

Council20th November, 2014PRESENT:-

The Lord Mayor (in the Chair).
 The 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 S. Chaytor, Councillor A. Clark, Councillor C. A. Clarkson,
 Councillor J. Conner, Councillor D. A. Craker, Councillor J. Dad,
 Councillor A. M. Dorton, Councillor J. L. Fareham, Councillor N. Fudge,
 Councillor A. D. Gardiner, Councillor T. Geraghty, Councillor D. R. Hale,
 Councillor J. A. Hewitt, Councillor C. Inglis, Councillor R. M. Jones,
 Councillor T. E. Keal, Councillor G. Kennett, Councillor D. Kirk, Councillor
 M. C. Mancey, Councillor E. Mann, Councillor K. E. Mathieson, Councillor
 D. J. McCobb, 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 J. W. Shipley, Councillor H. J. Spencer,
 Councillor C. A. Sumpton, Councillor C. Thomas, Councillor M.
 Thompson, Councillor K. W. Turner, Councillor G. D. Wareing, Councillor
 P. J. Webster, Councillor A. Williams and Councillor K. Woods.

APOLOGIES:-

Councillor H. R. Clay, Councillor J. I. Korczak Fields, Councillor P. D.
 Clark and Councillor S. Wilson.

Minute No.	Description/Decision	Action By/Deadline
PROCEDURAL ITEMS		
71	<p>PRESENTATION OF AWARD</p> <p>The Lord Mayor explained that the City Council had recently been awarded the 'Armed Forces Employer Engagement Silver Award', which recognised its work in support of the armed forces, reservists, service leavers and veterans.</p> <p>The Lord Mayor presented the award to Councillor Gardiner who received it on behalf of the City Council.</p> <p>Councillor Gardiner then addressed the Chamber.</p>	

72	<p>PRESENTATION OF AWARD</p> <p>The Lord Mayor presented the inaugural Rosa Parks Award to Ms. Karen Okra for her work in promoting and developing understanding between Afro Caribbean and black and minority ethnic groups and the wider community.</p> <p>Ms. Okra then addressed the Chamber.</p>	
73	<p>DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST</p> <p>Councillors Chambers and Woods declared personal interests in minute 80, insofar as they were employed by organisations involved with the formulation of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2014-2020.</p>	Members' Information Officer
74	<p>MINUTES</p> <p>Members referred to and discussed minute 61 as there was a difference of opinion over what had been agreed in the Chamber and what had been recorded in the minutes. It was suggested that, in this instance, the Constitution had not been strictly adhered to, insofar as the consideration of the amendments to the motion at minute 61 had not been dealt with in the order in which they had been received, which had led to the current difference of opinion.</p> <p>Agreed – That the minutes of the meeting of the City Council, held on 18th September, 2014, having been printed and circulated, be taken as read and correctly recorded and be signed by the Lord Mayor.</p>	
75	<p>COMPOSITION OF POLITICAL GROUPS</p> <p>The Town Clerk reported that there had been no changes to the composition to the political groups within the City Council.</p> <p>Agreed – That the report be noted.</p>	
76	<p>MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES AND JOINT COMMITTEES</p> <p>The Town Clerk reported that there had been no</p>	

	<p>changes to the membership of the City Council's committees or joint committees.</p> <p>Agreed – That the report be noted.</p>	
77	<p>DEBATE OF PETITION</p> <p>Ms. Hemingway addressed the Chamber concerning the petition entitled “Reopen Dock House”.</p> <p>Councillors Kirk and Wareing then asked questions of Ms. Hemingway concerning the petition.</p> <p>The Lord Mayor explained that the debate on this petition would now take place.</p> <p>Councillors Black, Kirk, Dad, Bell, Spencer and Fareham then took part in the debate.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Black and seconded by Councillor Kirk:</p> <p>That the petition, “Reopen Dock House”, be received and referred to Cabinet and the People and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Commission for further consideration.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	Laura Scholes/ Cherie Wiles
78	<p>LEADER'S STATEMENT</p> <p>The Leader commented on the first anniversary of the City being awarded City of Culture 2017; the plans for City of Culture 2017; the City of Culture 2017 leadership team; the progress of the Siemens' development; the recent investment in the City announced by Reckitt Benckiser; the Google conference on the digital agenda to be held in the City; further announcements on new jobs in the City before the next Parliamentary Elections; Combined Authorities; the Northern economy's contribution to the national economy, and green energy.</p> <p>Councillor Bell replied to the Leader's statement and commented on the first anniversary of the City being awarded City of Culture 2017; Green Port Hull; Combined Authorities; the strategic M62 corridor; the Leader's 2015/16 budget, and Labour's proposed cuts for 2015/16.</p>	

