



Rutland County Council

Catmose Oakham Rutland LE15 6HP.
Telephone 01572 722577 Facsimile 01572 75307

Minutes of the **MEETING of the COUNCIL** held in the <https://zoom.us/j/96585533627> on Monday, 11th January, 2021 at 7.00 pm

PRESENT:

Mr E Baines	Mr N Begy
Mr K Bool	Mr J Dale
Mr O Hemsley	Mr G Brown
Mr R Coleman	Mrs L Stephenson
Mr A Walters	Mr D Wilby
Mr P Ainsley	Mr D Blanksby
Mr A Brown	Ms J Burrows
Mr W Cross	Mrs J Fox
Mrs S Harvey	Miss M Jones
Mr A Lowe	Ms A MacCartney
Mr M Oxley	Mrs K Payne
Mrs R Powell	Mr I Razzell
Miss G Waller	Mrs S Webb
Mr N Woodley	

**OFFICERS
PRESENT:**

Mr M Andrews	Interim Chief Executive
Mr S Della Rocca	Strategic Director of Resources
Mr P Horsfield	Monitoring Officer
Mrs P Sharpe	Strategic Director for Places
Mr J Morley	Director of Adult Services and Health
Ms D Godfrey	Director of Children's Services
Mrs E Powley	Governance Manager
Ms E Dearsley	Governance Officer

1 APOLOGIES

There were none.

2 CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chairman confirmed that his engagements had been circulated in advance of the meeting.

3 ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE LEADER, MEMBERS OF THE CABINET OR THE HEAD OF PAID SERVICE

Councillor Hemsley spoke in relation to the COVID briefing. He raised that at the end of 2020 there had been a significant tightening of restrictions resulting at the start of 2021 in the Country being placed in lockdown. The impact of this was stark across the Country and there

had been a rise in hospital admissions and lives lost. Councillors noted that for Rutland, the lockdown came at the right time as there had been a sharp rise in figures and lockdown would assist in helping reduce this. The current figures were 283,000 per 100,000 of the population. The County had directed resources to help communities such as testing, shielding and vaccinations.

Councillor Hemsley went on to say how important it was to follow the national guidelines, most notably, those for staying at home. These included washing hands, keeping the house ventilated, self-isolating and following contact tracing guidance. 1.9million vaccines had currently been issued and the rollout encouraging and a relief. It was important that everyone continued to remind the community of being vigilant and following the guidance.

Councillor G Brown provided Council with an update on the Housing Infrastructure grant and the current position. He explained that work continued into getting agreement on the two key documents; the Grant Determination Agreement (GDA) and the Allocation Agreement. In relation to the GDA it was a Standard Homes England document and there had been some reluctance for it being modified for Rutland's unique project. The MOD and Rutland officers had been facing firm negotiations but Homes England was maintaining its standard position with only some amendments. It was almost complete and just required changes to the wording of some of the Schedules which were attached to the main document. The Allocations Agreement focused on the roles and responsibilities between Rutland and the MOD to agree the GDA.

Council expressed thanks for the hard work of all officers involved in the difficult process over the last nine months especially over unprecedented times.

4 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

In relation to Item 10, Mr Horsfield, the Monitoring Officer, advised that for those Councillors which were also Members of Parish Councils, he did not think discussion would result in a pecuniary interest. They may wish to advise that they are Members of a Parish Council for transparency.

During the meeting, on the second motion of item 15, Cllr Dale raised a pecuniary interest as a family member was in receipt of a carers allowance. He would not vote on this motion.

5 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The Chairman proposed, and Councillor Hemsley seconded that the minutes of the two hundred and twenty third meeting of the Rutland County Council held on 9th November 2020, be confirmed as amended by Councillor Waller prior to the meeting and circulated.

RESOLVED

The minutes of the Council meeting held on the 9th November 2020 be confirmed as a true record.

6 PETITIONS, DEPUTATIONS AND QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC

There were none.

