

PUBLIC

MINUTES of the meeting of the **DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**
held on 8 April 2015 at County Hall, Matlock

PRESENT

Councillors D Allen, S A Bambrick, Ms C Bisknell, Mrs S L Blank, Mrs M W Booth, A Botham, S Brittain, K Buttery, Mrs D W E Charles, Mrs L M Chilton, D Collins, Mrs C M Cox, J A Coyle, R Davison, J E Dixon, P Dunn, S J Ellis, M Ford, S Freeborn, J A Frudd, Mrs P A Gilby, K Gillott, D T Greenhalgh, Mrs C A Hart, Mrs Janet A Hill, Ms Julie A Hill, R L Hosker, Mrs J M Innes, T A Kemp, Mrs K D Lauro, B Lewis, D W Lomax, S Marshall-Clarke, W Major, D McGregor, R Mihaly, C R Moesby, K P Morgan, C E Neill, J R Owen, R A Parkinson, Mrs J E Patten, Mrs I Ratcliffe, B Ridgway, P J Smith, T Southerd, S A Spencer, Mrs M Stockdale, Mrs J S Street, D H Taylor, Mrs J A Twigg, D Walton, Ms A Western, D J Wilcox, E S Wilcox, D A Williams, J G Williams and B Wright.

18/15 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR On the motion of Councillor D J Wilcox, duly seconded

RESOLVED that Councillor S Freeborn be appointed Chair of the County Council for 2015/16.

(Councillor S Freeborn - in the Chair)

19/15 APPOINTMENT OF VICE-CHAIR On the motion of Councillor B Wright, duly seconded

RESOLVED that Councillor Mrs Janet A Hill be appointed Vice-Chair of the County Council for 2015/16.

20/15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE Apologies for absence were submitted on behalf of Councillors Mrs E Atkins, Mrs G Birkin, S J Bradford, P Jones and M V Longden.

21/15 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST There were no declarations of interest.

22/15 CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS The following announcements were made:-

(1) Councillor Tricia Gilby, newly elected Member for the Brimington Division was welcomed to her first meeting.

(2) Members were informed of the death of former County Councillor Margaret Treweek who represented the Brackenfield Division from 1989 to 2005 and was Vice-Chair of the Council from 2003-5. Members observed a minute's silence and tributes were made.

(3) The by-election for the Ashbourne Division arising from the resignation of Councillor A I Lewer, was to be held on 7 May 2015.

(4) A presentation was made to Director of Public Health Elaine Michel and Julie Hirst and Rosie Kightley of the Health and Communities Department following the County Council's receipt of two awards at the recent East Midlands Public Health Celebration Awards.

23/15 CABINET APPOINTMENTS, PORTFOLIO RESPONSIBILITIES, COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP AND APPOINTMENTS TO OUTSIDE BODIES On the motion of Councillor Ms A Western duly seconded,

RESOLVED (1) to note the Leader's appointments to Cabinet and the portfolio responsibilities; and

(2) to approve the appointments to Committees and Sub-Committees and the appointments to serve on outside bodies; subject to the list being amended as follows:-

Delegation Sub Committee of the Regulatory Licencing and Appeals Sub Committee – delete Councillor Julie Hill and insert Councillor Janet Hill.

Improvement and Scrutiny Committee – People – delete Councillor R Mihaly and insert Councillor C Cox.

Pensions and Investment Committee – Councillor D J Wilcox to be appointed Vice Chair.

Derbyshire Combined Fire Authority – delete Councillor B Lewis and insert Councillor Mrs J E Patten.

(3) to note that a further report would be presented to Council on 3 June 2015 and to future meetings, as appropriate, should political group nominations be amended during the municipal year.

24/15 MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING On the motion of Councillor S Freeborn, duly seconded,

RESOLVED that the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 4 February 2015 be confirmed as a correct record.

