

Council

20th March, 2025

PRESENT:-

Councillor M. Collinson, Lord Mayor, in the Chair.
 Councillor Payne, Deputy Lord Mayor (D. C.);
 Councillors Beeson, Belcher, Bridges, Burton, Byrne, Cahill, Chambers, A. Collinson, Conner, Coward, Dad, Dearing, Dolman, Drake-Davis, Fudge, Gardiner, Grozav, Haines, Hale, Harper, Harrison, Healand, Henry, Herrera-Richmond, Hofman, Ieronimo, Jepmond, Kassim, Keal, Kemp, Kennett, Matthews, McCobb, McMurray, K. Neal, T. Neal, Nicola, North, Pantelakis, Petrini, Preston, Pritchard, Quinn, Raspin, Robinson, Ross, Singh, A. Thompson, D. Thompson, Tock, Wareing, Wilkinson and Wood.

APOLOGIES:-

None received.

Minute No.	Description/Decision	Action By/Deadline
PROCEDURAL ITEMS		
	<p>MEMBER STATEMENT</p> <p>Councillor Gardiner addressed the Chamber regarding the meeting of Full Council on 27th February, 2025. He explained he was very sorry and wholeheartedly apologised, for any unintended offence caused by his actions and the rhetorical comments he made in response to accusations from across the Chamber.</p>	
147	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillor Hale declared a personal interest in minute 153, insofar as he was a Member of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Maurice Rawlings Community Centre.</p> <p>Councillor Bridges declared a personal interest in Minute 160, insofar as she was the Crisis Services Manager at Hull and East Yorkshire Mind.</p>	Director of Legal Services and Partnerships
148	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Agreed – That the minutes of the Meeting of the City Council, held on 27th February, 2025, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and</p>	Director of Legal Services and Partnerships

	correctly recorded and be signed by the Lord Mayor.	
149	<p>COMPOSITION OF POLITICAL GROUPS</p> <p>The Assistant Director of Legal Services and Governance 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>	
150	<p>MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES, JOINT COMMITTEES AND EXTERNAL BODIES</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Herrera-Richmond and seconded by Councillor Wareing:</p> <p>Councillor Conner to replace Councillor Belcher on the Communities Overview and Scrutiny Commission.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	Director of Legal Services and Partnerships
NON-EXEMPT ITEMS		
151	<p>PETITIONS</p> <p>The Assistant Director of Legal Services and Governance reported that she had not received any petitions that needed to be considered by the City Council.</p> <p>Agreed – That the report be noted.</p>	
152	<p>LEADER'S STATEMENT</p> <p>Councillor Ross, the Leader of the City Council, began his statement and commented on the actions of a Member opposite at the last meeting who he felt should resign; the Labour Government's behaviour regarding the Winter Fuel Allowance, the WASPI women, and the disabled; the completed consultation on the City's high streets; the successful cultural conference held at Hull Truck; the need to provide confidence to the business community, and the recent shipment of goods to Sierra Leone. He then reflected on the past Civic Year, including the City's response to the riots, and</p>	

	<p>the Legacy Funeral Homes incident.</p> <p>Councillor Hale replied to the Leader’s statement, and commented on the Muslim month of Ramadan; the Lord Mayor’s speech at the Iftar at Hull Minster; the breach of the ceasefire in the Middle East; the humanitarian cost of the continuing war between Russia and the Ukraine; employment based support measures; the Hull: Yorkshire’s Maritime City Project; the event at the Minster for those involved with Legacy Funeral Homes, and the continued non regulation of Funeral Homes.</p> <p>Councillor Wareing replied to the Leader’s statement, thanked Councillor Gardiner for his earlier apology, and commented on ColliderFest 2025; the City’s high streets; the increase in homelessness in the City Centre, and the recent resignation of Labour’s Nigel Findlay MSP, due to the UK’s Government’s cuts to the Welfare Budget.</p> <p>Agreed – That the Leader’s Statement, and the responses to that statement, be noted.</p>	
153	<p>QUESTIONS (WITH WRITTEN NOTICE) TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET, CHAIRS OF COMMITTEES AND OTHERS</p> <p>(Councillor Hale declared a personal interest in minute 153, insofar as he was a Member of the Co-ordinating Committee of the Maurice Rawlings Community Centre.)</p> <p>Councillor Wareing asked if the Leader of the City Council would admit whether it was himself or one of his Cabinet colleagues who authorised, in the current Hull City Council People’s Panel Vox Pop Survey the inclusion of the infamous USA Government’s Department of Government Efficiency’s question sent to federal workers in the USA by email, asking them to list 5 accomplishments a week with the ultimatum “answer or be fired”?</p> <p>The Leader of the City Council replied that neither he or any other Portfolio Holders had any involvement in setting the questions used in the People’s Panel. He had enough to be getting on</p>	

with without concerning himself with something of that nature. Councillor Wareing's question was also not an accurate representation of the question in the survey, which did not mention "or be fired". It simply asked for respondents to fill in their top 5 accomplishments for the week. Those could be personal, social or professional. He would ask that the narrative was corrected around this question. As with all questions and answers to the survey, any could be ignored and skipped should the respondent wish to do so. Of the hundreds of responses to the survey, there had not been any complaints about that question. Finally, he added that this Administration put listening to the views of the community at the heart of the way it worked. He took the opportunity to thank all those who had taken part in the survey.

Councillor Matthews asked the Portfolio Holder for Adult Services and Public Health and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, over the weekend, she became aware of a distressing situation where a dog had been left alone outside in poor conditions without food or drink after its owners were taken to hospital. As she tried to help a neighbour find support for the animal she found there was no help available from the Council in this situation as it was outside of working hours. The neighbour had to engage with wonderful volunteers "Never Give Up Trust", who took the dog in and had to pay for the service. In this case, Officers have told me that the Council has no duty to offer help, which comes as a surprise to me. However, it transpired that in January, 2023, the Council's Dog Warden Service was cut. Instead of operating into the evening, the Service now ends at 5.00 p.m. every day and doesn't operate on weekends or Bank Holidays. She was further told that outside of office hours local authorities are expected, where practicable, to provide a place where a stray dog can be taken and accepted into local authority care. However, there is no service beyond 5.00 p.m. any day of the week. On weekends and bank holidays the only option residents are given is to take strays directly to kennels in South Cave, and even then only before 5.00 p.m. In fact, the Never Give Up Trust told me that the Hull Animal Welfare Trust will only accept strays from the Dog Warden.