7 QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

Question from Councillor Jones to the Leader

“At the Cabinet meeting on Nov 17th 2020, it was announced that Cllr Stephenson would be taking on the role of Climate Change Champion:

- a) Can the terms of reference of the role be shared with councillors and made public through appending to the minutes of this meeting?
- b) With reference to the Climate Action Motion passed by Full Council in October 2019, can you confirm that Cllr Stephenson is therefore the cabinet member taking responsibility for the delivery of Zero Carbon Activity?
- c) What are the levels of carbon emissions from Council activities and how has this been calculated?”

In response to Councillor Jones, the Leader replied:

“The Terms of Reference were being drafted and would be circulated with the Minutes. He would like these to be informed by the discussions and debate with Councillors and the Community over the coming months. The final Terms of Reference would come to Full Council to be approved as well as the appointment of the Climate Change Champion for 2021/22.”

“The Leader confirmed that since the recent changes to portfolios, Councillor Stephenson would be the cabinet Member for the delivery of the Action Plan on Climate Change.”

“Councillor Stephenson would be addressing the planned programme of works to implement the Council’s planned approach and would be obtaining the latest up to date carbon emission baseline figures. Currently they were estimated and published by BASE to assess the impact within the Council and County wide. A link to this will be appended to the reply.”

There were no supplementary questions.

Question from Councillor Jones to the Leader

The Climate Action Motion committed to ensuring that the Executive and Scrutiny functions review council activities taking account of production and consumption emissions, and produce an action plan within 12 months, together with budget actions and a measured baseline.

- a) What precisely has Cabinet done in the last year to fulfil this requirement?
- b) On how many occasions has each scrutiny panel reviewed Council activities taking account of production and consumption emissions and as a result produced an action plan?
- c) Where on the forward plan is there an action plan to reduce carbon emissions?

The Leader responded that:

Alongside the Council's Climate Action Motion, it was agreed the Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny Committee would convene a Biodiversity Task and Finish Group. This Task and Finish Group took priority and had now concluded its discussions and published its findings in October last year.

The Covid-19 pandemic had impacted timescales for developing a comprehensive carbon reduction plan informed by a measured baseline. However, the pandemic had also provided opportunities for the Council to take positive steps in reducing its contribution to carbon emissions. Taking prompt action to enable staff to work from home and continue to do so since March 2020 had led to a considerable reduction in both business and commuter mileage, and associated emissions. In addition, the Council had taken the difficult decision to maintain a virtual offer for a number of services that were previously accommodation-based such as Brightways, Jules House and culture and libraries. This had resulted in a reduction in energy usage and again associated carbon emissions.

The Council had also continued to pursue funding opportunities to promote sustainability and carbon reduction and successfully secured grant funding to promote 'Active Travel' and cycling and walking routes. Through a consortium bid in conjunction with Peterborough Council and led by Portsmouth Council, the Council had been successful in securing Green Homes Grant funding. This should enable some home owners in Rutland to secure a financial contribution to home energy efficiency improvements.

Cabinet members and officers had also been engaging with other local authorities and partners, such as the Greater Lincolnshire Local Enterprise Partnership, to learn from good practice and inform our future approach to climate change.

The Scrutiny panels were not something I would influence but I would hope that the Scrutiny Commission would engage with Cllr Stephenson to inform the action plan, and, as before, Growth, Infrastructure and Resources Scrutiny have already considered the findings of the Biodiversity Task and Finish Group in October 2020.

I would argue that the Action Plan was already part of the forward plan as it was part of our decision making process, but I also understand that we should formalise this work, and Cllr Stephenson will expand on this later

Councillor Jones asked a supplementary question regarding the Biodiversity Task and Finish Group and how a great piece of work had been completed. However, there were no timelines given or names of officers carrying out the work to ensure that the Action would be in place by the end of the Council year. The Leader agreed that this would be added to the plan going forward.

Question Councillor Jones to Councillor Stephenson

1. What is the programme of work you will be undertaking in the role of Climate Change Champion?
2. How do you intend to involve the public of Rutland with the Climate Change debate?