25/15 REPORT OF THE LEADER OF THE COUNCIL

Councillor A Western, Leader of the Council, reported on the progress made on current major issues, notably progress on the establishment of a Combined Authority and the discussions that had taken place on a Devolution Deal; and the achievements of the Council over the last 12 months that were set out in the report on the Council Plan.

In referring to the Combined Authority, the Leader wished to place on record the Council's appreciation of the contribution of all of those involved in the progress made to date and, in particular, that of Joe Battye of the Economy, Transport and Environment Department.

26/15 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Question from Mrs E Potter to Councillor A Western, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Strategic Policy, Economic Development and Budget:-

The Learning Disability Carers Community and Disability Campaigners are two Derbyshire organisations who are committed to developing a grass-roots Coalition Against the Cuts Campaign for Derbyshire, bringing together disabled people, carers and supporters to be One Voice against the imposition of cuts on Derbyshire families, and on disabled and vulnerable people.

This Coalition demands a halt to the austerity being handed down from Government and also a halt to the cuts being imposed by Councils. We cannot afford for there not to be an alternative to this unfair, inhumane policy.

Backing for the Coalition so far comes from Our Vision Our Future, Enable Carers' Forum, Rethink MASH, Learning Disability Alliance England, Unite Community, and Mencap north of England region.

The Council has been criticised for certain expenditure whilst then making cuts to services and also for its interpretation of the County's finances and Government funding settlements.

Can the Council please clarify the reasons for expenditure on the outgoing Chief Executive, councillors trips outside of Derbyshire, and on private consultants, and what the correct figures are for the finances, and therefore put to bed the seemingly never ending dispute about this expenditure and about the Government funding settlement?

Councillor Western responded as follows:-

There are quite a number of parts to your question so I will deal with them in order and deal with the specifics first.

As regards the previous Chief Executive, these are extremely challenging times. A political decision was made that those times needed different management skills and fresh eyes. In regard to councillor trips, there are regulations governing councillors claiming travelling expenses and travel outside of Derbyshire is restricted to those purposes that have a clear benefit for Derbyshire. On a personal level as a councillor who probably travels more than anyone else, I do not claim back any mileage or any car parking costs that I incur personally but there is some control over that, as I say, at a Council level.

With regard to consultants, we are keeping a close eye on this to reduce costs, although sometimes it does make sense to use consultants on a one-off basis or where we need special expertise on an intermittent basis, so rather than employ a full-time specialist we bring that expertise as and when we need it, but we are bearing down on costs like that to make sure that the expenditure is justified.

As regards to the disputing of figures, I can fully understand it is confusing for the public when there is what appears to be a political tit-for-tat about the finances. We have seen it here in this Council Chamber when the Conservative Opposition at one meeting accuses this administration of dithering over the cuts saying that we should be cutting deeper and faster and at the budget meeting last time denying that the Council's budget has been reduced at all, so I can see it is very confusing for the public and not a very edifying spectacle if I can say as well.

My response is for you to look beyond Derbyshire, look beyond the local political debate on it and look at what is happening in the rest of the country. Cuts to services are not just a Derbyshire problem, they are happening right across the country and there is a general consensus, I think, that these are happening to a more severe extent the further north in the country you go actually.

I would just quote a few non-partisan sources in that debate. The Local Government Association (which is the national body that represents all Councils and is politically neutral) they say there has been a 40% reduction in local government funding in the past five years so that is not a political view, that is a neutral view that says 40% of Councils' budgets have been cut.

Other organisations like the County Councils' Network, which represents just the County Councils and is Conservative led, they have taken a very strong position with the Government about the degree of cuts that are being imposed on County Councils. Some of the larger

Conservative counties like Surrey, Buckinghamshire and Leicestershire are also complaining about the degree of cuts that they are facing, so this is not a Labour stance against a Conservative Government. There is a general consensus, I think, across local government that these funding cuts are hurting and because they target Councils they are impacting on very vulnerable people some of the time.

