquiry; the opening of the Gipsyville Community Centre; the former depot on Gower Road; trends for Area Committees; fluoridation of water; the contract for the land train in East Park; the process for planning events in the City's parks; budget savings for the Library Service for 2015/16; current and future issues to be tackled by the Portfolio Holder: Neighbourhoods and Communities; the recent spate of arson attacks in the City, and whether Victoria Dock was being considered as a site for a cruise ship terminal were asked by elected members and answered by the relevant office holder.</p> <p>Agreed – That the questions and answers be received.</p>	
24	<p>COUNCIL CONSTITUTION – ANNUAL REVIEW</p> <p>The Town Clerk and Monitoring Officer submitted a report which recommended amendments to the Council's Constitution as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Brady and seconded by Councillor McVie:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That, the amendments to the Constitution, set out at Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of the report, be adopted by the Council, with effect from 18th June, 2015, and shall continue in force unless and until amended or superseded by any new arrangements adopted by the Council, and b) that the amendments to the Council and Executive Scheme of Delegation, arising from the creation of Hull Culture and Leisure Limited, for the delivery of culture and leisure services referred to in paragraph 4.2 of the report, be approved. <p>Moved by Councillor Thomas and seconded by Councillor C. E. Payne as an amendment:</p> <p>The motion with the following amendments:</p> <p>Amend paragraph 4.6.2.5 of Part B - Council and Executive Scheme of Delegation to read:</p>	Town Clerk

4.6.2.5 An Area Committee has the power to require the attendance of members or officers at Area Committee meetings.

Amend paragraphs 14.1, 14.3, 14.4 and 15.1 of Part C4 - Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules to read:

14.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Commissions and Area Committees may scrutinise and review decisions made or actions taken in connection with the discharge of any function of the Council. The committee or a commission may review documentation and may require:

- any member of the Cabinet,
- the Chief Executive
- Director/Chief Operating Officer
- City Manager
- Assistant City Manager
- Any officer below Assistant City Manager level (but only following consultation with any of the officers referred to above by the chair of the area committee, scrutiny committee or commission requiring the attendance and agreement having been reached that the attendance is necessary and appropriate) to attend and answer questions on matters within their area of responsibility and concerning:

14.3 Where any member or officer is required to attend the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Commissions and Area Committees, the chair of that body will inform the Chief Executive who shall then inform the member or officer in writing giving at least five clear working days notice of the meeting at which he/she is required to attend. The notice will provide a summary of the matter and indicate whether any documentation is required to be made available. Where the production of a report is required the member or officer concerned will be given sufficient notice to allow for preparation of the report.

14.4 Where, in exceptional circumstances, the member or officer is unable to attend on the required date, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Commissions and Area Committees, in consultation with the member or officer concerned, arrange an alternative date.

	<p>15.1 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, Overview and Scrutiny Commissions and Area Committees may invite any person, not including a person referred to in rule 14.1 above, to address the committee or commission, raise issues of local concern and/or answer questions. The committee or a commission may hear from residents, stakeholders and members and officers from other public sector bodies and shall invite such people to attend recognising that their attendance cannot be required.</p> <p>Councillors Fareham, Williams, McVie, Ross, Abbott, Allen and Hale also spoke on the amendment.</p> <p>Councillor Thomas then exercised her right of reply on the amendment.</p> <p>Amendment lost.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor McVie and seconded by Councillor Hale as a further amendment:</p> <p>The motion with the following amendment:</p> <p>That paragraph 4.6.2.5 of Part B of the Constitution be amended, so that it reads “An Area Committee does not have the powers of a Scrutiny Commission to require the attendance of members or officers at Area Committee meetings, however, an Area Committee has the power to call for the attendance of a relevant officer in support of a report to the Area Committee where said Committee is due to make a decision permitted under the delegated powers from the Constitution. The determination of a ‘relevant officer’ should be in agreement with the Town Clerk.”.</p> <p>Councillors Fareham and Williams also spoke on the further amendment.</p> <p>Further amendment carried. Substantive motion carried.</p>	
25	<p>REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL’S MEMBER ALLOWANCES SCHEME</p> <p>(Councillor Lunn declared a personal interest in minute 25, insofar as she had been a member of the City Council’s Independent Remuneration Panel which had</p>	Town Clerk

reviewed the City Council's Member Allowances Scheme, prior to being elected as a member of the City Council, and did not speak or vote on this matter.