	<p>Councillor Fareham replied to the Leader's statement and commented on the first anniversary of the City being awarded City of Culture 2017; bringing the City's disused buildings back into use, and Combined Authorities.</p> <p>Councillor Kirk replied to the Leader's statement and commented on the Siemens' development; the Leader's budget for 2015/16; the devolution of powers away from London; the minimum wage; consultants employed by the Council; cuts to facility time, and the City Council's reserves.</p> <p>Agreed – That the Leader's Statement, and the responses to that Statement, be noted.</p>	
79	<p>QUESTIONS (WITH WRITTEN NOTICE) TO THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET, CHAIRS OF COMMITTEES AND OTHERS</p> <p>Councillor Kirk asked if the Leader would agree, given that Labour had stated that if elected in 2015 they would abolish the hated 'Health and Social Care Act', and that a decision was not needed here on outsourcing until June or July next year, that there should be no progress on outsourcing the Council's Adults Social Care function until after the General Election?</p> <p>The Leader replied that the Care Act which would come into being on 1st April, 2015, and was an important piece of legislation. As far as the Government was concerned, it had to deal with the present. The future would take care of itself, whatever government announced in May, they had to react to that as well. The Cabinet's decision regarding adult social care was to develop two business case options, one for a joint venture delivery model and the other for some form of in-house model. Both models necessarily had to be developed in the context of the Care Acts. Adult Social Care Services had to undertake the necessary preparation work now in order to be able to put in place the required changes at that time. It was not only the Care Act that currently necessitated the redesign of services, another key strategic driver being the need to realise both short</p>	

and long term savings. To stop the work that had already begun would prevent the services from being ready from what had to be put in place next April. To not progress with the development of the business cases would seriously delay the ability of the services to meet the future timescales of the Care Act, should it remain in force. It would be very risky to delay on the basis of the Act possibly being revoked or modified.

Councillor Wareing asked the Leader what action was being taken by the authority to tackle the problem of "legal highs" and what further action could be taken?

The Leader replied that he was obviously in the Chamber when he heard Councillor Wareing's question to the Police and Crime Commissioner earlier that day and the answers that were given. He did not really know why Councillor Wareing wanted him to go into a 'Jeremy Paxman' answer again because it would be saying very similar things and he did not think that was the right answer to give. He thought that the suggestion he had made was far better that he actually took it away from the Chamber to see what he could do. That was positive for the families that were suffering because of the children and family members who were suffering from those so called 'legal highs'. He would take up that suggestion and ask that officers looked at how they could address it and ensure that they did their very best for the people affected by it.

Councillor C. Payne asked the Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health when the new community library drop off points would be in place and why was the mobile library service axed before they were set up?

The Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health replied that the Library Service was working with its partners in the community to set up the library access points. Part of that required the recruitment of volunteers and that was what was under way at the present moment in time. Once the volunteers were in place they would be able to promote the library access points. For those residents not able to get to the branch library, the Library Service had introduced them to the Library Link Service for the housebound and

residents. One of the most important things he had to mention, and it stuck in his gullet, was why the Opposition were still coming forward when their government was cutting and slashing the Council's budget over the years. When he looked at what had happened across the country, for example, and there was no mention of it, over 700 libraries had been closed since the Liberal Democrats came into office. 700. Now as far as the Mobile Library Service was concerned, it was inefficient. For example, for every person using it, it cost £8 for every transaction. For a static library it was round about £2.50, or something of that nature. He always lived in hope. What had given him some sort of real hope was when the question of the Reel cinema in St. Stephen's came up. It was said that the Council should close it because it was uneconomical to keep open. He thought oh what a great idea here, the Council could save money, we could say save maybe £200,000 and maybe we would be able to use that money to open those community libraries; Lo and behold, when Labour looked into the small print, they found that against officers' advice the Liberal Democrats when they had been in office had signed an agreement that they had to cover the salary between now and the year 2024. That was way over £200,000. Labour had managed by discussions and negotiations to bring that figure down to £120,000. That money, in his opinion, could have been used to open those community libraries and also maybe renew the mobile library service. However, the Liberal Democrats had those sorts of attitudes, actions against the advice of the City Treasurer, against the lawyers, they signed that agreement. He believed, quite strongly, that Labour should look into it even further as it was against any tradition or any policy of any Councillor he knew when that sort of thing was signed without the blessing of everybody. He thought in actual fact he would ask whether the Chairman and Portfolio Holder for Finance had looked into it in a more serious manner.

Councillor Sumpton asked if the Leader could outline the financial, employment and economic regeneration benefits of Friday's announcement that Siemens would be developing their wind-turbine blade manufacturing operation within the City's boundary? Did the Leader also believe the announcement would bring jobs for local

Hull young people in the City's primary and secondary schools?

The Leader replied that obviously it was fantastic news and he had gone into that in his speech. Without a doubt it was a defining moment really, to see the work already going on, on the docks to transform that area into a huge new industrial site. What really was exciting was Siemens intended to sell their product to the rest of the world. So not only would we be using it for our own means but exporting it to Europe and beyond for many, many years to come, giving such wonderful opportunities. That was only done by the help of the £5m that the Council had put in which Siemens said was a huge commitment by the Council towards this development and they were really appreciative of it. The working relationship that they had was first class. Mr Dowling who was in charge of the development not only had the Hull sense of humour, but you could already see the effects of his decision making in getting both of those component parts onto the one dock. Maybe we could look round for a bit more space to put the supply chain there. Who knew what could happen over the next few months but yes, certainly good news for the City.

Councillor Chambers asked if the Portfolio Holder: Energy City would provide an update about how measures to tackle speeding traffic on Laburnum Avenue were being progressed? She and Councillor Williams had repeatedly asked for updates in recent weeks and received no response.