A further factor, just to explain more fully, not all of service cuts are due to funding. The introduction of the Care Act has for the first time set a national level for access to services with a higher threshold than that which Derbyshire has historically offered so they have set a national threshold rather than allowing Councils to set their own, as they did in the past. A higher threshold means that fewer people are eligible for care services. That is a specific change in legislation that has meant people who were previously able to access services in certain parts of the country are not able to any more.

I just want to explain a little bit because the opening of your question is about disability services and to say this administration we are not just wringing our hands and saying "Oh dear that is a shame" and we are doing nothing about it, we have introduced a four pronged approach to mitigating the worst of the damage arising from government cuts and those four different strands are the use of reserves. We are using Council reserves to protect some of the services for vulnerable people, whether they are adults or children, and that means for instance an extra £10m a year is going into social care. That is a political decision made by this Council. We are using Public Health money across a broad range of services that would otherwise have been cut. We are developing new income streams to fill the hole that is left when government funding is removed and in particular I just draw your attention to two.

We are consulting at the moment about using some Council land for the generation of solar energy, renewable energy to sell to the National Grid and the funding that that raises will go back into frontline services. We are also developing, as you have just heard, a Combined Authority and the purpose of that is to work more effectively together across Derbyshire and to bring funding down to the local level that currently sits in Whitehall because there is a huge body of evidence that says when money is spent locally it is more effective and services can be provided of high quality but cheaper. The fourth strand is innovation. We are setting up an Innovation Team and that will find more efficient and more effective ways of delivering services, so again protecting the quality of services but doing it more cost effectively.

Finally, just to be clear about the correct figures for the finances. These are not my figures, these are the figures from the Head of

Finance here who is a very well respected officer of this Authority. What he says is the figures that have already been published, including those at the budget report to the last Council meeting and in the Five Year Plan and in the Council Tax leaflet are figures that he will stand by. The Plan states that we have had to make spending reductions of £270m. We will be making those cuts over the ten year period that goes up to 2019/20. Included within that £270m over that ten year period is the figure that is quoted quite often of £157m in the five years that we are currently in, up to 2018, so those figures are real figures. The reductions are down to a combination of cash reductions in Government grants; restrictions on the ability to raise Council Tax and under-funding of pressures such as demographic growth in the number of Adult Care clients, so those three factors, cuts of grants, Council Tax restrictions and demographic growth that has not been funded account for the situation.

The Revenue Support Grant that this Council receives from Government has been cut by 27%, that is £34m, just in the one year between the financial year 2014/15 that has just finished and the one that is starting, so that is a 27% cut in that funding stream just in one year. This is the largest reduction of similar Councils, that is County Councils that do not have responsibility for the Fire and Rescue Service. They are the figures, they are the facts, not my figures as I say, they are the figures that this Authority has put forward from our officers.

I would just like to say given the scale of this and given the fact that Adult Social Care and Children's Services account for 64% of this Council's budget it is inevitable that with all the best efforts we can make some of those cuts will fall on those services because even if we stopped doing everything else that still would not fill the hole that has been left by the cuts in this Council's budget and inevitably Government cuts and legislation will impact on that. Basically the country has a choice to make in four weeks' time on May the 7th.

A supplementary question was asked as follows:-

The Coalition Against the Cuts we have in Derbyshire wanted to know what was going on so we are not here to make mischief, to be provocative and to engage in tittle-tattle. In fact we are quite fed up with it. We are fed up with mischief making and political grandstanding. We just wanted to know is the Council or is it not funded fairly and how much do we actually need to pay for all the services we need for all the people who live in Derbyshire? The Local Government Association Head, David Sparks, says that the level of social care funding is not allowing a civilised amount of care to be maintained. Please can we have some kind of cross- party working or a cross-party working group

or something arranged by the Scrutiny Committee like happened with the Youth Service cuts, get everybody on board and facing the right direction. I do not care who comes in on May 7th, we are fed up with it all. We want cross-party group working. We want to be invited to work with you to put this case to the next government for fairer funding, a fairer deal for Derbyshire, so can we have that?

