

MINUTES of the EXTRAORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING of the
SOUTH DERBYSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
held at the Civic Offices, Civic Way
on Thursday, 5 January 2023
at 6.00pm

PRESENT:

Labour Group

Councillor Bambrick (Vice-Chair)
and Councillors Gee, L. Mulgrew, M Mulgrew, Pearson, Pegg, Rhind,
Richards, Shepherd, Singh, Southerd, Stuart, Taylor and Tilley.

Conservative Group

Councillors Ackroyd, Atkin, Bridgen, Brown, Corbin, Dawson, Fitzpatrick, Ford,
Haines, Hewlett, Muller, Patten, Smith and Watson.

Independent Group

Councillor MacPherson.

Non-Grouped

Councillor Wheelton and Councillor Churchill.

CL/85 APOLOGIES

Council was informed that apologies had been received from Councillors Dunn
and Heath (Labour Group), Councillors Lemmon and Redfern (Conservative
Group) and Councillor Roberts (Non-Grouped).

CL/86 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Committee was informed that Councillor Atkin declared Personal in item
CL/89 by virtue of being a County Councillor.

The Committee was informed that Councillor Ford declared Personal in item
CL/89 by virtue of being a County Councillor.

The Committee was informed that Councillor Muller declared Personal in item
CL/89 by virtue of being a County Councillor.

The Committee was informed that Councillor Patten declared Personal in item
CL/89 by virtue of being a County Councillor.

The Committee was informed that Councillor Smith declared Personal in item
CL/89 by virtue of being a County Councillor.

CL/87 **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE CHAIR**

The Chair of the District Council addressed Members and expressed his gratitude to the Council's staff and officers for organising and holding the Christmas Lights switch on.

CL/88 **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER**

Council was informed that had the Leader of the Council had no announcements.

CL/89 **ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE**

The Head of Paid Service addressed members informing them of work to commence in mid-January with the demolition and redevelopment of Bank House, Swadlincote. He reassured members that all persons who might be affected by the redevelopment had been informed.

CL/90 **QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 10**

Council was informed that no questions had been received.

CL/91 **QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NO. 11**

Council was informed that no questions had been received.

CL/92 **EAST MIDLANDS DEVOLUTION DEAL AND MAYORAL COMBINED COUNTY AUTHORITY**

The Head of Paid Service presented the report on the East Midlands Devolution Deal noting that he had requested that the Monitoring Officer ask for an Extraordinary Council Meeting in order for the Council to consider the report and consultation documents and be able to respond to the consultation by the deadline of 9 January 2023. He explained the background to the Deal and that it required only the passing of legislation and the consent of the Upper Tier Authorities. The Head of Paid Service further explained that the report was drafted without a proposed consultation response and it was anticipated that the meeting would debate and resolve a corporate response to the consultation for submission.

Councillor Churchill commented that the Council would be a non-constituent body and that the Council would have little input. He considered that the financial implications, service implications were unclear and the risks unknown. Further he was not clear on the impact this would have on the Council's planning powers and the Freeport. He questioned whether in a time of financial hardship the Council should be considering this. He stated that the Council did not have a mandate to support the proposal and that he would prefer to consider it after the election.

Councillor Smith commented that he had had assurances from the Leader of the County Council that the Mayoral Precept would only be approved if approved

across all the councils. He further commented that the proposal could bring funding to the district and that the opportunity should be seized for a brighter future for the area. Councillor Smith listed the benefits including £38 m of funding over 30 years, a pipeline of housing sites, focus on skills and training and initiatives to achieve net zero. He started that this was all new funding and could attract more investment in the area. He emphasised that the proposal was not to merge or abolish district councils. He conceded that he had reservations regarding an elected mayor. Councillor Smith emphasised that the Council was successful council and needed to be part of the process and an enabling partner in the process. He concluded that the Council should grasp the opportunity and not be afraid of change.

Councillor MacPherson commented that the opportunities were appealing but noted that much of the detail was missing. He further commented that the proposal meant further bureaucracy without a cost justification.

Councillor Wheelton commented that rural areas pay more in Council Tax but receive less support than urban areas in the District. She was concerned that the proposal did not include Leicestershire. She commented that there were too many uncertainties. Councillor Wheelton also noted that the Mayor would have the functional powers of competency and was concerned that s/he might undertake some of the Council's planning powers.

Councillor Southerd expressed his dismay that the proposal did not include Leicestershire or Lincolnshire. He commented that despite the benefits that may accrue there were too many uncertainties and concluded that he could not support the proposal without a mandate from his constituents.

Councillor Richards commented that the Labour Group had discussed the proposal and was concerned regarding the lack of borough and district participation and lack of detail in the proposal. He noted a number of other combined authorities and the implications of these. He was concerned regarding the overlap in planning and housing functions and that the Council's ability to decide where housing should be built in their area will be curtailed under the proposal. Councillor Richards considered that it was likely that a precept would be levied to fund the required officer support of the Mayor. He noted that the funding equated to £17 per person and was not indexed linked.

Councillor Richards proposed the following motion for Council to consider.

The Council after considering the contents and possible implications of the East Midlands Devolution Deal (the Devolution Deal) and the proposed creation of an East Midlands Combined County Authority (EMCCA) resolved to respond to the consultation as follows

- 1 *In absence of the required and essential detail as to the direct effect both financially and on service delivery to the residents of South Derbyshire, whom we were all elected to represent, the Council has little alternative but to reject any support for this hastily contrived proposal as not being in the best interests of the residents of South Derbyshire.*

- 2 *Furthermore the council wish to express its opposition to the proposed geographical basis of the Devolution Deal linking Derbyshire to Nottinghamshire to form a Mayoral Combined County Authority.*

RESOLVED:

The Council after considering the contents and possible implications of the East Midlands Devolution Deal (the Devolution Deal) and the proposed creation of an East Midlands Combined County Authority (EMCCA) resolved to respond to the consultation as follows-

- 1. In absence of the required and essential detail as to the direct effect both financially and on service delivery to the residents of South Derbyshire, whom we were all elected to represent, the Council has little alternative but to reject any support for this hastily contrived proposal as not being in the best interests of the residents of South Derbyshire.***
- 2 Furthermore the council wish to express its opposition to the proposed geographical basis of the Devolution Deal linking Derbyshire to Nottinghamshire to form a Mayoral Combined County Authority.***

Under Rule 16.5 of the Council Procedure rules Members requested that a recorded vote be taken.

The Members who voted in favour of the resolution were:

Councillors Bambrick, Churchill, Gee, MacPherson, L Mulgrew, M Mulgrew, Pearson, Pegg, Rhind, Richards, Shepherd, Singh, Southerd, Stuart, Taylor, Tilley and Wheelton.

The Members who voted against the motion were:

Councillors Ackroyd, Atkin, Bridgen, Brown, Corbin, Dawson, Fitzpatrick, Ford, Haines, Hewlett, Muller, Patten, Smith and Watson.

CL/93 **LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 (AS AMENDED BY THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT [ACCESS TO INFORMATION] ACT 1985)**

RESOLVED:

That in accordance with Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended) the press and public be excluded from the remainder of the Meeting for the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined under the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act as indicated in the reports of Committees.

CL/94 **EXEMPT QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL PURSUANT TO COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULE NUMBER 11**

Council was informed that no questions had been received.

The meeting terminated at 18:40 hours.

COUNCILLOR S BAMBRICK

VICE-CHAIR OF THE DISTRICT COUNCIL