She had done some investigation and found this to be true. There was a very lengthy process in place before any stray dog can find sanctuary at these kennels not due to the fault of these kennels but this Council. She had been told that out of hours Vets will not accept strays. This leaves our residents in a dangerous position and the welfare of these poor dogs who may have already experienced untold abuse to be hanging by a thread. Could the Portfolio Holder tell the Chamber if she was satisfied with the current provision, and what measures she would take to remedy this gap in service if not?

The Portfolio Holder for Environment explained he would be answering the question as it was a public protection issue. He was aware of the situation. He pointed out that this was not a stray dog situation as the dog was within the boundary of its property, so it would not have fallen within the previous out-of-hours service which the Council provided. The Council's out-of-hours service for stray dogs which ran until 10.00 p.m. had ended in 2023. That was due to the kennelling provider that the Council had used for over 30 years, closing. A tender process was then undertaken to find a new kennelling provider, through which only one kennel bid. That was Hull Animal Welfare Trust at South Cave. They were awarded the contract as the only viable option. Hull Animal Welfare Trust was an excellent care provider, but did not provide an out-of-hours kennelling service and did not allow the Council's Dog Wardens on to their premises after 5.00 p.m. At the same time demand for the out-of-hours service for stray dogs had fallen significantly, by roughly 400% over the 10 years between 2012 and 2022. Only 44 dogs were kennelled in the year before the out-of-hours service ended. Therefore, it was also not the most practical thing to do, to operate an out-of-hours service for stray dogs when there was a low level of demand. The Public Protection Team operated an out-of-hours service for such things as noise nuisance, where there was a far greater prevalence of incidents after 5.00 p.m. and out-of-hours. He would look at the most recent reports from the Call Centre and from the Stray Dog Team to see if out-of-hours stray reports were rising again. However, at the moment there was no local kennelling provider that would accept an out-of-hours service from the Council. The question

asserted that members of the public couldn't drop off stray dogs at South Cave, but that was not true. There had been double digit occasions where dogs had been independently dropped off. The kennels were open to the public 7 days a week until 5.00 p.m. The public could also contact the Police out-of-hours if the stray dogs were considered dangerous. The dogs in this case would be visited by the Council's Animal Wardens from a welfare perspective to check that they were OK.

Councillor Byrne asked if the Leader of the City Council could share his insights on how the Brownfield Land Release Fund would positively impact housing development in the City of Hull?

The Leader of the City Council replied that he was determined that the Brownfield Land Release Fund would have a positive impact on the future development of new housing in the City of Hull. It would help to unlock a number of sites that otherwise may not have either come forward or by accelerating the delivery of new homes. There were many constraints that house building in Hull had to contend with and, ultimately, this leads to costs for new homes to be significantly higher than other areas. Such constraints included poor ground conditions, which required deep piled solutions for foundations as those dealing with the A63 would attest to; flood risk mitigation works to ensure any new homes were well protected; the installation of modern Sustainable Drainage Systems, and other innovative methods to reduce carbon emissions and provide more energy efficient homes. The fund would play a pivotal role to address significant viability challenges and in turn facilitate the delivery of new quality homes on brownfield land in Hull. He had, while speaking about house building, been clear in his view on the Government's changes to targets. He fully understood the desire from the Government to have more homes built, particularly when there were so many people needing accommodation. He thought everyone needed to be mindful of the practical difficulties of achieving this target, both in terms of land availability and the workforce available to build them.

Councillor Wareing asked if the Portfolio Holder for Culture and Leisure could tell the Council about his recent Council trip to Belfast and

update Members on what changes had been made as a result of his visit?

The Portfolio Holder for Culture and Leisure replied that it was an invaluable trip to develop the Council's learning. He would be following up with the contacts made, to develop partnerships with the City through culture. He learnt from their approach to conferences and the venues they had, which was informing our thinking about how the Council delivered conferences in Hull. As a current example of this learning, some of it was used in the recent Cultural Tides Conference, which seemed to have been received really well. It also showed to other cities around the country that Hull was no longer insular. Under this Administration, it looked to work with partners anywhere and everywhere, just so long as it delivered for the City's residents. The trip was a worthwhile use of my time.

Councillor Nicola asked the Portfolio Holder for Adult Services and Public Health and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, the East Riding of Yorkshire Council was offering a mobile Health Inclusion Service that makes available to residents the opportunity to obtain basic health advice and to undergo checks, such as blood pressure and cholesterol testing, close to their own homes. That Service was dedicated to enhancing health care accessibility and aimed to reduce health inequalities. As Members know, Hull City Council was to receive almost £30 million from the Labour Government's Public Health Grant to pay for preventative services in the City. Would the Portfolio Holder advise the Chamber whether some of this funding would be used to provide a similar mobile Health Inclusive Service to that offered in the East Riding to ensure residents in the more deprived parts of the City were able to more easily obtain basic health care?

The Portfolio Holder for Adult Services and Public Health and the Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board replied that she was sure Councillor Nicola was aware that the East Riding of Yorkshire Council was a much more rural authority. It had lots of small villages which suffered from an even greater lack of public transport and infrastructure. In Hull, the services were directed in line with the needs of the

City. If there was shown to be a need for such a service, the Administration could look at commissioning such a scheme. For now, the Administration had different issues that needed to be addressed in a different way to the East Riding of Yorkshire Council. In Hull there were higher rates of mental ill-health; smoking, and alcohol misuse, amongst other things, that needed addressing.

