MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER 2025

PRESENT

Mr. P. Harrison CC (in the Chair)

Mr. C. Abbott CC, Mr. R. Bailey CC, Dr. J. Bloxham CC, Mr. J. Boam CC, Mrs. N. Bottomley CC, Mr. S. Bradshaw CC, Mr. S. L. Bray CC, Mrs. L. Broadley CC, Miss H. Butler CC, Mr. N. Chapman CC, Mr. M. H. Charlesworth CC, Mr. G. Cooke CC, Mr. K. Crook CC, Mrs. L. Danks CC, Mr. M. Durrani CC, Mr. M. R. England CC, Mr. H. Fowler CC, Mr. S. J. Galton CC, Mr. D. A. Gamble CC, Ms. B. Gray CC, Mr. D. J. Grimley CC, Mr. A. Hamilton-Gray CC, Mr. D. Harrison CC, Dr. S. Hill CC, Mr. N. Holt CC, Mr. A. Innes CC, Mr. P. King CC, Mrs. K. Knight CC, Mr. J. McDonald CC, Mr. J. Melen CC, Mr. J. Miah CC, Mr. P. Morris CC, Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC, Mr. O. O'Shea JP CC, Mr. J. T. Orson CC, Mr. D. Page CC, Mrs. R. Page CC, Ms. A. Pendlebury CC, Mr J. Poland CC, Mr. C. Pugsley CC, Mr. V. Richichi CC, Mr. K. Robinson CC, Mr. P. Rudkin CC, Mrs B. Seaton CC, Mr. C. A. Smith CC, Mr. M. Squires CC, Mrs D. Taylor CC, Mr. A. Thorp CC, Mr. A. Tilbury CC, Mr. B. Walker CC and Mr. C. Whitford CC

28. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

County Service

The Chairman reminded members he would be hosting the County Service on Sunday 26th October at 3.00 p.m. at St John the Baptist in Hugglescote with the Bishop of Loughborough, The Right Reverend Saju Muthalaly, preaching. All members had been invited.

Remembrance

On Tuesday 11th November, the Chairman would be leading the County Council's tributes at the annual Remembrance Service at the Stand Easy memorial at County Hall. He hoped that members would be able to join him.

29. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 2 JULY 2025.

It was moved by the Chairman, seconded by Mr Hamilton-Gray and carried:-

"That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 2 July 2025, copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed."

30. MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 30 JULY 2025.

It was moved by the Chairman, seconded by Mr Hamilton-Gray and carried:-

"That the minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 30 July 2025, copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read,

confirmed and signed."

31. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

The Chairman invited members who wished to do so to make declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda for the meeting.

Mr Orson and Mr Bailey both declared a Non Registerable Interest in the Notice of Motion on Protecting Rural Communities from the Impact of Reckless Tax Reform due to their agricultural land holdings and the potential financial implications of the reforms for them. The issue affected them and their business more than most other people who were not farmers and might therefore be considered to affect their views on the matter. The Chairman therefore confirmed that the Monitoring Officer had approved a dispensation for both Mr Orson and Mr Bailey to allow them to take part in the discussion and vote on the matter on the grounds that this was in the public interest – namely to allow an informed debate, including the views of members who had knowledge of the sector and impact of the IHT proposals on the sector.

32. QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 7(1)(2) AND (5).

(A) Mr Bray asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"At the meeting on 30th July 2025 the Leader moved an amendment which included a commitment to write to the Government to ask for a referendum on local government reform, which I support. Given that the amendment was not passed by the Council, will the Leader now commit the Council to holding a referendum ourselves?"

Mr D. Harrison replied as follows:

"Mr Bray is aware that the Reform UK administration supports calls for a local referendum. This is why it was proposed in the amendment at the full Council meeting on 30th July 2025, which his Group failed to support. Holding a unilateral referendum by the County Council would be an uncosted burden on the tax payers of this County and would need the support of this Council to pass."

(B) Mrs Taylor asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"1. Can the Leader advise why he appointed Mr Boam as the Deputy Leader of this Council in May, and what were the changes of circumstances in the three months following that appointment which led him to sack Mr Boam as Deputy Leader and from Cabinet?