The Portfolio Holder: Energy City replied that Councillor Chambers would of course remember that she had met with him and Councillors Sumpton and Nicola recently on the matter. He thought it was on 30th September, 2014. Since then Councillor Mathieson would have had a detailed response from the Assistant City Streetscene Manager and he thought her fears that nothing was happening were without foundation.

Councillor Kirk asked if the Leader agreed that, following downgrading and loss of hours as a result of eye-watering Government cuts to council funding, it was a disgrace that some Council employees now had to rely on food

banks to feed their families?

The Leader replied that he thought he would use the opportunity as well to answer Councillor Kirk giving Labour advice on how to do the budgets. Over the last three and a half to four years, among all the cuts that the Council had to make, and just remind everybody over £100m had been taken out of the Council's budget and the promise of a further £50m plus over the next five years, the Council had managed to keep employment levels at the level they were at now with a balanced budget every year that had received the unqualified support of the auditors. It was absolutely the right way to go and it showed the competency of this Council to bring jobs and opportunities, City of Culture, all of that in the years than when we had had all these problems. So when we say about 'Here's an interesting aspect of it' actually, on that minimum wage or on the living wage, Labour intended to bring that living wage in, absolutely intended to. One of the problems was Labour wanted to make sure people did not have to go to food banks from or working for the Council but they needed two sets of people at the talks to bring in those pay rates that were above the minimum wage. You needed the Unions and you needed the management there. The Unions said they were not ready for that because what they said was it then had the effect on the other grades, the 'bounce' effect. What he wanted to do was to bring that new formula to the table. Labour were quite happy to talk to the Trade Unions about it. They wanted to move as quickly as possible towards that living wage so that they could then and only then say to other companies working through the Council, they thought they should do the same as well. It takes two to tango, they would wait for the Trade Unions response on that. Everybody had a part to play. The Trade Unions had to accept that one fact. You could protest as much as you wanted on the streets but only working with the Council, a Labour Council, would you ever get that stability that was needed to move forward.

Councillor Williams asked the Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health to outline what consultation was taking place with users of East Hull Baths around the future of the facility?

The Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public

Health replied that Labour was currently setting up a customer forum to take place at the Woodford Leisure Centre in East Hull on 2nd December, 2014. There would be a deadline date of 5th January, 2015. So they were consulting with the people. There were two dates of consultation and no doubt if Councillor Williams got in touch with the officers they would tell him, which he thought he might have done. As an elected member those were the sort of things that wasted Council's time. All Councillor Williams had to do was pick up the phone and ask the appropriate officers what the consultation was going to be. He thought quite frankly again you would think the Liberal Democrats would be congratulating the Council for its forward thinking. Here we are when everybody else, whether it be Sheffield, Bradford, Leeds or wherever you wanted to go, you would see them closing baths. Labour was not intending closing baths, especially East Hull, while the new pool opened. The fact was, Labour was going to sink in £3 - £4m in the new pool at the Woodford Centre, which would bring it up to date with modern day thinking. The people of East Hull would have somewhere to go where it was a very modern six lane swimming pool. He repeated that Labour were also keeping Ennerdale open so the Liberal Democrats could tear up their slips again and say about Ennerdale. Labour was not closing Ennerdale. It was part of the policy to keep those open. All of those things were happening against a backlog of Councillor Williams' Government again who had cut the Council's budgets by £150m over the last three or four years. He thought they should take credit, as a Labour Group, for what they were doing as far as that was concerned. It was about time Councillor Williams stopped whinging and talking about their sort of leaflets and started talking about how good this Council was doing.

Councillor Webster asked if the Chair of the Economy and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Commission endorsed the claims made by a Liberal Democrat Member for Drypool Ward, that he "pushed" the Council to progress the regeneration of the Holderness Road Retail Park, when no one involved from the Property Committee, or the Portfolio Holder for Property had any representations from him, or any other Liberal Democrat member, on this matter whatsoever?

The Chair of the Economy and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Commission replied the Mount Pleasant 'stuff' had started five years ago. Dransfield had done some consultation at the Balfour Centre which was before Councillor Webster was in the position he was in at the moment. The Drypool Ward Councillors met with lots of people, including people who were not local, who had a vested interest in not seeing it go ahead. However, the Drypool members were interested in making the area more prosperous so did not do that. After the initial consultation the members were dismayed that they were told the original plan would not go ahead but supported the scheme after having numerous discussions with the development company about the concerns about the new scheme. Her wonderful hard working Liberal Democrat Drypool members had met and communicated regularly with the representatives from the developers over the last few years. She had copies of the e-mails regarding the development. In July when the developers first mentioned that there were problems with the development, they pressed for dialogue between the Council and the developers. To do this they were in touch with the officers in the Property Section, the Head of Economic Development and Regeneration and Councillor Hale who, by the way, responded on 18th August, 2014, to that question. So they continued to be in touch with representatives from the development throughout the last few months whilst the dialogue was taking place. They were very pleased that the issues were being resolved and that the development was going ahead, so frankly, yes, she did endorse it.