Councillor Keal asked if the Leader of the City Council could highlight the success of the Love Your Neighbourhood scheme over the past year and share the exciting improvements planned for the year ahead?

The Leader of the City Council replied that the project, set up under the Liberal Democrat Administration, had so far covered 20 areas of the City from its official launch in 2024 to March this year, improving the visual street scene and making a huge environmental impact. More areas were looked after during the trial period the year before. 160 streets across all Wards of the City had been enhanced as part of the programmed schedule of the Love Your Neighbourhood Scheme, since April, 2024, including 34 Footpath reinstatements. The Team had also undertaken unplanned works on 33 streets across the City, in areas requested by residents and Elected Members to add extra street cleansing activity. Indeed, one of the successes of the project had been that when on-site the Team highlighted other aspects of work that needed to be addressed. This year the Team aimed to visit more areas, particularly ones which it hadn't previously been to, and leave a lasting legacy for residents to feel a sense of pride in their community. Works were bespoke to each area following engagement with partners. The works included footpath edging; intensive cleansing; graffiti removal; sign cleansing; footpath reinstatement, and fly tipping removal. The Team engaged with Community Payback through Project Clean Streets for accessible areas outside of the Council's responsibility. Area Teams and Elected Members would be contacted soon to select the next series of areas for a visit from the Love Your Neighbourhood Team for the coming year. He felt sure Elected Members would put forward areas for the works to take place.

Councillor Wilkinson asked if the Portfolio

Holder for Transportation, Roads and Highways would correct the record that there was no agreement with National Highways that there would not be any further overnight closures on the A63 works as he informed the Chamber at the January Council meeting, and which was refuted by National Highways in the press two days later?

The Portfolio Holder for Transportation, Roads and Highways replied yes, and there would continue to be closures.

Councillor Beeson asked if the Leader of the City Council would provide an update as to if and when the Council will receive the HS2 funding as promised by the previous Conservative Government?

The Leader of the City Council replied, yes, although the previous Government cancelled the budgeted for HS2 project, the latest Transport Secretary had told the country that this money was fictional and wouldn't be appearing. That came several months after the current Government was formed. That furthered his belief that the country was in an austerity period with this Labour Government. We had seen in the budget that there would be rail improvements in many other parts of Yorkshire and the north. Once again, the Labour Government had ignored the transport needs of Hull with the previous Transport Minister not even leaving the train station or informing the Council of her visit. He would, of course, keep pushing for Hull to get the transport funding it had been promised. He had written to the Government and would keep lobbying on this issue. Many other schemes needed that funding, and it would be a travesty for the Government not to support them.

Councillor Hofman asked the Portfolio Holder for Transportation, Roads and Highways, the National Avenue/County Road pedestrian crossing; the replacement of safety markings near Bricknell Avenue Primary, and the County Road Parking Improvement Scheme are all projects that Members have been waiting to materialise for up to two years. She was sure Councillors in other Wards would have similar experiences. What was the Portfolio Holder

doing to ensure that the Highways Department was clearing the backlog and getting those projects moving?

The Portfolio Holder for Transportation, Roads and Highways replied that the Highways Team was continuing to develop and deliver a significant number of high priority schemes. Those included the National Avenue/County Road pedestrian crossing and County Road parking improvement schemes. They were programmed to commence on site in July, 2025. The safety markings near Bricknell Avenue Primary School were programmed for next month.

Councillor K. Neal asked if the Leader of the City Council could update the Chamber on the progress of the footway programme in Hull over the past financial year and the positive impact it has had on the City's communities?

The Leader of the City Council replied that the Footpath Programme for this financial year contained a total of 85 schemes, 70 reconstruction and 15 slurry sealing. From this programme 80 schemes had been completed and the remaining 5 were currently on site and due for completion in the next few weeks. As a result of those works 43,000 square metres of footpath improvements would have been undertaken in various locations across the City. By improving those footpaths, the Council had enhanced the safety and accessibility for all residents, businesses and pedestrians within the community who used and relied on them as part of their everyday life. Of the total figure approximately 16,000 square metres was undertaken using the recycling technique, hence reducing the Local Authority's carbon footprint when carrying out construction work. As always, he encouraged residents and Councillors to report pavements in need of attention through the proper channels. Finally, he knew from listening to residents right across the City how important the state of the City's pavements was to them. He was pleased to see so much work done to address the state of them in communities right across the City.

Councillor Bridges asked if the Leader of the Majority Opposition Group could share with the Chamber his thoughts on the Liberal Democrat

decision to vote against a statue for the Headscarf Revolutionaries?

The Leader of the Majority Opposition Group replied that what you knew about big, civic projects, monuments, statues and fountains in the City, was that they always required a public/private partnership. Individuals; groups and the Council coming together. That was the same for the Boulevard Fountain, where the great work of Simon Kelsey and the residents was supplemented by the Council; the Stand Memorial where their fund raising efforts were supported by the Council, and the Victoria Avenue Fountain where the great fund raising efforts by residents which raised the lion's share of that, was part funded by the Council. When the Labour Group included within its budget proposals a contribution for a statue for the Headscarf Revolutionaries it was traditional in those that the Council supported the community groups. As he stood in the Chamber in the budget debate, he asked for the Labour budget amendment to be voted on in parts, so the Liberal Democrats could support a statue for the Headscarf Revolutionaries. Unfortunately, the Labour Group weren't allowed to. It was told it was 'all or nothing'. In a Council where the Liberal Democrats hold just over 50% of the seats, they failed to recognise that anybody in the Chamber could have a good idea apart from themselves. Obviously, that decision incensed the residents of Hesse Road. Councillor McCobb then said it was not as it seemed and the Administration was trying to find the money. The Liberal Democrats were not trying to find the money. The Liberal Democrats could find the money. The Labour budget amendment was signed off by the Section 151 Officer. In a £150m budget it was a minuscule amount of money that the Liberal Democrats could have voted on to make a difference for that community. The Liberal Democrats had the chance, but they should do the right thing and allocate the money. They should also allocate funds for the Dockers' Memorial Project as well. Why would you not do that? It was petty in the extreme. He would make a commitment today, with Councillors Fudge and Herrera-Richmond, if the statue was in St. Andrew's and Docklands Ward, he would work to use some of that Ward's Section 106 monies to contribute to make the Headscarf Revolutionaries statue happen.