2. Can the Leader confirm that this Cabinet will remain in post for the foreseeable future to provide stability?"

Mr D. Harrison replied as follows:

"1. Mr Boam was elected Deputy Leader of the Reform UK administration

by its elected members in May this year and his name was therefore nominated by the Leader at the Annual Meeting of the County Council. In August of this year, it became evident that Mr Boam could not continue with his duties as Adult Social Care Lead Member. The Reform UK group decided the right course of action was to remove Mr Boam from his positions.

2. Cabinet positions are appointed by the Leader of the Council, and I have every confidence we now have the right team in place."

Mrs Taylor asked the following supplementary question:

"I thank the Leader for his answer and just a point of clarity, he said the Deputy Leader, Mr Boam had been elected by the Reform UK administration elected members in May. Could he confirm if the current new Deputy Leader had also been elected by the Reform UK administration this time?"

Mr D. Harrison replied as follows:

"A very simple response. Yes."

(C) Mr Bray asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"The work that the County Council has done to roll out superfast fibre broadband across parts of Leicestershire is to be commended, however residents in Curzon Close, Burbage in my Division have been battling with their leasehold company and Openreach to try and get their street connected, so far to no avail.

Would the Leader ask officers to take up the case for people in Curzon Close and surrounding streets and work with these companies to get the homes connected?"

Mr Fowler replied as follows:

"Superfast Leicestershire, a Government funded programme to increase digital connectivity, brought Superfast broadband to over 78,000 Leicestershire premises between 2013 and 2021. The Council is now working with Building Digital UK to support gigabit-capable, full fibre broadband delivery to at least 17,000 homes and businesses in areas not covered by commercial broadband plans by 2032.

Openreach, Virgin Media, and CityFibre have delivered gigabit capable broadband in Burbage as part of their commercial build. Unfortunately, it appears that Curzon Court has not been included.

Officers have contacted Openreach to understand why Curzon Court has been excluded. Openreach can find no record of a build request. Curzon Court is an age restricted housing complex and therefore any installation to the premises will require the full support of the leasehold company.

If further details in respect of the leasehold company can be provided to

broadband@leics.gov.uk, Officers will investigate this further with Openreach."

(D) Mr Charlesworth asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"This Autumn the Government has introduced a £650 million electric car grant scheme; this will make EV ownership more affordable and accessible. However, if you live in a terraced property in Leicestershire, you will not be able to take advantage of this scheme if you need to charge your vehicle at home – as most owners do. This is because the County Council's current policy on charging forbids any cross-pavement charging methods. Many other local authorities have adopted various methods to address this issue; when is Leicestershire going to adopt a policy that meets the needs of its residents?"

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

"The County Council recognises the importance of electric vehicles in supporting the delivery of an efficient transport network, enabling people to get about in their daily lives. As a result, officers are currently investigating the potential for a pilot scheme to support cross-pavement charging methods in the County. Following the introduction of the Government's £650m electric car grant scheme, the County Council will be applying for a grant to support the introduction of the pilot scheme. Although a relatively small amount is available, this should be sufficient to investigate cross-pavement charging methods in Leicestershire. The application process closes at the end of October and dependent on the outcome, the scheme could be rolled out in 2026."

(E) Mr Orson asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"In June, our local NHS Trust announced the pause of birthing and postnatal services at St Mary's Birth Centre, Melton Mowbray—the only midwife-led unit in Leicestershire. For many families, this centre has been more than a place of care; it has been a sanctuary of safety, dignity, and support during life's most vulnerable moments.

This decision strikes at the heart of our Joint Health and Wellbeing Strategy, which rightly prioritises the first 1001 days of a child's life—a window where compassionate, community-based care can shape lifelong outcomes.
Will the Leader commit to:

- Standing with campaigners who seek to restore and protect vital services at St Mary's, especially postnatal care and breastfeeding support, which are so often undervalued yet profoundly impactful
- Ensuring the petition brought to County Hall today is formally presented to our key partner on the Health and Wellbeing Board, University Hospitals of Leicester, at its next meeting?

This is not just about buildings or budgets—it's about babies, mothers, and the kind of care we choose to champion."

Reply by Mr Squires:

"Pausing births and inpatient care at the Centre from 7 July was a difficult but necessary step, given the safety risks to mums and babies caused by staffing issues. I know senior staff at University Hospitals of Leicester NHS Trust and the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Integrated Care Board are working together to determine the next steps for St Mary's Birth Centre.