Councillor Western responded as follows:-

What I would say is I understand that the Cabinet team, led by Councillor Smith, has made offers to meet your Group and we can certainly facilitate that, there is not a problem, that offer is already on the table.

I do remember very well the Youth Service cuts and I remember how strongly the Labour Group fought against the proposed cuts. I remember as well that the solution to that was not cross-party it was something that was resisted very strongly by the controlling group at that time.

As much as I welcome your suggestion of cross-party working on this I am a bit doubtful as to whether we are going to achieve that, given the current circumstances, and with the greatest of respect to my colleagues from other parties this is a Labour administration and it will be the Labour Group that leads on policy discussions and so on.

I would invite you to take up the offer that has come from Councillor Smith, Councillor Davison and Councillor Jones and meet with them so we can work together, and please be assured that we are making every effort to get Derbyshire's need for fair funding across to the current Government in its last days and to a future Labour Government that hopefully will be in after the 7th of May.

27/15 RECEIPT OF PETITIONS No petitions had been received.

28/15 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL It was a requirement of the Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 that the Council appoint an Independent Panel on Members' Allowances to consider issues and put forward recommendations for the Council to consider in relation to the Members' Allowances Scheme. The Regulations also included a requirement for the Panel to make an Annual report to Council on its recent activities.

Mr S Westwood, Panel member, presented the Annual Report for 2014/15. The Panel had no recommendations to put forward to Council in the report.

On the motion of Councillor Ms A Western duly seconded,

RESOLVED that the Annual Report be received.

29/15 COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES Under the current arrangements, the Rules of Procedure relating to Council meetings did not provide for questions to be asked following the verbal presentation of the Report of the Leader of the Council. At its meeting on 3 December 2014, the Council resolved to amend the Rules to allow Members to ask relevant questions.

It was proposed that the Council's Rules of Procedure (Part 4 of the Constitution) be amended to include a new clause 9A, as follows:

9A. Questions by Members on the Report of the Leader of the Council

9.1 A Member of the Council may ask the Leader of the Council a question directly arising from the report.

9.2 A Member asking a question under this Standing Order may ask one supplementary question which must arise directly out of the original question or reply.

The subsequent Standing Orders would be re-numbered accordingly, with the current paragraph 9 becoming 9B.

It was also proposed to amend item 5 on the standard order of business of the Council to provide for 'Report of the Leader of the Council and Members' questions'.

The proposed change to the Rules of Procedure was considered by the Standards Committee on 25 March 2015. The Committee commended the proposed amendment.

On the motion of Councillor Ms A Western duly seconded,

RESOLVED to approve and adopt the proposed amendments to the Council's Rules of Procedure, to take effect from the next meeting of the Council on 3 June 2015.

30/15 COUNCIL PLAN UPDATE 2015/16 The Council Plan clearly established and communicated the Council's key priorities to a

wide range of stakeholders including: members of the public; service users; councillors; employees; businesses; and partner organisations.

The Plan was structured around the five key pledges which would enable the Council to demonstrate how services contribute to better outcomes for local people.

As part of an annual programme, the Plan has been reviewed and an update for 2015-16 has been produced to ensure that the Plan continued to reflect the priorities of the Council and remained fit for purpose. The update sets out, for each pledge, the key achievements from last year and priority actions identified for 2015-16.

On the motion of Councillor Ms A Western duly seconded,

RESOLVED that the Council Plan update 2015-16 be approved.

31/15 DEPARTMENTAL SERVICE PLANS 2015/16 Service Plans set out how each department would contribute to and deliver priorities set out in the 2014-17 Council Plan and how impact would be measured. The Service Plans were considered by Cabinet on 24 March 2015 and were recommended to the Council for approval.