Councillor Mathieson asked if the Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health would agree that, in the centenary year of the start of World War One, 100 years of Lord Mayors, and the awarding of the City of Culture, that the Streetlife Museum should now have an onsite café or at least a tea room? Had the possibility of turning the sweet shops inside the museum into a working sweet shop been investigated? Recently many people had visited the museum to see the mock World War One tank, but those that wanted refreshments had to sit outside. If the Portfolio Holder agreed that the installation of a tea room or café would be an asset to the

museum, would he inform the Chamber when it would be installed? Would the Portfolio Holder also be able to clarify if the burger van selling food and drink which was recently stationed outside the museum was licensed and local to Hull?

The Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health replied that as regards the café at the Streetlife Museum, Labour would always want to improve the services for visitors to any of the sites. However, the current financial position the Council faced meant that catering or trading activity had to be viable and not create a burden on the service budget. Previous cafes within the museums had not been financially sustainable. Reviewing the picnic and refreshment arrangements was one of their activities to be looked at in next year's part of the Arts Council funding projects. As regards the sweet shop, the shop and all its fittings were part of the museum collection. The primary responsibility for the museum was to preserve the material for the future. Whilst an idea of a working shop had been discussed, the structure of the shop and its contents were very old and fragile. Continuing to operate the shop would be a risk to ongoing damage to this unique piece of Hull's history. Staff had sold sweets outside the display in the past during busy Christmas events but the sales were not good enough to cover staffing costs. Regarding the burger van, the event food store was from West Yorkshire, and licensed there. The Event Team used this company a year ago when a regular local supply was unable to cover this event. The food store donated 20% of its royalties on sales to their charity partners for the event, the Royal British Legion. Staff would look at the local option for future events.

Councillor Hale asked when the Chair of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission intended to provide a written answer to the question tabled at the last Council meeting, and did the Chair think it was appropriate to ignore constitutional requirements in this way?

The Chair of the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny replied that Councillor Hale had asked whether he was going to be providing a

written response. He had provided a written response and he knew he had done so because he had actually got answers back to that response from members. So, maybe, the e-mail with the answer had not got as far as Grimsby. In terms of the question, however, he found it a bit of a cheek being brought up on issues of the Constitution from the gang over there with their approach to the Constitution over the last year. Perhaps members would have got to the question last time, he did not say last month because the number of Council meetings had been cut, another part of taking the actions of the Constitution, if the amount of time for questions had not been reduced as part of Labour's attack on the Constitution. He would not take lessons on the Constitution from the members sitting opposite when time for questions had been reduced to forty minutes; when the number of committees had been reduced, and when Labour had a member in their Group who, when they sat in the Lord Mayor's chair, had said 'I don't care about the Constitution, I'm in charge'. So he would not take lessons on the Constitution from that Group. As for some of the other questions on this agenda, when other members asked questions about where things were, he would perhaps remind some members he had been asked by one of the Labour members where Fifth Avenue Primary School was. He thought the clue was 'on Fifth Avenue' perhaps?

Councillor Keal asked the Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health, on 19th September, 2014, the Finance and Value for Money Overview and Scrutiny Commission was informed that officers had advised before the 2014/15 budget was set, that the creation of a new leisure company was not achievable in the 2014/15 financial year and that the savings attached to this would not be achievable. Why, therefore, was the decision taken to proceed as if the company would be set up and the savings achieved?

The Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health replied that at the time of the budget in 2014/15 it was set up to show that the attainment of a full year's savings on 2014/15 was largely attainable. In the event the process to set up a new company proved to be more detailed than had been expected. The Cabinet was also mindful of the

conclusion of the Scrutiny Task and Finish report on company set up. This company would be set up next year either in April or May. Cabinet also agreed to the principle of the setting up of a 'not for profit' company last November. Members may recall events last November, if you remembered last November, it was announced that we would be given City of Culture. Incidentally if we had accepted Councillor Keal's budget set up when the Liberal Democrats took office because when Councillor Keal had put in for the City of Culture if you remember the Liberal Democrats failed miserably. When Labour took over their budget they had to put more money in. Thanks to Councillors Brady and Hale, the Labour Group put more money into the museums and also money into libraries. So therefore we were in a stronger position to be Year of the Culture. So he could not tell Councillor Keal that he had welcomed the Year of the Culture because if they had listened to Councillor Keal in the first place they would not have been in the running. What he was looking at now was the delay meant that the project saving determined at the beginning was no longer achievable in the financial year. Labour had agreed to maintain the target savings figure for further consideration. At the time the budget for 2014/15 was set it was thought the attainment of a full year saving was largely attainable. In the event as he had explained, the process of setting up a new company proved to be more detailed than expected and the Cabinet was also mindful of the conclusions of the Scrutiny Task and Finish report. The company now expected to be set up in April, 2015, and the financial impact on the delay had been managed. His personal view was that the full saving was not possible and he had said so at the time. He assured Councillor Keal that as far as Labour were concerned, the Company would be up and running and financially sound.

Councillor Brown asked if the Portfolio Holder: Energy City would like to set the record straight in relation to the road works at the junction of Beverley Road, Greenwood Avenue and Sutton Road including what actually happened and the actions that were taken by the Council, given the misinformation spread by a local Councillor in the area?