Councillor Healand asked the Leader of the City Council how the new Local Plan was shaping up, and what opportunities were there for the community to get involved?

The Leader of the City Council replied that the Council had started engagement with the residents, businesses, visitors and people who work in Hull on what should be in the new Local Plan. The Team had set up a new online survey, which was open through to 28th April, 2025, to gauge opinion. That was supported with an Engagement Plan, which was currently being finalised, where Officers would be in various parts of the City throughout that period to help and guide the respondents. That would be the first phase of public engagement on the Local Plan, and additional public engagement would occur as the Local Plan progressed towards its adoption. He encouraged all Councillors to engage with the process and residents to make the Local Plan as informed as it could be. He knew that Councillor Healand and his Ward colleagues were doing an excellent piece of work around this with the residents in Sutton Ward. On the subject of public consultation, and the last question, the Chair of the Group had been in touch and he was ensured that the Council would support the Group at the appropriate time and in the appropriate manner, doing it properly. Politically charged amendments as seen last month, to politically point score, was not the appropriate way of doing it.

Councillor Wood asked if the Portfolio Holder for Transportation, Roads and Highways would like to join her in thanking the new Labour Government for the £1.1million additional investment provided to Hull to repair potholes? Would the Portfolio Holder provide details on the areas of the City to be prioritised and how quickly the work would be scheduled?

The Portfolio Holder for Transportation, Roads and Highways replied that any additional funding to the City was, of course, welcome. It should be seen in the context of the dashed HS2 funding previously promised to the City. The Administration's strategy was currently being developed. It would target the areas most in need of repair based on condition data. It was a work in progress.

Councillor Dolman asked if the Leader of the City Council would join him in welcoming the £100,000 allocated in the recent budget for the mass transit system?

The Leader of the City Council replied 'yes', it was one of the highlights of the budget passed at Council last month. The primary goal of mass transit was to provide an affordable, convenient, and environmentally friendly way for people to travel; reducing congestion, and giving people the services they needed when they needed them. Proposals would seek to make it easier to get from one side of the City to the other, not just into the City Centre. It could also look to improve connectivity to places like the hospitals and colleges. It also demonstrated the willingness of the City to 'dream big' and look at different ways of doing things.

Councillor Fudge asked if the Leader of the Majority Opposition Group could share with the Chamber his thoughts on the extended closure of the Pier?

The Leader of the Majority Opposition Group replied that he needed to be sure that the money included in the budget, that wasn't spent last year, would be spent during the current year, to bring the Pier back into use. It had been shut under Labour temporarily, for emergency repairs. Labour had put money in the budget, but they then lost power, and nothing had happened since. His real concern was that there was no commitment to undertake the work. When Councillor Dearing questioned the Portfolio Holder at an Overview and Scrutiny meeting, the reply was that it depended on what came back in the report. The Pier was part of the City's heritage. It's the place where Monarchs have got off; it's the place where ferries used to go to and from, and was a crucial part of Hull's history. He made no apologies for saying not to repair it would be cultural vandalism, and it would certainly be just that. It was really important for the City. He was sure that Members knew the area, but as the Ward Councillor for that area, with the extended height of the flood defences, welcome as they were to protect that area of the City, the best view of the Humber would now be from the Pier. It was almost more important now than before the flood defences were installed. It was

absolutely essential that the money was spent. He was disappointed again when he had asked for the Labour budget to be taken in parts, that the additional money was voted down. It was his view that £1m would not be enough. The same could be said for the £1m for Chapman Street Bridge that wouldn't be spent, it wasn't enough either. He needed a commitment to make a start. The Liberal Democrats held just over 50% of the Chamber, with Labour just under 50%. Surely 100% of the Chamber agreed that the Pier needed repairing. Surely everyone could come together, do the right thing, and commit to repairing it and getting it open for the residents.

Councillor Preston asked if the Leader of the City Council could share how the Creative Growth Programme had been progressing and the positive impact it has had on supporting the City's local businesses?

The Leader of the City Council replied that the Creative Growth Hull and East Yorkshire Programme was being delivered by the Hull and East Yorkshire Business Growth and Skills Hub in partnership with Hull City Council; the East Riding of Yorkshire Council, and the University of Hull. It was one of 12 pilots funded across England. Since the programme commenced last April, there had been four cohorts delivered by Hull University Business School with over 40 businesses from across the region participating. As well as workshops; peer to peer discussions; mentoring, and masterclasses, the programme had been well received by local businesses in the creative sectors. That showed that this Administration was committed to working with businesses and partners to develop the economy of the City in line with a shared vision. Feedback had been that the programme helped to develop local business confidence to grow. Recently, four businesses presented at a national event called 'The Big Creative UK Summit'. A local showcase event was being held later this year, to highlight all the Creative Growth participants; promote local creativity, and their specific business markets. Those events, and the knowledge they shared, allowed the employers of Hull to be confident and proud, that their work with the Council put the City on the map and made it a desirable location for firms to set up and employ, even in the economic

turmoil the UK was facing under this Labour Government. Of course, most importantly, this all helped achieve growth in the City, something he was sure all Members wanted to see. That meant new jobs for local people and more money in the pockets of local residents. He looked forward to hearing about more success for the scheme in the months and years to come.

Councillor Nicola asked the Deputy Leader of the City Council, the “HEY Endo” launched their Workplace Charter on Friday, 14th March, 2025. That workplace charter outlined essential workplace adjustments to support employees with endometriosis and foster an inclusive environment. Did the Deputy Leader support signing the Charter; adopting the principles, and support the practises that the Charter sought to establish?

The Deputy Leader of the City Council replied that the Administration was currently exploring the requirements of the Charter and would update Members in due course. If the principles were sound and deliverable, then she was sure the Administration would support it.