On the motion of Councillor Ms A Western duly seconded,

RESOLVED to approve the Departmental Service Plans 2015-16.

32/15 ESTABLISHMENT OF A LOCAL PENSION BOARD

Council was informed of the need to establish a Local Pension Board for Derbyshire in accordance with the recently published Local Government Pension Scheme requirements. The new governance structure was being brought into effect by the Local Government Pension Scheme (Amendment) (Governance) Regulations 2015 which were published on the 26 January 2015. The Regulations were intended to ensure better governance and improved accountability in the Local Government Pension Scheme. A new national Scheme Advisory Board was being established to provide advice to both the Secretary of State and to administering authorities such as the County Council. The Regulations also required administering authorities to establish Local Pension Boards by April 2015.

The County Council must, therefore, approve the establishment of a Local Pension Board, its composition and its terms of reference without delay. The statutory guidance accompanying the Regulations clearly recognised that the timescale for establishing the Boards was unrealistic and acknowledged that it would not be possible for them to

be operational immediately; the guidance anticipated that they would be operational within a reasonably practicable period after 1 April.

On the motion of Councillor Ms A Western, duly seconded,

RESOLVED (1) to approve the establishment of a Local Pension Board;

(2) to approve the Terms of Reference for the Local Pension Board as set out in the appendix to the report; and

(3) to note that a further report would be presented to Council on 3 June 2015 relating to the appointment of Board members.

33/15 WAIVER OF CALL-IN PROVISIONS On the motion of Councillor Ms A Western, duly seconded,

RESOLVED to note the report on the agreements to waive the call-in provisions.

34/15 PRESENTATIONS There were no presentations.

35/15 REPORT OF CABINET AND MEMBERS' QUESTIONS ON THE REPORT Councillor A Western, Leader of the Council, presented a report on the decisions that had been taken at meetings on Cabinet held on 3 and 10 February and 3 and 24 March 2015.

Questions on the report had been received from Councillor B Lewis as follows:-

Question for Councillor A Western, Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Strategic Policy, Economic Development and Budget from Councillor B Lewis on Sustainable Energy - Ground Mounted Solar PV (3 March 2015, Item 15)

We are supportive of the use of renewables where appropriate, however, this paper raises a few questions:

(1) In NPPF and within the framework of localism, developers of such schemes are encouraged to explore mutually beneficial arrangements, such as perhaps providing low cost energy to local households as a way of ameliorating the negative aspects of these large scale developments. This document looks at the methods of income generation, some or all of which could be utilised, but does not discuss the benefits to communities. Will the Cabinet Member undertake to do that as part of this consultation?

(2) Which three sites is this Council aiming will be fast-tracked before March 2016?

(3) Will the Council be mindful of local concerns where this type of development could blight a rural area?

Councillor Western responded as follows:-

The answer to the first part around the NPPF, the NPPF was taken into consideration when carrying out feasibility work to determine which Council owned sites had potential for ground mounted solar PV. This has ensured that the selected sites have a relatively low impact on communities in the first instance.

Additionally, improvements to the ecology and landscape in the vicinity of any development is being factored into the business case. Improved habitats has been a theme of the ongoing consultation.

Finally, the finances generated will be utilised to protect local services and this has been received well by local residents during the consultation. Detailed business cases and the consultation responses will be presented to Cabinet in May for consideration.

In answer to the second part of the question about the three sites, this will be dependent on the consultation responses and the grid connection costs for each site. However, the three larger sites are at Swanwick, Williamthorpe and Temple Normanton and it is hoped that at least two of these three will be developed.

Thirdly, "Will the Council be mindful of local concerns?" Absolutely. This is the reason for the early non-statutory consultation. It is hoped that any development will be seen as a positive temporary land use. Any land used will be protected from any further and more intrusive development for 25 years, will be environmentally enhanced and will ultimately be returned to its current use.