This includes discussing the safety risks and what can be done to mitigate them. I have been told that no decision has yet been made but it is anticipated this will happen before January 2026.

Like Mr Orson, I am concerned at the potential loss of the St Mary's Centre and would urge the NHS to consider the issues of postnatal care and breastfeeding that he has highlighted. I would welcome the presentation of the petition at the Health and Wellbeing Board."

Mr Orson asked the following supplementary question:

"I was presented with a petition on this matter just before the meeting. I've handed it to Democratic Services, and I asked that this be handed to the Board tomorrow and thank you for that. But the question is, would Councillor Squires agree that those currently assessing their birth choices need certainty and the continual holding position of a decision being anticipated before January is becoming untenable. Given we are now approaching the halfway point in this pause, will he press the Trust to be more open and concrete about their timeline for announcing their future plans for St. Mary's?"

Mr Squires replied as follows:

"I can confirm I'm already doing that and awaiting a reply."

(F) Mr Walker asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"A number of residents are facing flooding on Sapcote Road, Burbage, particularly nos. 141 to 149. This is caused by water run-off from a neighbouring field. Would the Leader please look at this situation and update myself and the residents on the proposed remedial action."

Mr Tilbury replied as follows:

"The County Council is aware of the flooding issues at 141 – 149 Sapcote Road, Burbage. National flood risk mapping shows parts of the area to be at high risk from surface water flooding. This is most likely to occur following periods of seasonally wet weather when the ground becomes saturated, or when intense rainfall occurs following periods of dry weather.

In its role as the Lead Local Flood Authority, the Council investigated flooding which occurred at this location in autumn 2019. The Council also investigated public highway drainage assets in its role as the Local Highway Authority, and worked in partnership with Severn Trent Water, who manage public

sewer assets nearby.

The neighbouring field mentioned in the question is privately owned land. Measures to reduce the risk of surface water flooding from the field were considered in 2020; however, such work would be subject to landowner agreement as there is no statutory responsibility for the landowner to agree to or undertake any works. Neither are there any powers to enforce the landowner to carry out any works. To date, an agreement is yet to be reached.

At the time, the Council also encouraged property owners to be flood-ready and consider resilience measures to reduce the potential impacts of flooding. We have had limited recent correspondence from the community. Officers will therefore arrange a discussion with Mr Walker to understand further the current situation from the community perspective. We are also aware that Severn Trent Water have been contacted regarding their assets on Sapcote Road."

(G) Mr Bray asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Now that schools have returned, I'm getting comments from parents and neighbours about parking issues in the Westfield Road, Northfield Road and Coventry Road areas at school drop off and pick up times. People are concerned about inconsiderate parking and more importantly pedestrian safety.

Could the Leader please update me on what action the County Council has taken and any further measures proposed to alleviate problems in this area."

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

"These concerns were raised previously in September 2024 by Mr Bray. Officers responded by commissioning surveys to assess whether a pedestrian crossing would be required, inclusive of a school crossing patrol. Mr Bray was provided with a copy of the outcome of these assessments including the results and proposed actions in December 2024. The investigations and actions are summarised below.

<u>Pedestrian Crossing Request</u>

When assessing the justification for a crossing, the County Council uses an assessment involving both pedestrian and vehicle flows. This assessment results in a score, which in Leicestershire is called the Crossing Justification Value (CJV) and this will determine if there is justification for a crossing or not. The results of any surveys carried out are then placed into one of the following types of categories:

- A CJV of less than 0.4 would not justify any type of crossing;
- A CJV between 0.4 – 0.7 would justify the provision of an uncontrolled crossing point or dropped kerb;
- CJV between 0.7-0.9 would justify the provision of a zebra crossing;

- A CJV of 0.9 and above would justify the provision of a controlled puffin crossing.

Upon reviewing the assessment for this particular location, the results showed a score of 0.072. This value falls below any threshold of intervention whereby crossing facilities are justified. It is also pertinent to highlight that Westfield Junior School does benefit from the presence of an existing uncontrolled crossing point, which goes above and beyond what is justified when referring to the CJV.