3. With reference to the Climate Action Motion passed by Full Council in October 2019, could this council hear Cllr Stephenson's plans to:
 - a) "ensure that Cabinet and an Officer of the Senior Management Team embed this work [zero carbon activity] in all areas and
 - b) take responsibility for reducing, as rapidly as possible, the carbon emissions resulting from the Council's activities, ensuring that any recommendations are fully costed and affordable"

Councillor Stephenson responded that:

In relation to the programme of work in relation to her role as Climate Change Champion that without a coherent plan that included a comprehensive understanding of why addressing climate change was crucial to ensure a future proof planet as we head through the Anthropocene age. The interdependencies to other key issues such as biodiversity and an overarching understanding of this at a global level was fundamental: we were in the Anthropocene age; how we have lived was no longer sustainable – the planet cannot cope with how humans use the planet; to address this would not simply be a case of addressing climate change rather reviewing and altering the core values by which we had hitherto lived our lives. To consider this, therefore as a standalone programme of work would be ill advised; to affect fundamental and lasting change this would need a whole organisation approach. With this in mind the 'Future Rutland Conversation' work would need to be the overarching backbone – what we aspire to deliver and most crucially the way in which we deliver it has to be underpinned by a fundamental shift in our values, as individuals and as a collective community. Here I am driving at 'growth' as an overarching principle that has underpinned millennia of human existence.

In terms of specific work for an effective approach to climate change: I propose that there are 5 key areas that must be included: scoping (establishing our boundaries – what are we responsible for and where partnership working would be required to achieve a common goal); a carbon baseline assessment: detailed and specific analysis of where we were currently at; the identification of deliverable decarbonisation projects; a comprehensive and cohesive finance plan and finally monitoring and evaluating sufficiently to enable any plans to be flexible, working documents that can develop as needed to deliver our duty to reduce the impact of human activity on climate change. Within all this we need to be clear of the interdependencies between the various services and underlying policies. This would be a very complex piece of work and one that would need everyone's support.

Involving the public of Rutland drives to the crux of the climate change issue: this was not a challenge for anyone person, organisation or business, county or indeed country. To be successful everyone must play their part, not least with an acknowledgement of where we were at as a species on a planet and an overarching understanding of how the choices we made could have a positive and an accumulative impact. In the Spring RCC would be hosting a Climate Change Summit –this would be streamed to enable as many people as possible to attend. One of the outputs of this would be the establishment of Climate Action Groups within our community – this would be crucial with supporting individuals to address their carbon footprints.

There was much good practice to be tapped into not least the report due in the spring from the newly formed UK Citizens' Climate Assembly. The pandemic pausing of the overarching Climate Action Partnership (involving stakeholders from across the county) needs to be re – started and will provide an essential input into the programme for the Climate Summit. It was also crucial that this engagement was not confined to our adult population, work with the Rutland Youth Council and our schools likewise crucial. On that note I would wish to bring members' attention to the work on food waste that RYC is currently undertaking which had a helpful synergy with work that the Waste Management Board was currently doing reviewing and developing a new waste management strategy. I believe this is important to deliver on.

The 'Future Rutland Conversation' work would ensure that Cabinet and officers of the Senior Management Team embed this into all areas. A starting point was our reports: climate impact needs to be identified in all reports as we do equality and diversity. To be clear, this was not a one person job – as your questions have demonstrated how we all work together as elected members is crucial: the agendas that scrutiny panels set, the questions asked at full council, members engagement with cabinet papers and full utilisation of the portfolio holders' informal 'open door' policy to question and interrogate policy with a collective desire to make how we live mutually beneficial, not just as one distinct species but rather as one, albeit powerful, element of a planetary ecosystem.

The responsibility lies with all of us for reducing, as rapidly as possible, the carbon emissions resulting from the Council's activities: this was not a one-person job. I refer to my initial response above in terms of specific plans – I am sure Councillor Jones would appreciate that the overarching plan needed to be developed first.