The panels used are low level, non-reflective and do allow sheep grazing to continue underneath. Furthermore they create no additional road traffic.

Councillor Lewis asked a supplementary question as follows:-

Just in regard to the NPPF and the sort of exchange of energy for permission, I guess is probably the best way of describing it, I would argue that, in specific sites, such as those affected like at Temple Normanton, they might have a specific view about whether they would like to benefit from the energy that is produced there as a way of

ameliorating that impact. I can see why the whole county might say, "Yes, it would be a good thing to use that money to put back into Council services" and that is quite agreeable, but when you are down to a specific community that is impacted upon by this sort of development then there might be specific questions raised, so my question would be would you in those instances where those specific communities are affected look at that particular issue?

Councillor Western responded as follows:-

The purpose of doing this pre-consultation, non-statutory consultation was to test the temperature with communities because obviously this is a first venture of this type in this county and it is relatively new across the country so we will be mindful of whatever issues come back from the consultation when we take the further report in May. At this moment I do not know what the consultation responses are so I cannot rule anything out or in, but there is no point conducting a consultation exercise if you do not take note of what comes out of it.

Question for Councillor K Gillott, Cabinet Member for Children and Young People from Councillor B Lewis on the Report on the findings of the consultation undertaken on the proposals to review Children's Centres (3 March 2015, Item 26)

This report raises a number of concerns, chiefly:

- (1) Of the five criteria to determine the future of children's centres numbers iv and v clearly did not apply to Ashbourne and Duffield. Could the Cabinet Member explain why?
- (2) It is clear that greater numbers of respondents will be affected by the closure of Ashbourne and Duffield than will be in Langwith and Castle Gresley, yet the users of the latter two, fortunately, have nearby provision that they can attend. Where does the Cabinet Member suggest that Ashbourne and Duffield users go?
- (3) This report amplifies the divide between the rural and urban provision of services. It is accepted that to deliver services that are valued costs more to do so in more sparsely populated rural areas. However, the effects of deprivation, due to poorer public transport links, cost of living and other factors can also be amplified, does the Cabinet Member not agree that delivering services in such areas is at least as important as it is in the more populous eastern parts of the County?
- (4) In this report it is highlighted that the closure of Ashbourne Children's Centre will net little cost saving and may impact upon Adult

Education provision there. Could the Cabinet Member reassure local residents that this will not be the case?

(5) Finally, what this report has highlighted is that real the cost savings are not in the closure of buildings, but in the staffing reductions. With over £163,000 being saved from Ashbourne and Duffield Centres, therefore, why was not a service wide staffing review considered for more significant savings whilst maintaining a service in our rural areas?

Councillor Gillott responded as follows:-

The greatest threat to the Children's Services that we now provide is not what we do, it is actually the budget cuts that this Council is now facing and, if the Tories are re-elected in May, they will be absolutely devastating in Derbyshire, absolutely devastating. £157m, yes it is £157m cuts that means for children's services reducing the budget from in excess of £100m to less than £80m and that takes us to this question really because why on earth are we wanting to cut Children's Centres? It is a Labour initiative, I remember it being started. I was in there from the very beginning. I think there are only six people in this room who have been on this Council longer than me now and I was involved in one of the very first Children's Centres in my home village of North Wingfield. I am incredibly proud of that and the work it has done. Therefore to be the person who has to cut Children's Services is a great sadness but it is not just Derbyshire who is cutting it, there are approximately 600 that have gone nationally and we know in the county if the Tories are re-elected there are another 20 likely to go at the very least.

If I turn to your question in detail I am going to give you some advice actually first of all, Councillor Lewis. The best thing to do before you ask a question is actually to read the report because the answer to most of your questions is contained in the report as well. I know Opposition is hard work, we did it for four years, but you had better get used to it because you are going to be there for a long time and if you are going to ask questions it would be very helpful, at least, if you asked questions where I did not just have to refer you to the page numbers to point out the answers.