The results of this survey taken last year remain relevant as we are not aware of any change in the environment or development taking place in the vicinity which would contribute towards changes in travel patterns.

School Crossing Patrol

We can confirm that the crossing point in front of Westfield Junior School was previously used for a School Crossing Patrol (SCP) until 2015 where the service was withdrawn due to not meeting the required CJV values. In line with the concerns raised along Westfield Road, officers conducted a new assessment on 3rd October 2024, at the same formal crossing point to re-evaluate eligibility.

This assessment as per the Road Safety GB SCP guidelines, includes all children walking to school and crossing the road in the vicinity of the Priority Narrowing. It includes all vehicle traffic in both directions. There are additional weightings for larger vehicles (i.e. anything that is not a car). There are additional factor multipliers for age of children, width of carriageway and proximity to junctions.

For an SCP site to be established, the assessment must meet a threshold of 4,000,000 or above. At its busiest, the Westfield Road site achieved a result of 1,664,331 meaning that an SCP would not be supported at this location.

School Keep Clear

Previously, the school keep clear marking which existed along Westfield Road was only an advisory marking as the school had not responded to previous calls for schools to work with us to change these markings to a mandatory marking which could be enforced (the marking on Ashford Road is mandatory and is included on the enforcement route).

When concerns were raised in September 2024, the Council again offered to convert this to a mandatory marking inclusive of installing a second marking on the other side of the road to create a clear parking zone which would offer unobstructed visibility for parents/guardians and children crossing the road.

Officers conducted the necessary consultation for the Traffic Regulation Orders to make the existing marking mandatory and introduce the second marking. This was implemented with all new signs and road markings introduced on 11th April 2025.

Other measures

Westfield Road also benefits from extensive traffic calming in the form of road narrowings, speed cushions, speed tables and a 20mph Advisory School Zone with twin amber flashing lights.

These measures aim to highlight the school and reduce the speed of traffic using the road.

As with all schools in Leicestershire, the school has been offered Road Safety Education training.

The Sustainable Travel Team (Choose How You Move) have also offered support to the school in developing a travel plan. This would include the implementation of active travel initiatives aimed at reducing congestion at the school gate by encouraging more pupils and parents to walk, cycle or wheel to and from school. Although the school has not yet taken up this offer, information and resources have been provided directly to them.

Following a request from the Head Teacher, the team provided bespoke maps showing walking and cycling routes within a mile radius of the school. The Head Teacher also expressed an interest in Bikeability, which has been booked for w/c 19th January 2026."

(H) Mr Smith asked the following questions of the Leader or his nominee:

"At the Scrutiny Commission meeting on 8 September 2025, the Leader of the County Council stated that he will cut council tax without cutting services in the upcoming budget.

Can the Lead Member confirm whether reducing staff numbers is being considered as a means of addressing the widening deficit, and if so, what assessment has been made of the likely impact this would have on the delivery of our services, on residents' wellbeing, and on staff morale across the authority?"

Mr D. Harrison replied as follows:

"Due to the significant financial challenge that the County Council faces it is important that we look at all Council activities so that the best options for change are identified.

It would be wrong to just target staff, as Mr Smith seems to be suggesting. As a council we exist to provide services to the residents of Leicestershire, so any service changes will be carefully considered so that their impact is fully understood.
Our workforce is highly valued, whether their role is directly delivering a service or part of a support function.

If any changes are made, people will want to be treated honestly and fairly. This has always been my approach. For changes under my administration, I will ensure that there is clear communication about why change is needed,

meaningful consultation and implementation in a professional and supportive way."

(I) Mrs Bottomley asked the following questions of the Leader or his nominee:

"When can we expect to see a Local Government Reorganisation proposal from the administration? With the deadline being in two months time, what steps are being taken to ensure that adequate consultation can take place, and our residents are allowed to have their voices heard?"

Mr D. Harrison replied as follows:

"At its recent meeting the Cabinet highlighted the importance of modelling the different options for reorganisation which have so far been put forward. The outcomes are not yet known but they will be made available to all members. I'm conscious of the time that is left before a submission to Government has to be made but I want our consultation and the final proposal to be informed by evidence, particularly the impact on the County of any extension of the City boundary.

I respect the views of residents, which have been recognised in this chamber at our last meeting, but I expect the Government also to take other factors into account when they assess final proposals."