In relation to the last question regarding reviewing the targets Councillor Stephenson responded that as members were aware a motion had been tabled to discuss later. I am not pre – determined to this debate; it was an important one to have and I come to it with a desire to listen, learn and consequently reach a decision which will be made with a disregard to the political labels we have chosen for ourselves. The issue of living through this age and successfully was a matter that is bigger than modern political labels; it was a global concern and one which would require cooperation and a determination to reach conclusions and actions that were the right thing to do. Therefore, my answer to this question is based on my knowledge and that of our officers to date, I reserve the right to change my mind as result of listening to members during the debate. This I believe is in the spirit of what we wish to achieve: an environment of cooperation to deliver what is best for the overall well – being and health of our community.

Other councils are referenced in this question. For clarity South Kesteven has not committed to being carbon zero by 2030, rather they have set a target of a 60% reduction with an ambition of 'becoming carbon zero as soon as viable before 2050'. Melton, having set a 60% reduction by 2030 in their outlined Climate Change plan dating from 2008, had changed this stance to carbon zero by 2030 as from 2019, but did not have a more recent plan than the 2008 one. The councils that remain in this question had got clear plans of delivery and crucially plans for annual monitoring and evaluating progress.

There were various methodologies for reducing carbon emission: one such is carbon off set. I am uncomfortable with this. If we were to agree that the fundamental challenge was not to produce the carbon emissions in the first place, then off set

simply creates rebound or 'greenwashing' whereby we might feel successful at a local level but fail to consider the global impact and actually make little or no difference to the global aim of reducing temperature rise to 1.5 degrees C.

In order to achieve a future proof blueprint for how we live required time, planning and investment. To set targets that were unachievable I do not think useful; any targets that were set must not be vague and populist, rather evidence based with a supported methodology for delivery. Therefore, until we had our baseline work completed, I think it ill advised to set a target at this precise point. I like the South Kesteven wording: becoming carbon zero as soon as is viable'.

In terms of declaring an emergency, I am never a fan of doing something just because everyone else has or in this case 74%. I am mindful of avoiding going down a linguistic rabbit hole but the use of language was important. Last year, as the pandemic took hold, a state of emergency was declared: the use of emergency powers instigated and still happening – is this how we understand the implication of declaring a state of climate emergency? Clearly in practice, as far as I can see, this declaration by councils had resulted in plans (%), and (%) getting their baseline assessments done as of January 2020. The words had not necessarily resulted in meaningful action or to quote Luke Osborne (ECA advisor) 'There is a lot of rhetoric out there but very few action plans'. A piece, published this January, regarding the impact of Cyclone Idai on Mozambique is referred to by the writer as a climate crisis not a climate emergency. 1,000 people died, 146,000 people lost their homes and 2,355 people were still living in a temporary camp some 11 months after the cyclone struck. Addressing climate change, I believe, therefore is a matter of urgency and should be described as such. So my questions are these, and I hope that members will share their views through the course of debate under item 15 'What is the value added of declaring an emergency? What impact will the use of this word have? Is there a more useful term to capture our shared goal of carbon neutrality?'

Councillor Jones asked a supplementary question in response. She felt that there was always reasons for not doing something but this was not that time. Being part of the 74-78% of Councils trying to achieve net zero by 2030 was a great collective resource. The word ambition had been said a lot and that was a key word. She asked Councillor Stephenson whether she felt that the Council could draw upon the others to help with its plans. Councillor Stephenson responded that they did have very good plans but as far as she could see but the meat upon the bones were lacking. She was not keen in having a collective march as might not be the right direction to help with the Council's own one it wants to achieve.

Question from Councillor Dale to Councillor Hemsley

Would the leader agree, that the option he chose last June, to take all his allocation of seats on scrutiny and committees has resulted in some of his members sitting on 3 ,4 ,5 panels while members of other groups are on none, a fair indication of an open transparent and all-inclusive council which he stated he wanted two years ago?