Councillor Kemp asked the Leader of the City Council, how will the £1 million investment in Hull’s Community Centres enhance those vital spaces for local residents?

The Leader of the City Council replied that the £1m investment in Hull City Council’s Community Centres would enhance those vital spaces for local residents. He emphasised how vital Community Centres were for numerous residents of the City. The ongoing works aimed to provide all Centres with compliant Energy Performance Certificate ratings, so new leases could be entered into with the current Trustees. Whilst, at the same time, seeking to reduce the operating and utility costs on the buildings by making them more energy efficient. That would assist in maintaining current services, as well as providing affordable opportunities for more organisations to further increase the scope and variety of services offered to both the local community and individuals. The Council’s Community Centres provided a much-needed place for all members of the local communities to come

together. The Community Centres provided safe spaces for people to come together to access advice; health services; warm meals; a place to sit; find companionship, or engage in a wide variety of services and activities provided by Hull City Council; its partner organisations, and local volunteers. There were 17 projects in progress. Those included installation of new high efficiency boilers; replacing existing lighting with new LED units; removing old single glazed windows, and replacing them with new double-glazed units. Those were currently taking place at seven different Community Centres across the City with projects due to be completed by the middle of the year. The Administration's intention was for the buildings to continue to be a suitable focal point for local organisations and residents to lead on improving their own community through increased social interaction; accessing support; training, and recreational opportunities, thus strengthening local pride and community participation. He thanked all those that worked in the Community Centres for the support given to communities right across the City.

Councillor Raspin asked if the Leader of the Majority Opposition Group could share with the Chamber his thoughts on the Liberal Democrat decision to vote against parking enforcement cameras outside every school in the City and explain to the Chamber how much of a difference he thinks such a scheme would make for the children of the City?

The Leader of the Majority Opposition Group replied that he knew, as Councillor Raspin had regularly raised this issue at the Shadow Cabinet, it was an issue that did affect the schools in the Ward she represented, along with schools all over the City. The Labour Group had put a lot of work into its budget amendment as Councillor Raspin was aware, as she was involved in it. They had worked and researched with other Local Authorities and had undertaken correspondence with the Officer concerned. The Labour Group had even told the Officers they could base the camera costs on the costs of the cameras for the bus lane enforcement rather than rather the ridiculous, three times as much, price the Council had been quoted elsewhere. Those cameras seemed to be able to find people quite readily, so they must be of the

	<p>required standard. The Labour Group had put a lot of work into that budget amendment. Likewise, the Labour Group had asked Council to take its budget amendment in parts. That was a spend to save proposal, was perfectly valid, and would not have effected the position whatsoever. In contrast, what was passed, was a proposal to spend £50,000. The point that Councillor Bridges made was, based on that rollout period, the last school to be finished, the children there now would be 41 years old before that school had a camera outside the gates. Absolutely ludicrous. The same Officer that costed the Labour Group proposals had a duty to share that information with the other Groups if asked for. The Officer could have shown the Liberal Democrat Group how it was perfectly achievable. The scheme was something that would make a safety difference for children. It would make a huge difference. It had gone on for years. His youngest, who was now 22/23, when they were at Sidmouth Primary School, there was carnage 16/17 years ago. It was even worse now. It was the same for lots of inner city schools that were built before the car was as prevalent as it was today. You couldn't do anything about the car being more prevalent, but what you could do was make sure the school gates were safer. Lets come together and say Labour had a good idea, just steal it and implement it. The Administration would have the Labour Group's support and wouldn't be criticised for doing so. The Labour Group would say get on with it and make the City's schools safer.</p> <p>Agreed – That the questions and answers be received.</p>	
154	<p>REVIEW OF THE EAST, WEST AND NORTH PUBLIC SPACES PROTECTION ORDER</p> <p>The Director of Public Health submitted a report which explained the process and consideration given to date to the proposed three-year extension of the East, West and North Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO).</p> <p>The report sought approval for the continuation of the East, West and North PSPO and a variation to the Order. That included strengthening the existing prohibition to address alcohol related anti-social</p>	Director of Public Health

	<p>behaviour; include two new prohibitions across the current PSPO area, detailed in Appendix 1 of the report, to address begging and bedding down, and one new prohibition for the Hull City Centre Safer Entertainment Zone only, detailed in Appendix 2 of the report, to address loitering related anti-social behaviour.</p> <p>The report also set out the objectives of the PSPO to provide control of anti-social behaviour associated with the consumption of alcohol, begging, bedding down and loitering in public spaces within the target area.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Tock and seconded by Councillor Pritchard:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) That the continuation of the Public Spaces Protection Order for the period of three years from 20th March, 2025, to 19th March, 2028, be approved, and b) that a variation of the Order to include one strengthened and two new prohibitions across the current Public Spaces Protection Order area and one new prohibition for Hull City Centre Safer Entertainment Zone only to tackle the consumption of alcohol, begging, bedding down and loitering related anti-social behaviour in the East, West and North Areas, be approved. <p>Councillors Hale, Wood and McMurray also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Councillor Tock then exercised her right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried unanimously.</p>	
155	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Singh and seconded by Councillor D. Thompson as an amended motion:</p> <p>Council notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Asset of Community Value (ACV) regime was introduced under the UK Government's 	Director of Regeneration

Localism Act, 2011. The ability to have a facility (most commonly a public house) listed as an ACV was introduced to deliver upon the then Government's promise to "give bold new powers to local people to protect and improve their much-loved community assets and preserve the social fabric of their neighbourhoods"* (*Caroline Spelman - 2009).

Council further notes:

- 1) The listing process allows a community asset to be listed when it satisfies the listing tests under Section 88(1) or (2) of the Localism Act. Namely that the use of the land furthers the social wellbeing of the local community and can realistically continue to do so.
- 2) Once listed the sale of such an asset is subject to moratorium provisions which are intended to delay sale and provide a window of time for a community bid. A property's status as an ACV can also be a material consideration in planning decisions relating to future development and may limit some Permitted Development rights under the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order, 2015. Nationally Both Councils and Planning Inspectors have taken account of listings in their determinations.
- 3) That in Hull only three assets are currently afforded ACV status.
- 4) That the Government has committed in November, 2024, to strengthening the ACV framework, stating it wants to replace this right to bid with a right to buy, with funding available to purchase community assets.