If we take the first point of your question which is why those two criteria were not considered or were not applied in the same way, well the answer is quite simple: they were not applied because they are not measurable, they are child specific, and short of going through each and every child both current and future you can't make that decision. The requirement to actually apply a criteria and the requirement to actually target the services, although it is the right thing to do it is what we are instructed to do by your government, so as services and money

are cut you have to now concentrate it on the areas with the greatest need. Therefore we did do that and the three criteria that we did apply were to the areas with the least deprivation, the areas with the least usage and the areas with the high unit costs. That seems to me a perfectly sensible thing to do. If you have to cut back do that sort of thing and that is what we did. Two of the Centres that came out in all three categories just happened to be Duffield and Ashbourne.

When you actually look at the usage of those Centres, take Ashbourne for example, only 50% of children who could be registered at that Children's Centre are registered and of that 50% only two-thirds, in fact less than two-thirds actually use the Centre.

We will continue to support vulnerable children. The absence of a Centre does not mean those children will go without services. Most of them are getting one-to-one service outside the Children's Centre and that will continue. As far as alternative provision is concerned, I would have thought the obvious answer would have been to ask the local Member.

Question 3 is a false question. Children, wherever they are in Derbyshire, whether they are in a rural setting or an urban setting if they are vulnerable they are vulnerable and it is the job of this Authority to do its best for them. How we do that will vary. It will vary on what resources we have and it will vary on that community as well. I just do not accept what you are saying there, Councillor Lewis, it is just a false choice. What it does do though, it shows really you are not saying "Isn't it shocking that we are closing Children's Centres" because I think it is shocking that we are closing Children's Centres, all you are saying is "Isn't it shocking that you are closing Children's Centres in my areas", in Tory areas. I will be saying it is shocking wherever we have to close them and the fact that 600 have gone is incredibly shocking.

As far as Adult Education is concerned, the closure or not of the Children's Centre will not have a major impact on the future of Adult Education in Ashbourne because the bulk of the funding for Adult Education comes from a separate Government grant. It was cut last year. It has been cut by a further 8% I think it is this year. That is the real threat to Adult Education in Derbyshire and therefore as to what guarantee I can give to anybody, well if we have another Tory Government after May you can give no guarantees because the bulk of our services are going to go.

As for the final question well the answer is we did. We actually had a two stage process. The first stage was a service wide review and then the second stage was a specific consultation on the options we put forward, so I go back to my advice to you: at least take the courtesy of

reading the report from page 1 to the end and reading the other reports that go with it rather than just asking questions.

There was no supplementary question.

On the motion of Councillor A Western, duly seconded,

RESOLVED that the report be noted.

36/15 COUNCILLOR QUESTIONS There were no Councillor Questions.

37/15 MINUTES OF MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES AND OTHER BODIES On the motion of Councillor S Freeborn, duly seconded,

RESOLVED that the minutes of the following meetings be received:-

- (a) Regulatory – Licensing and Appeals Committee held on 2 March 2015
- (b) Regulatory – Planning Committee held on 9 February and 9 March 2015
- (c) Pensions and Investment Committee held on 21 January 2015
- (d) Audit Committee held on 3 February 2015
- (e) Improvement and Scrutiny Committee – People held on 19 March 2015
- (f) Improvement and Scrutiny Committee – Places held on 24 February and 11 March 2015
- (g) Improvement and Scrutiny Committee – Health held on 21 January and 16 March 2015
- (h) Improvement and Scrutiny Committee – Resources held on 19 March 2015
- (i) Improvement and Scrutiny Management Committee held on 23 February 2015
- (j) Health and Wellbeing Board held on 15 January and 11 March 2015
- (k) Derbyshire Police and Crime Panel held on 29 January 2015
- (l) Derbyshire Fire and Rescue Authority held on 4 December 2014.