Councillor Hemsley responded that:

Thank you Cllr Dale for your question, I would think that this question could be asked of all group leaders, as I understand that we have all taken our full allocation of seats.

With regards the comment on Open and Transparent I had asked that all Chairs ensure that as our constitution allows for contributions from Councillors who were not members of the Committee. This allowed any elected member to raise their view on a topic and any elected member could attend any of these meetings. There were also numerous all member briefings to ensure that we were enabling all councillors the opportunity to be involved, it was however up to each elected member to choose their priorities and attend these if they wish.

Councillor Dales asked a supplementary question asking if the Constitution Review Working Group (CRWG) could look into allocating a further two seats to Scrutiny Panels. This was because he had found that since having not sat on a Panel for the last 6 months he was feeling that it was not very inclusive. He would like it to be brought back as a proposal. The Leader responded that he did not think this was something for the CRWG but Annual Council where the seat proportionality was debated.

Question to Councillor G Brown from Councillor Coleman

Councillor Coleman advised the Chairman that he would raise his questions under Item 10.

8 REFERRAL OF COMMITTEE DECISIONS TO THE COUNCIL

Nothing to raise.

9 CALL-IN OF DECISIONS FROM CABINET MEETINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM 10TH NOVEMBER 2020 TO 11TH JANUARY 2021

There were no call in of decisions.

10 REPORT FROM THE CABINET

Councillor G Brown presented a report to Council regarding payments being made to Parish Councils for the CIL [Community Infrastructure Levy] money that they would have received but for the issues described within the agenda report. The Cabinet report of 17th November 2020 (report number 153/2020) was attached to the agenda papers outlining these.

It was outlined to Members that as a result of the issues, Parish and Town Council's may have missed out on CIL Payments. As a consequence, (and in addition to the recommendations made in the Report) Cabinet considered that, as Parish and Town Council's had not received CIL payments they may otherwise have received, the County Council should make equivalent payments to the amount of CIL, approximately £22,563.77.

Council noted that there was no provision within the budget for this payment. It would be taken from general reserves if approved. As the payments in relation to CIL were never received then the Council was not able to use CIL monies to make these payments.

Prior to the Chairman opened up this item for debate and discussion, the Interim Chief Executive clarified that Cabinet had agreed to 'write off' £150,425.26 potential income associated with the 8 applications as this was in its powers.

Councillor Coleman advised that although he felt that it was a morally right thing to do and that they should get the full percentage owed to them. But should take into account that we did not get the full percent owed to us. He asked, being aware of the current financial climate, whether officers had asked the Parish Councils whether or not a phased approach could be taken.

Councillor Powell agreed it was the morally correct thing to do. She asked Councillor G Brown if the terms of giving that CIL be given under the same terms, i.e, spend, monitoring and retrieving monies because its technically not a CIL payment and legally where id the Council stand with this. She was alarmed that there had been a failure of the system. So adding the £20,000, it was now £170,000 of income that had disappeared. In the improvement plan that had already gone to Cabinet, there was in progress the review of the Section 106 process and payment and would like to know that this come back to Cabinet or Council with an action plan with dates included to ensure the processes were correctly applied.

Councillor Waller was concerned about the use of reserves which the Council may need in future. However, she agreed that they did need to pay the funding. If any of these Parishes were in her Ward, none of them would on balance our loyalty outweighs anything else and it isn't their fault that we made a mistake. What she was more worried about was some Members may recall losing Section 106 monies as the Council didn't claim them in time. For example, with the Oakham North development and wanders about how robust the processes across the board were. This had happened in the past and hoped that going forward the Council would prioritise looking at processes.

Councillor Cross felt that this was not about the systems but the people running it and wanted action to be taken.