Councillor Hale declared a personal interest in minute 25, insofar as he was a member of the Local Government Pension Scheme.

Councillor Fareham declared a personal interest in minute 25, insofar as he had previously been a member of the Local Government Pension Scheme.)

The Town Clerk and Monitoring Officer submitted, on behalf of the Independent Remuneration Panel, a report which provided recommendations arising from the four yearly review of the City Council's Member Allowances Scheme by the Independent Remuneration Panel.

Members commented on paragraph 5.1(v) of the report concerning the security of tenure for their inclusion in the Local Government Pension Scheme.

Moved by Councillor Hale and seconded by Councillor McVie as an amended motion:

- a) That, the Member Allowances Scheme be approved as amended at Appendix 1 of the report, save that paragraph 5.1(v) of the report to the City Council's Independent Remuneration Panel be referred back to the Panel for further consideration, as elected members were not aware that there was no security of tenure for their inclusion in the Local Government Pension Scheme, and
- b) that the scheme be subject to an interim review in 2017 to ensure that no unfairness is arising from its application.

Councillors Fareham and Ross also spoke on the amended motion.

Councillor Hale then exercised his right of reply on the amended motion.

Motion carried.

26	<p>ADJOURNMENT</p> <p>The meeting stood adjourned at 11.45 a.m. and reconvened at 11.55 a.m.</p>	
27	<p>CHAIR</p> <p>At this point, the Lord Mayor left the meeting to undertake a civic engagement and the Deputy Lord Mayor took the Chair.</p>	
28	<p>ORDER OF BUSINESS</p> <p>Moved by the Deputy Lord Mayor and seconded by Councillor McVie:</p> <p>That, under paragraph 10.1.2 of the Council Procedure Rules, the motion concerning 'Conflict-Free Hull', be taken as next business.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	
29	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Jones and seconded by Councillor Thomas:</p> <p>Council notes the request from Mike Riley from 'Conflict-Free Hull' and the Student Ambassadors from Sirius Academy and Thomas Ferens Academy that Kingston upon Hull becomes a 'Conflict-Free City' by resolution of the Full Council.</p> <p>Council notes that the International Rescue Committee has found more than 5.4 million civilians have been killed and countless more remain at risk as a consequence of attacks conducted by armed groups in eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo.</p> <p>Council notes trade in conflict minerals – gold, tin, tungsten, and tantalum – is one of the primary drivers of conflict in eastern Congo.</p> <p>Council resolves that where the Council procures electronic products which contain gold, tin, tantalum, and tungsten from the Democratic Republic of the Congo or an adjoining country it will to the extent legally permissible consider in the procurement process whether such products contain 'conflict</p>	Town Clerk

	<p>minerals', and to the extent permissible in law, will favour verifiably conflict-free products or companies making greater progress towards this goal and calls on companies from all sectors in the City to follow this lead.</p> <p>Council further resolves to call on electronic companies and other industries to take the necessary steps to invest in ethical mineral resourcing from the eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo and calls upon Central Government to help establish an international certification system for minerals coming from Central Africa.</p> <p>Councillors Fareham, Glew, Hale, Nicola, Bell, O'Mullane and Abbott also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Councillor Jones then exercised her right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried unanimously.</p>	
30	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Fareham and seconded by Councillor Mancey as an amended motion:</p> <p>Council notes that previously the Department for Transport advised that their consent was for signs to enforce against parking on verges but that, following local research, it now appears that the Council could introduce a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on its own cognizance.</p> <p>Council notes the Department for Transport has not gain said this.</p> <p>Council notes that one way forward may be to be to bring in a TRO to prohibit parking on specific sections of verges in certain streets (just like a TRO for double yellow lines). Supported by Department for Transport approved traffic signs to Diag. 637.1 at the start and finish of the length of verge affected and with repeater signs every 30 yards.</p> <p>Council further notes there are two main variants of the Diag. 637.1 sign; - the Diag. 636 symbol prohibiting 'waiting' on a grass verge and/or footway and allowing loading/unloading. Alternatively the Diag.642 symbol</p>	Town Clerk/ City Streetscene Manager

prohibits 'stopping' on the grass verge and/or footway and as well as loading and unloading.