Council recognises that:

- 1) Although ACV accreditation "can also be a material consideration in planning decisions relating to future development" it is left up to individual Local Planning Authorities to determine how much weight, if any, to accord

	<p>ACV status in a given planning application.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2) This lack of consistent national advice can lead to a varied picture in the UK.3) There would appear to be a dichotomy and inconsistency between one section of a Local Authority affording ACV status, to an asset and the Planning Authority in that same area not “materially considering” this status in planning applications, especially as the Government has committed to tightening up this community right. <p>Council further recognises:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) That Hull City Council has often used Supplementary Guidance to strengthen local decision making where it has felt the need, such as with the Article 4 provision in both the Avenue Conservation Area, and elsewhere in the City pertaining to tightening the Planning requirements around the registering of smaller Houses in Multiple Occupation (HiMOs). <p>Council therefore believes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) That affording of ACV status is an important recognition locally of the importance of certain assets within our community.2) That any ACV status in the Hull City Council boundary area should be a material consideration during determination of a planning application or Cabinet decision. <p>Council resolves to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Request that Supplementary Planning Guidance be developed within the revised Local Plan to ensure that there is guidance upon material considerations in any planning application or Cabinet decision including considering the status and weighting of an ACV as a “material consideration” of the ACV status within a determination. <p>Sources:</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>Localism Act, 2011</p> <p><u>England council shake-up: five ways it could affect you - BBC News</u></p> <p>Councillors Robinson, Hale and Gardiner also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Councillor Singh then exercised his right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried unanimously.</p>	
156	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Bridges and seconded by Councillor Wood:</p> <p>This Council is aware of the news that ‘Winner Trading’, the trading arm of the Preston Road Women’s Centre (PRWC), is being investigated by the Social Housing Regulator due to a number of issues, including serious disrepair in some of the properties that they manage. The tenants of these properties are all women that have fled domestic abuse and violence. Earlier this year the same organisation was also reported to the Charity Commission.</p> <p>Concerns have included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The level of disrepair including essential entrance/exit points • Boarded up fire escapes • Damp and mould • Not having adequate safety and target hardening for the safety of tenants. <p>The Council referred Winner Trading to the Regulator, and this is to be commended. Council thanks the Officers that have ensured that the evidence has been gathered, analysed and acted upon.</p> <p>Following on from International Women’s Day, this Council wants to make clear its commitment to supporting people who are fleeing domestic abuse and advocate for them to be in decent and safe homes.</p>	Director of Legal Services and Partnerships

	<p>This Council commissions services from the PRWC to the tune of £107,000 per annum and the organisation has received other grants to improve its services.</p> <p>Council resolves to request that the Executive commission a review of all Council funding to this organisation to see if the support being commissioned is being delivered appropriately, and that the findings of the review be referred to the Audit Committee.</p> <p>Council further resolves to request the Executive to use the information the Council already has on the properties operated by Winner Trading to instruct Officers to conduct a set of environmental health surveys of those properties to gain a better picture of the extent of the disrepair and neglect.</p> <p>Sources:</p> <p><u>Tenants of Hull charity Winner say 'safe houses' were not secure - BBC News</u></p> <p><u>Hull's Preston Road Women's Centre given £1m lottery grant - BBC News</u></p> <p><u>Founder of Hull women's centre named in King's Birthday Honours - BBC News</u></p> <p>Councillors Hale, T. Neal, Drake-Davis and Wilkinson also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Councillor Bridges then exercised her right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried unanimously.</p>	
	<p>ADJOURNMENT</p> <p>The meeting stood adjourned at Noon, and reconvened at 12.30 p.m.</p>	
157	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Conner and seconded by Councillor Wareing:</p>	Leader of the Council

Despite sales being age-restricted, vapes have become increasingly popular among young people, causing issues in schools, impacting on learning, and posing significant public health concerns.

Recent data indicates that in the Hull and East Yorkshire states 13.6% of young people who had never smoked had tried an e-cigarette UK, 35% of 11 – 13 year olds don't know the rules about vaping in their school and Vaping increased with age from 0.4% of 11-year-olds to 18.6% of 17-year-olds stating they vape regularly.

Young people may face peer pressure to vape or try vaping. It is illegal to sell vapes to anyone under 18 including nicotine free vapes. If caught under 18s may be required to attend an education and awareness programme. Also the Police may stop under 18s and confiscate vapes.

Evidence in adults shows that regulated vape products and devices are less harmful than smoking and can aid adults in quitting smoking, but vaping of any kind is not recommended for children and young people due to potential health risks. Short-term effects include headaches, sore throats, dizziness, and coughs, with long-term effects still unknown.

This Council:

- Welcomes the Government's introduction of the Tobacco and Vaping Bill, 2024, to strengthen restrictions and regulations around tobacco and vape usage to protect young people and ensure they never start to smoke or vape.
- Recognises the critical role that local authorities' Trading Standards will play in building compliance within various areas of both existing vape regulations and those planned for consultation.
- Commends the Council's Public Health Team, local schools, and other citywide partners for the progress they have made in implementing a broad programme of work around vaping prevention for both children and adults, including action to prevent vaping