In response to the above questions Councillor G Brown he advised that they could discuss with Parishes about delaying the payments by taking a phased approach. In place of conditions on the payments, he would need to speak with the Monitoring Officer and take legal advice but he would like to think conditions would be similar if not identical to CIL payments. Agree with the comments that this was a difficult decision financially but it was morally the correct decision to take for its parishes. He clarified that the maximum liability now was £160,000 and not £170,000 as had been mentioned by Councillor Powell. In response to the comments from Councillor he advised that he had been assured that the new Director of Places had put in some real performance management aims for the directorate. He recognised it did come down to individuals but ensuring adequate and effective training and he can confirm that the training advised through the consultant's report had been completed.

Councillor Hemsley seconded the proposal.

Before going to the vote, Councillor Oxley asked whether every decision would always be a recorded vote. The Monitoring Officer advised that this was agreed as part of the virtual meetings protocol but could bring something back to retract this position. Currently though it was in the standing orders to do as part of a virtual meeting.

A recorded vote was held:

There voted in favour:

Councillors Ainsley, Baines, Begy, Blanksby, Bool, A Brown, G Brown, Burrows, Coleman, Cross, Dale, Fox, Harvey, Hemsley, Jones, Lowe, MacCartney, Oxley, Payne, Powell, Razzell, Stephenson, Waller, Walters, Webb, Wilby and Woodley.

RESOLVED:

As the amounts do not form a part of the budget framework Council approved:

That payments be made to Parish Councils for the CIL [Community Infrastructure Levy] money that they would have received but for the issues described in Cabinet Report No. 153-2020 -17th November 2020

11 REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES OF THE COUNCIL

There were no reports from Committees of the Council to consider.

12 REPORTS FROM SCRUTINY COMMISSION / SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

There were no reports from the Scrutiny Commission or the Scrutiny Committees to consider.

13 JOINT ARRANGEMENTS AND EXTERNAL ORGANISATIONS

The Chairman advised that Cllr Bool had emailed Councillors on the 23rd December 2020 updating members on the Combined Fire Authority.

14 FUTURE RUTLAND CONVERSATION

The Council received a report in relation to Rutland County Council seeking to establish a conversation with residents, particularly those who did not traditionally engage with Council consultations and plans, to understand what mattered most to them in order to develop a vision and aspirational view for Rutland to inform future strategies and approaches and broaden the Council's ongoing engagement with residents. The report was introduced by Councillor Hemsley.

The report outlined the background to this position, highlighting that when in 2019 Rutland County Council agreed its Corporate Plan 2019-2024. As part of its strategic aim to Deliver Sustainable Development it was identified that a 50-year vision needed to be established. However, but this was delayed by the outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic and the need to reprioritise resource to support the activity around this. The postponement provided an opportunity to reassess this project.

It was proposed that Rutland's approach should focus on developing a stronger ongoing relationship with residents and businesses through engaging, posing questions and listening to what matters to them about their lives in Rutland. And looking at a number of different communication channels. Councillor Hemsley advised that the Council had already received letters asking to be involved by interested parties that can see how important this work would be for understanding the Health needs of the County, having also shared the concept with some local businesses who were keen to help inform the work. Councillor Hemsley welcomed Council's thoughts on this and hoped that this meeting was the start of a fruitful conversation.

Councillors considered the proposal and mostly supported the approach. It was felt that it was crucial to start as soon as possible although concern was raised about the time table and whether or not it was achievable. Also, that it was important that it was accessible to all members of the community to be part of, especially those hard to reach. Further concern was raised about how this would be translated into action and a request was made for a briefing so they could discuss in more detail.

In response to the comments, Councillor Hemsley confirmed that a briefing would take place towards the end of January ready for the launch in March and asked Members for their support going forward.

Councillor Stephenson seconded the report.

In relation to recommendations 1, 2 and 4 a recorded vote was held:

There voted in favour:

Councillors Ainsley, Baines, Begy, Bool, A Brown, G Brown, Burrows, Coleman, Dale, Fox, Harvey, Hemsley, Jones, Lowe, MacCartney, Oxley, Payne, Powell, Razzell, Stephenson, Waller, Walters, Webb, Wilby and Woodley.

There voted against:

Councillor Cross

There who abstained:

Councillor Blanksby

The vote being 25 in favour, 1 against and 1 abstention, the motions 1, 2 and 4 were carried.