Council notes that we employ Civil Enforcement Officers to enforce prohibition of stopping orders and can enforce on verges if a prohibition of stopping traffic regulation order supported by Diag.637.1 signs varied to incorporate the Diag.642 symbol, was put in place but recognise it is not possible to implement a TRO to prevent verge parking unless every section of verge concerned has the appropriate signs although in smaller areas the use of bollards, rocks, or other obstacles is probably more effective and reduces the need for enforcement .

Additionally Council is aware of the problem caused by driving on verges.

Whilst council recognises may be possible to prosecute the drivers of vehicles parked on grass verges under s.25 of the Kingston upon Hull Act, 1984. which makes it an offence to drive or ride a vehicle on certain land including grass verges forming part of or adjacent to the highway when notices are displayed prohibiting such actions. This could involve a prosecution of the driver of the vehicle in the Magistrates' Court and may attract a maximum of a £500 fine.

However under the Kingston upon Hull Act of 1984 the offence is 'driving' rather 'parking' on the verge there are practical difficulties obtaining a successful prosecution under the Act making it to obtain evidence of a person physically driving the vehicle onto or off the verge. The Act makes no provision that the owner or registered keeper of the vehicle is liable for the offence unless it can be proved that he or she drove it onto the verge; which is further compounded by the fact that there is no provision for officers issuing Fixed Penalty Notices) for the offence. As a result prosecution of the driver in the Magistrates' Court would be necessary and for such a prosecution to be successful it would be necessary to obtain evidence proving beyond reasonable doubt that an identified individual actually drove a vehicle on the verge.

Council, along with many citizens recognises that damage caused to a grassed area by a vehicle is an offence under section 1 of the Criminal Damage Act, 1971. A Fixed Penalty Notice (FPN) of £75 can be issued for this offence under s.43 of the Anti-social

Behaviour Act, 2003, because it is a relevant offence under s.44 (1) (c).

However the parking on or driving across, a grassed area is not in itself an offence under s.1 Criminal Damage Act, 1971, where it is marking or damaging the grassed area which constitutes the offence. To ensure a successful punishment any Enforcing Officer would need to witness a vehicle actually causing marks on the grassed area and identify the actual driver of the vehicle (where identification relying on the registered keeper from the vehicle registration number is not sufficient).

Equally damage to a grass verge forming part of highway (i.e. a verge between footpath and road) is also an offence under s.132 of the Highways Act, 1980, because it is an unauthorised mark on the surface of the highway; making it a relevant offence under s.44 (1) (e) of the Anti-Social Behaviour Act, 2003, and an FPN can be issued under s.43 of the Anti Social Behaviour Act.

Council understands that whilst the Criminal Damage Act offence may be more useful, because it is not limited to the highway and can include grassed areas not forming part of the highway, it is evidentially useful to obtain photos of damage caused by the car's tyres and if the grassed area has been churned up by car tyres over a period of time, it may be difficult to prove that the driver has caused specific damage unless it is actually witnessed by an Officer.

Council notes the reluctance of the constabulary to become involved in such matters, largely because of the fact the Council has civil enforcement powers and the Constabulary then argue all verge matters are the responsibility of the council. However it is an offence under s.34 of the Road Traffic Act, 1988, to drive a vehicle on land not forming part of the road as well as an offence to park a car so that it is causing an obstruction or danger which, Council understands is a matter for the police to enforce such Road Traffic Act offences rather than the officers of the Council.