The Portfolio Holder: Energy City replied that

probably the best thing to do was to start with a chronicle of events commencing with a letter that was sent to Councillor McCobb on 30th September, 2014, explaining the works and the arrangements being made. A letter was also going to be sent to residents inviting Councillor McCobb to make any comments. Councillor McCobb to be fair had made a comment asking that residents be given information about the works. That letter to 2,500 residents, was delivered between the 6th and 8th October, 2014, telling them about the works; the times of the closures, and giving contact details for any queries. The variable message signs were erected and the additional information added on the Council website. On 14th October, 2014, an e-mail was sent to ward members including Councillor McCobb, again detailing the timing of the closures and providing a copy of the letter to the residents. Councillor McCobb had not made any comment about the letter or the inadequacy of that letter in response to that e-mail of 14th October, 2014. He became aware of the problems on site on Sunday, 19th October, 2014, when the works were in progress. He went to both the Sutton Road and Endike junctions which were closed contrary to the programme agreed with the contractor. It was too late to reopen the Endike Lane junction because the surface had been planed and the top coat applied. He complained to the contractor about failure to comply with the agreed programme and timings and instructed the contractor to complete the surfacing at the Endike Road junction as quickly as possible and also to guide residents through the Sutton Road junction to access their homes. Unfortunately the contractor's paving machine then broke down, causing more delays. So, to ensure that everyone was aware of what was going on, he had e-mailed the Head of Streetscene asking him to ensure the ward members were advised and to arrange an apology to local residents. That e-mail went on the afternoon of Sunday, 19th October, 2014. The Assistant Head of Streetscene followed that up. Officers had since had meetings with the contractor and basically the whole problem arose through the failure of the contractor to comply with instructions. The only lesson to be learnt from this was that the Council had not in any way failed in its management of the works, but that the contractor had failed to do what they were told. It was interesting finally to note that members should know

that in the National Highways and Transport Public Satisfaction Survey, Hull City Council was rated as the best of the thirty three unitary councils for managing roadworks and minimising nuisance.

Councillor Dad asked the Portfolio Holder: Energy City how the £500,000 cut and Transport Review included in the budget consultation would affect public transport in the City? Would more bus routes be cut? If yes, which ones?

The Portfolio Holder: Energy City replied that the £500,000 cut and the Transport Review were not about public transport as in EYMS or Stagecoach, so there was no proposal to remove subsidies to the bus companies included in that saving proposal. However, it always made sense to review any subsidised bus route from time to time. So he could not rule out for ever the possibility of other subsidised routes being affected in the future but they were not the subject of the £500,000 saving.

Councillor Sumpton asked the Leader, a report published in this week's Guardian showed that the Government's Tax and Welfare policies had led to the rich getting richer at the expense of the less well off. The study showed money had transferred from the "poorest to the better off". What role had the Liberal Democrats played in achieving this and how had that benefited the people of Hull?

The Leader replied that he thought you could go round Hull, go round any street in the City, you could go down any street in the North of England and ask them the question 'Do you feel better off through the policies of this government?' Well do not expect a positive on what the government would tell you. Particularly the Liberal Democrats in relation to the Income Tax reductions, which was welcomed. It was one way but in terms of the overall amount of money in people's pockets and taken into account the freeze on benefits; you took into account the freeze on working tax credits, family tax credits, and you took that in the round and you then said 'Am I better off?' or 'Have I more money?'. Well, apparently, we were less well off than we were fifteen years ago. So we have gone back fifteen years in four years. A bit of this government told you about the achievements or what the things that

the Liberal Democrats hoped were not or do not become prominent during the election campaign. It was interesting because when all those uncomfortable facts were brought out, the Liberal Democrats always seemed to be talking to each other and smiling. It was denial. That was what the Liberal Democrats did when you denied the part that they had played. Actually without the Liberal Democrat support on those harsh policies that had hit ordinary people instead of actually the people who had actually caused it, the banking industry, we still had not got to that stage where there was some sort of equality of justice. As he had said at previous Council meetings, some of those bankers in a decent society would be behind bars now. They would be answering instead of continuing to find ways and means of fiddling their bonuses, which they were still carrying on. They had still now been criticised for other methods of fixing the rates so that they enjoyed greater bonuses.

Councillor C. Payne asked the Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Learning, Skills and Safeguarding Children, the consultation on the 2015/16 budget proposals outlined that £200,000 was to be cut from Children’s Centres. Would the Portfolio Holder inform the Chamber which Children’s Centres would be closed or mothballed to meet that savings target?

The Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Learning, Skills and Safeguarding Children replied that she would like to state that, despite the fact that Hull City Council had been subject of over £100m worth of cuts from Central Government funding since the coalition took control in 2010, no Children’s Centre in Hull would close.

Councillor Webster asked the Chair of the West Area Committee if any of her residents were concerned that the Liberal Democrat prospective parliamentary candidate for West Hull did not know where the iconic and historic Lord Line Building was or who owned it? Was the Chair, as she so often stated, ‘confused’, about this given that she also sat on the Economy and Regeneration Overview and Scrutiny Commission?