In relation to recommendation 3, a recorded vote was held:

There voted in favour:

Councillors Ainsley, Baines, Begy, Bool, A Brown, G Brown, Coleman, Fox, Harvey, Hemsley, Jones, Lowe, MacCartney, Oxley, Payne, Razzell, Stephenson, Walters and Wilby.

There voted against:

Councillors Cross, Dale and Powell.

There voted to abstain:

Blanksby, Burrows, Waller, Webb and Woodley.

The vote being 19 in favour, 3 against and 5 abstentions, the motion 3 was carried.

RESOLVED

1. That the Future Rutland Conversation project to engage with residents and businesses to develop a vision and aspirations for Rutland that will inform future Rutland County Council strategies and approaches be approved
2. That the commencement of the Future Rutland Conversation project be approved.
3. That the indicative timeline for the Future Rutland Conversation project and for future reports and updates to be presented at Full Council be agreed

4. That support be given to the planning of Future Rutland Conversation engagement approach through input at an engagement event to be held in late January 2021 be agreed

At this juncture of the meeting, it was proposed and seconded that the meeting be extended to finish the business of the meeting.

A recorded vote was held.

The vote was unanimous and the motion to continue the meeting approved

15 NOTICES OF MOTION

Motion received from Councillor Jones (and seconded by Councillor Oxley)

- i) *Rutland County Council declares a climate emergency and commits to appointing Rutland's Climate Change Champion (to mirror the Armed Forces Champion) at Annual Council.*
- ii) *Rutland County Council commits to achieving zero carbon activity by 2030.*
- iii) *Rutland County Council will include a standard paragraph "impact on the climate and the Council's aim to reduce carbon emissions" in every Council and Cabinet report.*
- iv) *Rutland County Council will report annually, through the Annual Governance Statement, progress made to achieve net zero carbon emissions.*

The Chairman opened up debate on the motion to Council. A number of Councillors were in support of the motion but there was concern about the ambitious target of being carbon zero by 2030 and whether it was achievable. It was agreed that the Council should be aspiring to this and although COVID had set progress back, it was important to start having conversations and make progress. Councillor Stephenson outlined that there needed to be an overarching strategy to identify the projects that were going to make a large impact on reducing carbon emissions and an action plan to drive work forward. It was recognised that action would require capital expenditure. It was highlighted that taking action going forward, it really needed to be done in partnership as reducing emissions was the responsibility of everyone. She put forward an amendment to the motion, seconded by Councillor Razzell as follows:

"This Council acknowledges that we are in a climate crisis. This Council understands it needs to take urgent action to address this by

- *undertaking a thorough baseline assessment of carbon emissions*
- *reviewing and developing the existing climate change action plan to include a clear financial plan, scope of responsibilities and specific carbon reducing projects.*
- *Establishing an evidence base and deliverable target for the reduction of carbon emissions by 2030 with net carbon zero as soon as it is possible before 2050.*

This Council also notes that it must work in partnership with the wider community and businesses including the farming community to reduce the overall carbon emissions for Rutland creating a sustainable rural life for future generations"

Councillors were in support of the amended motion but felt that it should include points 3 and 4 from the original motion as it was important that an annual report was prepared with checks and balances. Furthermore, that placing a note on reports was a good reminder for report writers to consider climate change issues. Councillor Brown reminded members that the action plan agreed in 2018 had these points included already, but due to factors such as COVID these had not been taken forward. A further point was raised questioning why the farming community was noted specifically in the motion.

Councillor Stephenson summed up her amended motion, she assured members that there was no black hole and she was driving this forward. She was proud of the farming community in Rutland and this was about partnership working. Farmers knew about sustainability, and they provided an essential amount of energy for Rutland by keeping people and stock alive. The mention of farming in the motion was not to single them out, it was there to emphasise the importance of them. She did not feel it was necessary to amend the motion as it stood because it was covered in the already agreed action plan. She encouraged Members to attend the Climate Action Plan Summit in the spring.