So, against that complicated legal background what are the outcomes? Council believes that. Whether for driving on verges or damage to verges, the evidential test for issuing FPNs is "reasonably expect to believe" and the evidential test for a prosecution for failing to

	<p>consequently pay is “beyond reasonable doubt”. However the issuing of FPNs is discretionary and it is possible to proceed straight to prosecution instead in appropriate circumstances and although there is no obligation to pay a FPN and no appeal procedure against it payment of an FPN simply discharges the person of any liability for being prosecuted and failure to pay could result in prosecution for the offence.</p> <p>Council believes this system is unduly complicated, has grown organically rather than as a result of radical review of the legal and policy framework, and is not understood by the public. As a result some citizens are not following the law, and many citizens then regard the council as not upholding and enforcing the law. Council further believes that, in the City of Culture, grass verges are as much a part of the Hull street-scene as trees and we must send out a clear message that the public realm will be defended.</p> <p>Council therefore instructs officers to bring forward a report to Scrutiny containing a raft of proposals for tackling this situation, and to do so by September, 2015. Such proposals are to include, but may not be confined to, amending the local Act, bye-laws, a policy for which signs will be used, lobbying Parliament to make the enforcement process simpler, and a bar at which prosecutions will be sought. Other proposals in the Report should include, a review of if our Enforcement provision is sufficiently robustly staffed and funded, and how we can make the situation simpler so all may indeed understand duties and obligations as well as rights and privileges.</p> <p>Councillors Brown and C. E. Payne also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried unanimously.</p>	
31	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Quinn and seconded by Councillor Mathieson:</p> <p>Council notes that it has been over two years since the following motion was unanimously passed at the Budget Full Council meeting on 28th February, 2013:</p> <p>“Council notes that a living wage was first established</p>	City Human Resources Manager

in the UK in 2001. Currently the living wage rate is £7.45p per hour outside London (the “living wage”), calculated using incomes and prices data by the Centre for Research and Social Policy at Loughborough University.

Council believes that the national minimum wage was an important development to ensure a basic level of income for the lowest paid. However, given the cost of living the minimum wage is not enough for many individuals or families to avoid living in poverty.

Council also believes that as one of the City’s biggest employers, the Council can help promote the living wage in Hull by becoming a ‘living wage employer’. That the procurement strategy of the City Council can influence and encourage our partners in service delivery to uphold the same approach as ours.

Council resolves to promote the living wage across the City and will change the Council’s procurement processes to encourage contractors to adopt a similar position and as legislation permits insist that contractors provide the living wage.

Council requests that the Interim Chief Executive bring forward proposals that ensure that all employees receive at least the living wage as soon as is practicable and by no later than April, 2013, and explore agency staff receiving the living wage as part of the Budget process for 2013/14.

Council also requests that the Interim Chief Executive write to the Living Wage Foundation expressing Council’s support for their campaign.”

Council also notes that the Living Wage has increased to £7.85 (UK rate) since the motion was passed.

Council further notes that during the meeting on 28th February, 2013, the Council’s Twitter account announced that: ‘The Leader (Councillor Brady) supports the “living wage”.’

Council is concerned by the lack of action taken to implement the resolutions contained in the motion and the reputational damage such inaction will have undoubtedly caused.

Council is also concerned at proposals for a Hull Living

Wage which would be lower than the nationally set Living Wage. Adoption of a lower Hull Living Wage would send out the message to employers that it is acceptable to pay people living in Hull less than the rest of the country.

Council asks that a report be produced by the relevant portfolio holder and officers explaining why a motion, unanimously passed by Council, has not been acted upon.

Council reaffirms its commitment to the Living Wage and in particular the commitment contained in the motion, unanimously passed by Council on 28th February, 2013, that: "all employees receive at least the living wage as soon as is practicable."

Moved by Councillor Inglis and seconded by Councillor Spencer as an amendment:

The motion with the following amendments:

1st paragraph delete: "the following" and insert: "a".
1st paragraph after: "motion" insert: "to bring forward proposals that ensure that all employees receive at least the living wage"

Delete reproduction of previous Labour motion.