The Chair of the West Area Committee replied that

she always loved getting nice, warm, fluffy questions from Councillor Webster and the answer was no. She could assure Councillor Webster that she did know where the Lord Line building was. She had to say that the residents she had been speaking to had actually got some really important, genuine concerns about the amount of money that the Council was spending on consultants, particularly hundreds of thousands of pounds on projects that then did not happen. She was sure that Councillor Webster was aware that there was a petition at the moment around the Lord Line building and there were some very, very interesting comments on that petition. For example a particular gentleman who complained about the amount, the hundreds of thousands of pounds, being wasted on consultants by the Council and pointed out that there could well be better ways to spend that money. She had to say that she found it very interesting that every single Labour Councillor that had stood up was talking about government cuts but they did not have a problem with spending loads of money on consultants. Labour needed to make decisions about how they spent the money. Labour could not complain about not having any money and then spend hundreds of thousands of pounds on consultants. So she had a lot of sympathy with the view expressed by comments on that particular petition about how the Council was spending their money. Labour could perhaps preserve some of Hull's heritage better if they were not so interested in shiny brand new buildings; preserving some of the excellent heritage that Hull had, or Labour could even keep libraries open or fix potholes. There were all sorts of things Labour could do.

Councillor Keal asked who the Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health felt was appropriate to lead the new leisure company, if it was set up?

The Portfolio Holder: City Plan Enabler – Public Health replied that it was a funny old question, who they think appropriate to lead a new leisure company, well it was him. Certainly it would not be Councillor Keal.

Councillor Sumpton asked if the Leader would be prepared to offer Councillor Thomas a guided tour of St. Andrew's Quay, kindly pointing out

	<p>the Lord Line Building whilst explaining what the term 'vision' meant?</p> <p>The Leader replied that Councillor Thomas got around Hessle and her beloved West Hull Constituency faster than Mary Poppins. If Councillor Thomas, with very, very concerned residents in Hessle over any issue they could think of, then she would be there. How did Councillor Thomas get to Hessle? Did Councillor Thomas fly like Mary Poppins, where you maybe would go over the top of the Lord Line building or would you travel by car, which would go along the Clive Sullivan Way and lo and behold at the side of it was a huge building called the Lord Line building. Of course, he had to say he was really concerned that the member and prospective parliamentary candidate from West Hull had not seen it. However, if you looked in today's paper Councillor Thomas would see that people who did not live particularly in West Hull and did not often pass the Lord Line building were going to do something about it. So if you read today's papers you would see where the Lord Line building was and what you might do about it. He was sure Councillor Thomas would then be as concerned as they all were to do something about it.</p> <p>Agreed – That the questions and answers be received.</p>	
80	<p>HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY 2014-2020</p> <p>(Councillors Chambers and Woods declared personal interests in minute 80, insofar as they were employed by organisations involved with the formulation of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2014-2020.)</p> <p>The Director for Public Health and Adults submitted a report which explained that the first Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy was approved and adopted by the Council at its meeting on 21st March, 2013. In March, 2014, the Health and Wellbeing Board approved a refresh of the previous Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2013-2016. The refreshed document reflected the new challenges facing the Council; the NHS Hull Clinical Commissioning Group and partners, which included reducing health</p>	Director for Public Health and Adults

	<p>inequalities; addressing health and social care across the life course; the Hull 2020 Vision for transformational change; focusing on early intervention, prevention and integration; delivering against the Outcomes Frameworks, and working with reducing resources.</p> <p>A draft refreshed strategy was developed and presented to the Health and Wellbeing Board for comments in July, 2014. Those comments, together with feedback from a range of other stakeholders including members of the public, were considered in a final draft, formally approved by the Health and Wellbeing Board in September, 2014.</p> <p>The Strategy must be formally approved by Hull City Council, for inclusion within the Council's Policy Framework as a policy framework document, and also by the NHS Hull Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> <p>The Strategy would be supported by an annual Action Plan setting out how partners would work together each year to achieve the three outcomes by 2020: the best start in life; healthier, longer, happy lives, and safe and independent lives</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Inglis and seconded by Councillor Spencer:</p> <p>That the Health and Wellbeing Strategy 2014-20, be agreed and included in the Council's Policy Framework as a policy framework document.</p> <p>Councillors Bell and Fareham also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	
81	<p>ADJOURNMENT</p> <p>The meeting stood adjourned at Noon and reconvened at 12.45 p.m.</p>	
82	<p>NEXT BUSINESS</p> <p>Moved by Councillor McVie and seconded by Councillor Chaytor:</p> <p>That under paragraph 10.1.2 of the Council's</p>	

	<p>Procedure Rules, the item 'The Charter for Care Leavers' be taken as next business.</p> <p>Councillors Fareham and Bell also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	
83	<p>THE CHARTER FOR CARE LEAVERS</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Nicola and seconded by Councillor Petrini:</p> <p>Council notes the Charter for Care Leavers, which was published on 31st October, 2012. Produced by the Care Leavers' Foundation, the Charter is a set of principles and makes seven promises for young people leaving care that are designed to raise expectations, aspirations and understanding of what care leavers need and what the local authority should do to be good corporate parents.</p> <p>Council also notes that the seven promises are to: respect and honour the care leaver's identify; believe in them; listen to them; inform them properly; support them; find them a home and be a lifelong champion for them.</p> <p>Council believes that although the Authority largely meets many of the principles and commitments, signing up to the Charter will focus the Authority and, when aligned with the Corporate Parenting Strategy, will provide a strong basis for ongoing development of the Corporate Parenting Role.</p> <p>Council resolves to sign up to the Charter, incorporate it into the emerging Corporate Parenting Strategy and monitor it through the Corporate Parenting Board.</p> <p>Councillors Abbott, Bell, Kennett and Hewitt also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Councillor Nicola then exercised her right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	City Children Safeguarding Manager