A recorded vote was held on the amended motion:

There voted in favour:

Councillors Ainsley, Baines, Begy, Blanksby, Bool, A Brown, G Brown, Coleman, Cross, Dale, Fox, Harvey, Hemsley, Jones, Lowe, MacCartney, Oxley, Payne, Powell, Razzell, Stephenson, Walters, Webb, Wilby and Woodley.

There voted against:

Councillors Burrows and Waller

The vote being 25 in favour and 2 against (please see final note below), the motion was carried.

RESOLVED:

That the amended motion be carried

Prior to considering the next motion, Councillor Waller received clarification from the Monitoring Officer about the motion taken as she had not realised it would become the substantive motion. Mr Horsfield advised that because it was so substantially different to the original that it would be replaced. Following this advice, she wanted it to be noted that she was in favour of the amended motion

Motion received from Councillor Burrows (and seconded by Councillor MacCartney)

Before reading her motion, Councillor Burrows obtained advice from Mr Horsfield that she could speak to her revised amended motion. It was confirmed that in relation to Procedure Rule 35.4, she could.

Consequently, with the agreement of the Chairman, Councillor Waller asked to amend the Motion (seconded by Councillor MacCartney). Her proposed amended wording to the original motion 3b was as follows:

“We will publicise the existence of carer’s allowance more prominently on our website and as opportunities arise.”

Councillor Burrows said in support of the amended motion that it was intended to highlight the fact that the rate of attendance allowance had kept pace neither with inflation nor with other state benefits. The purpose of the attendance allowance was to help keep people in their own homes and it was better for people to stay in their own homes as long as possible rather than go into domiciliary care. This motion was to ask the Leader to write to the Chancellor and Secretary of State requesting an increase in this valuable benefit for the benefit of Rutland residents. In addition, though, she also wanted to advertise the existence of the benefit to those who are not aware of it.

Councillor Burrows went on to say that it was not suggesting Rutland’s social care services were anything other than excellent. Universal Credit was increased by £20 last year and all the indications were that this sum would be continued. We would be simply mirroring in this motion what Government has already done with Universal Credit.

A further amendment was put forward by Councillor Walters (seconded by Councillor McCartney) as he felt that it could be more direct and he felt that we did already stand up for carers. The amendment was as follows and replaced what had been proposed:

- 1. This Council will issue communications to residents and organisations in Rutland aimed at identifying carers previously unknown to us and encouraging carers awareness of their right to seek council support and claim Government financial assistance. We will ensure our partners, particularly in the voluntary sector are included in this process. This communication may form part of the Rutland Conversation that we have already dealt with.*
- 2. This Council asks the Leader to communicate with the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, also the MP for Rutland and Melton, seeking their assurance that they will review the allowances by Government to carers and that they will ensure that the payments are increased sufficiently to be commensurate with the responsibilities and the time they taken on their caring roles*

The Chairman asked whether the proposer and seconder of the original motion if they were satisfied of which it was agreed.

Councillors discussed the motion and were in full support of it. It was suggested that they should be more proactive and make information on the carers allowance more accessible on the website. They highlighted the excellent job carers did in the community and nationwide. Furthermore, it should be noted the hard and great work of the RISE team in contacting every carer known to us during the pandemic to ask if they needed any assistance. They were going above and beyond with the work they carried out.

The amended motion was put to the vote:

There voted in favour:

Councillors Ainsley, Baines, Begy, Blanksby, Bool, A Brown, G Brown, Burrows, Coleman, Cross, Fox, Harvey, Hemsley, Jones, Lowe, MacCartney, Oxley, Payne, Powell, Razzell, Stephenson, Waller, Walters, Webb, Wilby and Woodley.

There abstained:

Councillor Dale

RESOLVED:

That the altered motion be carried

16 ANY URGENT BUSINESS

None to consider. The Chairman, therefore, closed the meeting.

---oOo---

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.46 pm.

---oOo---