Except for final paragraph delete after "Council further notes that during the meeting on 28th February, 2013, the Council's Twitter account announced that: 'The Leader (Councillor Brady) supports the "living wage".'

And insert "Council notes that the Health and Wellbeing Board has commissioned work on implementing the Living Wage within the Council and across the City in other employment and resolves to support the Board and Cabinet in implementing the results of this work".

Councillors Brady, Bell, Williams and Allen also spoke on the amendment.

Councillor Inglis then exercised his right of reply on the amendment.

Amendment carried.

Substantive motion moved by Councillor Inglis and

	<p>seconded by Councillor Spencer:</p> <p>Council notes that it has been over two years since a motion to bring forward proposals that ensure that all employees receive at least the living wage was unanimously passed at the Budget Full Council meeting on 28th February, 2013:</p> <p>Council also notes that the Living Wage has increased to £7.85 (UK rate) since the motion was passed.</p> <p>Council further notes that during the meeting on 28th February, 2013, the Council’s Twitter account announced that: ‘The Leader (Councillor Brady) supports the “living wage”.</p> <p>Council notes that the Health and Wellbeing Board has commissioned work on implementing the Living Wage within the Council and across the City in other employment and resolves to support the Board and Cabinet in implementing the results of this work</p> <p>Council reaffirms its commitment to the Living Wage and in particular the commitment contained in the motion, unanimously passed by Council on 28th February, 2013, that “all employees receive at least the living wage as soon as is practicable”.</p> <p>Substantive motion carried.</p>	
32	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Dad and seconded by Councillor Kennett:</p> <p>Council notes that concerns have been raised by residents about the possibility that Hull’s water supply might be fluoridated.</p> <p>Council also notes that thousands of residents have either protested against, or signed a petition opposing, the potential of fluoridating the water supply.</p> <p>Council further notes that Labour councillors spoke in favour of a feasibility study into fluoridation of Hull’s water supply at a recent Health and Well-being Board meeting.</p> <p>Council asks that the concerns of residents be taken</p>	Director of Public Health and Adults

on board before any decision is made.

Council also asks that those making the decision about fluoridation make every effort to enter into a genuine dialogue with those residents who have concerns.

Moved by Councillor Inglis and seconded by Councillor Spencer as an amendment:

The motion with the following amendments:

Delete paragraphs 2 and 3 and insert:

“Council notes the unanimous decision of the Health and Well Being Board to commission a technical engineering feasibility study into fluoridation from Yorkshire Water, following the receipt of which a decision whether to proceed to making a proposal will occur, followed, if necessary, by a lengthy and wide-ranging statutory consultation process.”

Paragraph 4 - delete “...asks...” and insert “...notes...”.

Add new final paragraph:

“Council believes that prior to receiving this technical study populist politicking on this matter is neither helpful nor productive and urges all Members to refrain from the temptation to engage in this however badly their parties may have done in recent local elections.”.

Councillors Abbott and Ross also spoke on the amendment.

Moved by Councillor Hale and seconded by Councillor Brady:

That the motion be put.

Motion carried.

On the completion of the above vote, the vote on the original amendment was taken.

Amendment carried.

Substantive motion moved by Councillor Inglis and seconded by Councillor Spencer:

Council notes that concerns have been raised by

	<p>residents about the possibility that Hull's water supply might be fluoridated.</p> <p>Council notes the unanimous decision of the Health and Well Being Board to commission a technical engineering feasibility study into fluoridation from Yorkshire Water, following the receipt of which a decision whether to proceed to making a proposal will occur, followed, if necessary, by a lengthy and wide-ranging statutory consultation process.</p> <p>Council notes that the concerns of residents be taken on board before any decision is made.</p> <p>Council also asks that those making the decision about fluoridation make every effort to enter into a genuine dialogue with those residents who have concerns.</p> <p>Council believes that prior to receiving this technical study populist politicking on this matter is neither helpful nor productive and urges all Members to refrain from the temptation to engage in this however badly their parties may have done in recent local elections.</p> <p>Substantive motion carried.</p>	
--	--	--

Start: 10.00 a.m.
Finish: 2.00 p.m.