(J) Mrs Bottomley asked the following questions of the Leader or his nominee:

"After the reallocation of £2 million into "flooding", when can our residents have details on what exactly that money is now going to be spent on?"

Mr Tilbury replied as follows:

"The County Council has been working to shape proposals for how this reallocated funding is to be spent on flood mitigation initiatives including expected outcomes. The proposals will be presented to Cabinet on 28th October for approval."

(K) Mrs Bottomley asked the following questions of the Leader or his nominee:

"Leicestershire County Council's section 19 report is significantly overdue compared to other local authorities, what steps are being taken to ensure that the report is published as quickly as possible, and that any future reports will not be delayed to this extent?"

Mr Tilbury replied as follows:

"Whilst there are no statutory timescales for the publication of a formal flood investigation, the completion and publication of outstanding formal (Section 19) flood investigations is a high priority for the Council. Over the last two years Leicestershire has experienced a high number of major flood events resulting in properties being internally flooded. The flood events in January

2024 (storm Henk) and January 2025 were the worst recorded in Leicestershire's recent history with well over 1000 properties being internally flooded across the two events. This has resulted in a high volume of formal flood investigations for the Flood Risk Management Team.

There are various other workstreams which must continue whilst investigations are being progressed. These are detailed in the Local Flood Risk Management Strategy for Leicestershire. The Council has also had to administer Property Flood Resilience Repair Grants with no additional resource provided from the Government, and deal with high volumes of flooding related enquiries.

Investigations also require significant amounts of consultation with other agencies. The process is detailed in the Leicestershire Formal Flood Investigations Policy available on the Council's website.

The Council has allocated an additional £400,000 to help with the completion of existing investigations and other resource pressures.

It is fully recognised that the publishing of Section 19 investigation reports is very important for communities; however, I would reassure people that where actions are agreed by all parties, we do not wait for the report to be published before progressing them. A list of outstanding investigations with estimated publication dates is available on the Council's website. These dates are currently the best estimates for publication. In the meantime, to provide communities with clarity on actions and their progress, multi-agency action plans are being prepared and shared with communities.

The speed of completion of future investigations will be improved by additional funding enabling greater resource to be directed to carrying out these formal investigations."

Mrs Bottomley asked the following supplementary question:

"Thank you for the response. While we are repeatedly assured that actions are being taken in the absence of the section 19 flooding report, myself, parish councils, flood wardens, and residents have no details as to what these actions are. Can we please have some clarity around what steps will be taken and when by who to ensure that communities are fully informed and can track progress while we await the report?"

Mr Tilbury replied as follows:

"The interim action plan of the section 19 reports will be revealed in the next couple of weeks around mid-October."

33. POSITION STATEMENTS UNDER STANDING ORDER 8.

The Leader gave a position statement on the following matters:

- The Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy
- Notable achievements since May
- Local Government Reorganisation

- Meeting with the Lord Lieutenant
- Meeting with Staff Network Representatives

The Lead Member for Adults and Communities gave a position statement on the Care Quality Commission Assessment of the County Council.

The Lead Member for Children and Family Services gave a position statement on the following matters:

- Special Educational Needs
- Children in Care
- Admissions and School Improvement
- Music
- Families First Partnership Programme

The Lead Member for Environment and Flooding gave a position statement on flooding and flood management.

A copy of the position statements is filed with these minutes.

34. REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

(a) Revision of the Constitution.

It was moved by Mr D. Harrison, seconded by Mrs Taylor and carried unanimously:

"That the proposed changes to the terms of reference of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committees, as set out in the Appendix to this report, and any consequential amendments to the Constitution required as a result of these changes, be approved."

35. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICES OF MOTION:

(a) Protecting Rural Communities from the Impact of Reckless Tax Reform

It was moved by Mrs Taylor and seconded by Mr Poland:

"1. That this Council notes:

a) That 6,365 agriculture, forestry, and fishing businesses have closed in the past year—more than in any year since quarterly records began in 2017 (ONS).

b) That the majority of these closures occurred in the first half of the year, following the Chancellor's October 2024 announcement to slash inheritance tax relief for family farms.

c) That only 3,190 new businesses were created in the sector during the same period, leaving a net loss of 3,175—evidence of the fastest contraction on record.