84	<p>NEXT BUSINESS</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Ross and seconded by Councillor Bell:</p> <p>That under paragraph 10.1.2 of the Council's Procedure Rules, the item 'Review of Major Road Works' be taken as next business.</p> <p>Councillors Fareham and McVie also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Motion lost.</p>	
85	<p>POOR MAINTENANCE OF HULL'S GRASS VERGES AND GREEN SPACES</p> <p>Moved by Councillor McCobb and seconded by Councillor Keal:</p> <p>Council notes that £256,000 was recently 'reprofiled' away from the Council's City Services Directorate by the Cabinet despite significant public concern over the current maintenance regime for grass verges and green spaces. Council therefore asks Cabinet to 'reprofile' enough of it back to enable grass verges and green spaces to be maintained to a better standard.</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Fareham and seconded by Councillor Abbott as an amendment:</p> <p>The motion with the following amendment:</p> <p>Add "as determined by ward members via the Area committees along the manner undertaken at Wyke Area Committee" to end.</p> <p>Amendment carried.</p> <p>Councillors Mancey, Thomas, Abbott and Keal spoke on the substantive motion.</p> <p>Councillor Fareham then exercised his right of reply on the substantive motion.</p> <p>Substantive motion lost.</p>	

86	<p>DURATION OF MEETING</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Ross and seconded by Councillor McCobb:</p> <p>That under Paragraph 24.1 of the Council's Procedure Rules, the meeting be extended to allow all the business on the agenda for the meeting to be considered.</p> <p>Councillors Fareham and Brady also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Motion lost.</p>	
87	<p>SHALE GAS AND COAL BED METHANE EXTRACTION</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Kennett and seconded by Councillor Conner as an amended motion:</p> <p>That this Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Notes the commitment of the Coalition Government for developing hydraulic fracturing (fracking) in the UK; b) Notes the recent protests against shale gas drilling in areas of East Yorkshire; c) Notes the controversy about both the supposed benefits of extracting on-shore gas resources and the local environmental impacts; d) Notes the recent evidence that 60-80% of world fossil fuel reserves need to be left in the ground if average global temperature rise is to remain within 2 degrees; e) Believes that UK shale gas and coal bed methane will add to the fossil fuel pollution burden; f) Notes that the millions of gallons of water, per well, needed for hydraulic fracturing to extract shale gas (known as fracking) would reduce water supplies in this region, which are also threatened by the impact of climate change; 	City Regeneration and Policy Manager

	<p>g) Notes the well-documented risk of groundwater contamination as a result of fracking, which would exacerbate the pressure on water supplies and put residents at risk, especially as the water supply to this city comes from the aquifers which are undergoing exploratory drilling at the moment;</p> <p>h) Notes the unavoidable increase in noise, visual intrusion and air pollution from heavy traffic in communities close to fracking sites;</p> <p>i) Will develop a Council policy on shale gas and coal bed methane extraction by referring this motion for a full scrutiny inquiry into the issue of 'fracking' including the evidence of ecological, geological and pollution associated with this method. To report back to Full Council as soon as possible.</p> <p>j) Will continue to attract appropriate funding for projects which increase energy efficiency, sustainability and self-sufficiency, stabilise energy bills, and create jobs in the green economy;</p> <p>k) This Council believes that the future for this region is in developing the potential of the green, renewables energy generation industry and moving away from depleting resources of fossil fuels that damage the environment and lead to climate change, and</p> <p>l) Send a copy of this motion to the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change and the Minister of State for the Department for Energy and Climate Change.</p> <p>Councillors Bell and Fareham also spoke on the motion.</p> <p>Councillor Kennett then exercised her right of reply on the motion.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>	
--	---	--

88	<p>CROSS-PARTY AND CROSS-BOUNDARY INDEPENDENT COMMISSION OF INQUIRY</p> <p>Moved by Councillor Fareham and seconded by Councillor Abbott:</p> <p>Council notes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Her Majesty's Government (HMG) are funding the biggest investment in transport infrastructure since WWII – so businesses aren't hindered by poor transport and can create jobs, giving us financial security. As shown in Department for Transport (DfT) press release, 15th May, 2014, the Government has secured over £70 billion of investment in transport over the next parliament. • That HMG are providing the biggest programme of road investment since the 1970s – so British roads don't deter business from investing in Britain thereby creating jobs for our children and grandchildren. HMG have committed to investing more than £24 billion on England's strategic road network between 2010 and 2021 as announced in a DfT press release, 20th June, 2014. • HMG's specific commitment to resurfacing 80 per cent of our national roads – so they aren't a barrier to businesses moving goods around the country and are safe for all of us to use. HMG are also adding 221 lane miles of extra capacity to our busiest motorways and starting 52 major road projects by 2021 which is part of the biggest ever upgrade of the existing network of roads as outlined in a DfT Press Release, 16 July 2013. • That the Government are making it easier for people to use the roads by freezing fuel duty when Labour planned to raise it (after 12 rises in their previous administration) thereby saving £728 a year for a household filling up twice a week. <p>Against this upbeat background of investment in the UK a country which, under this Government, has</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
----	--	----------------