	<p>in schools and reduce school exclusions due to vaping.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concurs with the Chief Medical Officer of England's public health view that if you smoke, vaping is safer; if you don't smoke you shouldn't vape; and marketing to children is utterly unacceptable. <p>This Council requests:</p> <p>a) The Leader to write to the new Parliamentary Under-Secretary of State for Public Health and Prevention, Ashley Dalton MP urging the Minister to expedite consultations and introduce stricter regulations on the advertising and sale of vapes as soon as possible. This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Restricting branding and packaging to reduce appeal to young people. • Banning the distribution of free vapes to children. • Regulating the contents and flavours of vapes to prevent targeting young people. • Limiting the display and promotion of vapes in retail environments, including introducing a ban on shop floor sale of vapes. • The Minister sets out a clear time-frame for when the consultations will happen, and secondary legislation laid before Parliament. <p>b) The Leader to write to Dr Sam Roberts, CEO of the National for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) to request that Government consider the development of national guidance on advice, intervention and support that should be available for young people in the following context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Young people under 18 who routinely smoke tobacco (and maybe dependent on nicotine) that wish to switch to vaping as a less harmful method of using nicotine • Young people who have become dependent on nicotine through vaping but wish to reduce harm or stop and request 	
--	---	--

	<p>help to do so.</p> <p>c) The Leader requests that the Director of Public Health engages with and influences fellow Directors of Public Health and other relevant stakeholders to prioritise actions to prevent youth vaping. This includes writing to local businesses and national chains to request they voluntarily take actions to prevent youth vaping, namely, removing vapes and associated products from shop floors.</p> <p>d) The Leader ensures that the Council continues its proactive engagement with citywide partners to prevent youth vaping both in and out of school settings.</p> <p>Sources:</p> <p>https://chimneykid.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/05/HULLAN1.pdf</p> <p>https://healthmedia.blog.gov.uk/2024/11/05/the-tobacco-and-vapes-bill-what-you-need-to-know/</p> <p>Councillors Quinn, Chambers, Bridges, Grozav and K. Neal also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Councillor Conner then exercised her right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried unanimously.</p>	
158	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>At the request of the mover, Councillor Wareing, and with the agreement of the Chamber, the motion concerning Personal Independence Payments, was withdrawn.</p>	
159	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>At the request of the mover, Councillor Dolman, and with the agreement of the Chamber, the motion concerning welfare cuts, was withdrawn.</p>	
160	<p>COMPOSITE MOTION</p>	Leader of the Council/

<p>(Councillor Bridges declared a personal interest in Minute 160, insofar as she was the Crisis Services Manager at Hull and East Yorkshire Mind.)</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Dad and seconded by Councillor Wareing:</p> <p>Council notes:</p> <p>The Financial Times of 6th March stated “Chancellor Rachel Reeves will this week submit plans to Britain’s official forecaster for billions of pounds of spending cuts, with a focus on slashing the welfare bill to shore up the country’s weak public finances. “</p> <p>ITV news revealed the package of measures are likely to be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £5bn in savings by making it harder to qualify for Personal Independence Payments - a benefit not linked to work that is meant to help people with the additional costs of their disability • Further savings by freezing PIP payments next year, so they do not rise with inflation • Raising the basic rate for Universal Credit paid to those searching for work, or in work, while cutting the rate for those who are judged as unfit for work. • A billion pounds of savings ploughed into a major investment for employment support for those who are looking for a job. <p>In response the Joseph Rowntree Foundation have produced a Health Related Benefit Cuts Fact Sheet which states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% of people receiving the health-related element of Universal Credit (LCWRA) are either unable to heat their home, behind on bills, or have low or very low food security, compared to 11% in households not receiving any UC or Personal Independence Payments (PIP). • There are 900,000 children living in a household where someone receives LCWRA, the main health-related benefit for those receiving UC. • Recipients of health-related benefits are disproportionately at risk of food insecurity: 	<p>Chief Executive</p>
--	------------------------

- Almost a quarter (24%) of working-age adults in a family receiving health-related UC have had to use a foodbank in the last year, compared to 3% of all working-age adults and 17% of working-age adults receiving non-health-related UC.
- Almost half (48%) of adults in a household where someone claims health-related UC are also in a household without reliable access to enough affordable, nutritious, healthy food, compared to 11% of all working-age adults.
- People receiving health-related benefits already face some of the highest rates of material deprivation in the population, meaning these cuts are set to damage the living standards of some of the poorest people in our society.
- Reducing PIP expenditure by £2.0 billion in 2029/30 would require at least 310,000 fewer people to be receiving PIP in that year, or for the average PIP award in 2029/30 to be 7% lower in value than planned.
- Reducing PIP expenditure by £4 billion would mean at least 630,000 fewer people receiving PIP, or a 15% cut in real terms to projected PIP values for 2029/30.
- The latest analysis from the Department for Work and Pensions itself, published in January 2025, showed that 30% of the growth in incapacity benefit caseload between 2018 and 2023 is explained by the rise in State Pension Age, demographic changes and structural differences between Universal Credit and its legacy benefit equivalents. This would go against the idea that this increase is solely down to people now claiming benefits as a lifestyle choice.
- Between 2018/19 and 2022/23, the approval rate for PIP fell from 55% to 51%.
- The Office for Budget Responsibility also forecasted that the previous Government's announced Work Capability Assessment criteria restrictions would result in 424,000 fewer people receiving LCWRA by 2028/29, yet only 15,400 more people (or 3% of those affected) moving into work.

Council further notes that the Prime Minister has openly admitted that the majority of proposed government savings will come from cutting welfare

benefits. This reckless approach will inflict devastating harm on the most vulnerable in our communities, stripping away the dignity, independence, and security that these vital payments provide.

Council further notes that these proposed cuts will disproportionately target those who are already struggling to survive in the midst of a cost-of-living crisis. It is an unacceptable assault on people with disabilities, those with chronic illnesses, and their carers - who now face the threat of further economic hardship.

Council specifically rejects the Government's attack on Personal Independence Payments. PIP is not a luxury, it is a fundamental support that allows disabled individuals to live with independence, access essential services, and participate in society. Looking to target PIP for £5 billion of cuts is an outright betrayal of the principles of fairness, inclusion, and support for those in need.

Council stands resolutely against any attempt to undermine this essential benefit and calls on the Government to halt its plans immediately.

Council resolves to formally condemn the Government's approach to welfare reform, which prioritises short-term savings over the well-being and dignity of the most vulnerable in society."