2. That this Council believes:

a) That the Chancellor's decision to reduce inheritance tax relief has dealt a devastating blow to generational farming families, many of whom now face impossible financial choices.

b) That this policy was implemented without adequate consultation or impact assessment and has disproportionately harmed rural communities.

c) That the Government must be held accountable for the consequences of its actions and take immediate steps to reverse the damage.

3. That this Council resolves to:

a) Condemn the Chancellor's decision to reduce inheritance tax relief for family farms and call for its urgent reversal;

b) Demand that the Government introduce emergency support for rural businesses affected by the policy, including transitional relief and access to financial advice;

c) Request a full impact assessment on rural business viability, to be shared with local authorities and farming unions;

d) Stand in solidarity with farming families and rural workers and commit to championing their interests at every level of government."

The motion was put and carried, with 45 members voting for the motion and 2 members voting against.

(b) <u>Protecting Homes from Flooding in the Planning and Infrastructure Bill</u>

It was moved by Mrs Bottomley and seconded by Mrs Pendlebury:

"1. That this Council notes that:

a) The Government's current Planning and Infrastructure Bill makes provision for housing development and infrastructure investment but does not go far enough in ensuring that new and existing homes are adequately protected from the increasing risk of flooding.

b) Climate change is increasing the frequency and severity of flooding events across the UK, placing thousands of households at risk of damage, disruption, and loss.

c) Local planning authorities are currently restricted in their ability to ensure developments are flood-resilient. For example:

d) Planning law largely limits councils to considering the management of surface water within the site boundary, with limited powers to require or enforce measures for water once it leaves the site.

e) Councils cannot always insist on the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) or require developers to demonstrate the long-term adequacy of drainage and outflow arrangements into wider catchments.

f) Once a development is built, responsibility for managing downstream or cumulative flood risk typically falls to local authorities or agencies, without dedicated funding from central government.

2. That this Council believes that:

a) Flood prevention and resilience must be a central part of all planning and infrastructure decisions, not an afterthought.

b) Developers must be held accountable not only for water management on-site, but also for the impact their developments have on neighbouring land and communities downstream.

c) Local authorities should be empowered and properly resourced to require the highest standards of flood resilience in all new developments, and to invest in infrastructure that protects existing communities.

d) Without stronger measures, the Planning and Infrastructure Bill risks locking in avoidable future costs, damages, and risks for residents and taxpayers.

3. That this Council therefore resolves to:

a) Write to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, and the relevant local MPs, calling for the Planning and Infrastructure Bill to be amended to:

i. Strengthen requirements on developers to use robust, sustainable drainage solutions that demonstrate effectiveness both on-site and downstream;

ii. Give councils clear powers to refuse or condition developments where surface water and flood risk management plans are inadequate beyond the site boundary;

iii. Provide long-term, ring-fenced funding for councils to invest in flood prevention and resilience measures, including off-site infrastructure;

b) Work with neighbouring councils, the Local Government

Association, and relevant agencies to lobby for stronger national policy on flooding and planning, taking an accumulative view of the risks."

On the motion being put and before the vote was taken, five members rose asking that a named vote be recorded.

The vote was recorded as follows:

For the motion

Mr Abbott, Dr Bloxham, Mr Boam, Mrs Bottomley, Mr Bradshaw, Miss Butler, Mr Chapman, Mr Crook, Mrs Danks, Mr England, Mr Fowler, Mr Galton, Ms Gray, Mr Grimley, Mr Hamilton-Gray, Mr Dan Harrison, Mr Paul Harrison, Dr Hill, Mr Holt, Mr Innes, Mr King, Mrs Knight, Mr McDonald, Mr Melen, Mr Miah, Mr Morris, Mr Mullaney, Mr O'Shea, Mr Orson, Mr Page, Mrs Page, Mrs Pendlebury, Mr Poland, Mr Pugsley, Mr Richichi, Mr Robinson, Mr Rudkin, Mr Smith, Mr Squires, Mrs Taylor, Mr Thorp, Mr Tilbury, Mr Walker, Mr Whitford.

The motion was carried with 44 members voting for the motion. There were no votes against the motion.

2.00 pm – 5.26pm CHAIRMAN
24 September 2025