seen 2 million more private sector jobs created, 1.6 million new apprenticeships, Income Tax reduced for 25 million people with 3 million working people lifted out of tax altogether leading to economic growth of 8.1% since 2010 (faster than Germany and almost twice the speed of France), we see the situation in Hull.

Council further notes:

- Hull, Aberdeen and Plymouth are the largest population centres not connected to the motorway network in their boundaries and that- we have the largest population (at least in the Census). Council further notes that even on the most wildly optimistic expansion of the city boundaries we will still not be directly connected to the motorway network in the city boundary.

Council therefore condemns the decade's long failure of Hull Labour MPs to better connect Hull to the motorway system, even when there was a Labour Government and one MP was the appropriate Secretary of State, and how this mirrors the failure to vote for the Conservative Budgets which for decades have proposed increased expenditure to tackle Hull's roads. Council believes this failure to connect Hull business and citizens to the benefits of rapid and safe transport is a classic example of why Hull needs expanded boundaries.

Council believes:

- Following the Chancellor's "Northern Powerhouse" speech that the time has come to work with our sub-regional partners to discuss the extension of the M62 to fuel economic growth.
- That whilst this motion is about road/and motorway investment the topic cannot be divorced from the docks and rail-freight transport both of which this council reaffirms its commitment to.

Council calls on the Leader, following the pioneering and trailblazing Boundary Commission model, to cause to be set up a cross-Party and cross-

boundary Independent Commission of Inquiry to see how Hull can benefit from the aggressive investment in national infrastructure that exists at this moment in time.

Moved by Councillor Thomas as an amendment:

After the final bullet point under 'Council notes' insert another one that reads:

"That in Hull, the Government has enabled the reduction in the Humber Bridge tolls and investment in Castle Street."

Delete the words:

"and how this mirrors the failure to vote for the Conservative Budgets which for decades have proposed increased expenditure to tackle Hull's roads. Council believes this failure to connect Hull business and citizens to the benefits of rapid and safe transport is a classic example of why Hull needs expanded boundaries."

In the first bullet point under 'Council believes' the following between the words 'speech' and 'that':

"and the Deputy Prime Minister's work on devolution of power and investment in Northern cities"

After the final bullet point under 'Council believes' insert a new penultimate paragraph:

"Council also notes that the LEP is a cross-boundary organisation incorporating independent members as well as members from different political parties."

In the final paragraph delete: 'following the pioneering and trailblazing Boundary Commission model, to cause to be set up a cross-Party and cross-boundary Independent Commission of Inquiry' and insert:

"to work with the LEP".

That, as the consideration of the motion, 'Cross-Party and Cross-Boundary Independent Commission of Inquiry', was not completed by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next

	ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15 th January, 2015.	
89	<p>LABOUR'S LIBRARY CUTS</p> <p>That, as the motion, 'Labour's Library Cuts', was not considered by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15th January, 2015.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
90	<p>REINSTATE A BUS SERVICE TO THE LAMBWATH ROAD AREA</p> <p>That, as the motion, 'Reinstate a Bus Service to the Lambwath Road Area', was not considered by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15th January, 2015.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
91	<p>THE ARTS, CITY OF CULTURE, AND DIAMOND GEEZERS</p> <p>That, as the motion, 'The Arts, City of Culture, and Diamond Geezers', was not considered by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15th January, 2015.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
92	<p>KEEP VULNERABLE PEOPLE SAFE IN TAXIS IN HULL</p> <p>That, as the motion, 'Keep Vulnerable People Safe in Taxis in Hull', was not considered by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15th January, 2015.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
93	<p>CENTURY 21 PRODUCTIONS LIMITED</p> <p>That, as the motion, 'Century 21 Productions Limited', was not considered by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15th January,</p>	Paul Rawcliffe

	2015.	
94	<p>GO-AHEAD TRANSPORT POLICY AND GOVERNANCE FOR THE MODERN AGE</p> <p>That, as the motion, 'Go-Ahead Transport Policy and Governance for the Modern Age', was not considered by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15th January, 2015.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
95	<p>REVIEW OF MAJOR ROAD WORKS</p> <p>That, as the motion, 'Review of Major Road Works', was not considered by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15th January, 2015.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe
96	<p>YOUR MONEY NOT SAFE WITH LABOUR</p> <p>That, as the motion, 'Your Money Not Safe With Labour', was not considered by 2.45 p.m., and no extension to the meeting had been agreed, the item stood adjourned to the next ordinary meeting of the City Council due to take place on 15th January, 2015.</p>	Paul Rawcliffe

Start: 10.00 a.m.

Finish: 2.45 p.m.