Council resolves to request the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive write to the three Labour MPs representing the City of Hull to express the Council's position, its deep unease with the proposals and ask them what support and advice they can give those who continue to suffer from this shameful decision and request them to work to withdraw the Labour Governments proposed spending cuts.

Council also resolves to request the Leader of the Council and Chief Executive write to the Chancellor, expressing the Council's concern around these plans and urge the Government to reverse the decision and instead focus on sustainable and fair economic policies, rather than punishing those who need support the most.

	<p><u>Sources:</u></p> <p>https://news.sky.com/story/billions-of-pounds-in-spending-cuts-including-welfare-expected-in-spring-statement-13321764</p> <p>https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c1lpjgg2mp5o</p> <p>https://www.ft.com/content/daabf042-b1db-4366-b5ca-17e4e3ef244e?utm</p> <p>https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/pip-changes-dwp-benefits-latest-labour-disability-b2712733.html</p> <p>https://www.ft.com/content/c479320f-dc85-4ff5-90c3-0bc21dc21102</p> <p>https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/welfare-cuts-labour-plans-benefits-spending-reeves-b2709304.html</p> <p>https://www.itv.com/news/2025-03-07/government-to-make-6bn-welfare-savings-with-benefits-shake-up</p> <p>https://www.jrf.org.uk/news/factsheet-health-related-benefit-cuts</p> <p>Councillors Henry, Conner, Wilkinson, Pantelakis, Wood, Burton, Rospin, Bridges, McMurray, Ross, Hale and Harper also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Councillor Dad then exercised her right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried unanimously.</p>	
161	<p>NOTICE OF MOTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Chambers and seconded by Councillor Ross:</p> <p>Council notes that the social care system in England is in crisis. For many years the system has been severely underfunded, leaving vulnerable people without the care they desperately need.</p>	Leader of the Council

Council further notes that successive governments have promised to address the crisis in health and social care but have consistently failed to deliver the necessary reforms and funding to ensure a sustainable system.

Council notes with concern that the Labour Government proposals around phased reforms to social care, under the leadership of the Health Secretary, Wes Streeting, fall short of the funding and reforms urgently needed. The failure to properly fund social care has resulted in increasing pressure on the NHS, with inadequate social care provision to support them at home or in the community.

Council further notes that cuts to winter fuel payments and rise in National Insurance contributions have exacerbated the struggles faced by vulnerable individuals, many of whom rely on these payments to keep warm and healthy during colder months. This decision reflects a worrying lack of commitment to supporting older people and those with additional care needs.

Council notes that the demand for social care services continues to rise year on year as people live longer, yet the funding available to local authorities has failed to keep pace with this increasing need. As a result, we have seen unacceptable delays in access to care home places, home care support, and essential home adaptations.

Council declares a social care emergency.

Council resolves to request that the Leader of the Council writes to the Government to:

- ask that the conclusion of the social care review is brought forward so that it is completed within a year, and
- call for an immediate funding settlement to tackle the rising crisis in social care.

Council also condemns the Chancellor of the Exchequer Rachel Reeves National Insurance Contribution rise which will damage the social care sector and calls for that rise to be abolished.

Sources:

<https://basw.co.uk/policy-and-practice/resources/care-crisis-whats-next-social-care>

<https://committees.parliament.uk/committee/127/public-accounts-committee/news/200468/adult-social-care-pac-raises-alarm-as-government-falls-short-of-promise-to-fix-crisis/>

<https://www.ageuk.org.uk/our-impact/campaigning/care-in-crisis/>

<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/articles/c791gyx2n50o>

<https://www.libdems.org.uk/news/article/one-in-two-pensioners-hit-by-winter-fuel-payment-cuts-will-heat-their-homes-less-this-winter>

Moved by Councillor Hofman and seconded by Councillor Bridges as an amendment:

The motion with the following amendments:

Paragraph 2: after “Council further notes that” delete “successive Governments have” and insert “the previous government”. After “social care but” delete “have consistently”.

Delete Paragraph 3 and insert: “Council welcomes the additional £6.8m funding the new Labour Government has recently allocated to Hull City Council for social care services, which, along with the significant increase to the Public Health grant to over £28m and the additional £431,391 Disabled Facilities Grant, provides much needed additional funding for frontline and preventative social care services to residents in the City.”

Delete Paragraph 4.

Paragraph 5 – delete “, yet the funding available to local authorities has failed to keep pace with this increasing need. As a result, we have seen unacceptable delays in access to care home places, home care support, and essential home adaptations.” Insert “and more funding is needed to keep pace with this demand and welcomes the establishment of an independent commission on adult social care reform, which will deliver a

<p>framework for a national care service, based on a cross-party consensus, by 2028.”</p> <p>Delete Paragraph 6.</p> <p>Paragraph 7 - delete “ bring forward the conclusion of the social care review so that it is completed within a year. Council calls for an immediate funding settlement to tackle the rising crisis in social care.”, and insert “provide an additional interim funding settlement to tackle the rising cost of providing social care, whilst the new framework is being developed.”</p> <p>Delete Paragraph 8.</p> <p>Additional Sources:</p> <p>General Fund Revenue Budget 2025/26 and MTFP 2025/26 to 2027/28. Table 2 – Movement in Resource Base 2024/25 to 2025/26</p> <p>HCC Capital Programme 2024/25 – 2025/26 (Improving Local Areas)</p> <p><u>Emma Hardy MP - I’m delighted your Labour Government has... Facebook</u></p> <p><u>Hull health services handed £30m funding boost - BBC News</u></p> <p>Councillors Petrini, Burton, Hale, Harrison and Nicola also spoke on the amendment.</p> <p>Councillor Hofman then exercised her right of reply on the amendment.</p> <p>Amendment lost.</p> <p>Councillor Chambers then exercised her right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>With the voting on the motion being equal, the Lord Mayor used his second and casting vote, and the motion was carried.</p>	
--	--

Start: 10.00 a.m.
Finish: 2.20 p.m.