



This information is available free of charge in electronic, audio, Braille and large print versions on request.

For assistance in understanding or reading this document or specific information about these Minutes please call Democratic Services on 01629 761133 or e-mail committee@derbyshiredales.gov.uk

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a Virtual Meeting held on Thursday 11 June 2020 at 6.00 pm.

Under Regulations made under the Coronavirus Act 2020, the meeting was held virtually. Members of the public were able to view the virtual meeting via the District Council's website at www.derbyshiredales.gov.uk or via our YouTube channel.

PRESENT

Councillor Garry Purdy - In the Chair

Councillors Sue Bull, Paul Cruise, Graham Elliott, Chris Furness, Clare Gamble, Susan Hobson and Claire Raw.

Paul Wilson (Chief Executive), Tim Brand (Director of Regulatory Services), Karen Henriksen (Director of Resources), Ashley Watts (Director of Community & Environmental Services), Steve Capes (Director of Regeneration and Policy), Rob Cogings (Director of Housing), Lee Gardner (Legal Services Manager) Simon Beynon (Housing Strategy Officer), Dave Turvey (Events Manager), Samantha Grisman (Clean & Green Manager), Jim Fearn (Communications and Marketing Manager) and Jackie Cullen (Committee Assistant).

368/19 – APPROVAL OF MINUTES

It was moved by Councillor Garry Purdy, seconded by Councillor Susan Hobson and

RESOLVED

(unanimously)

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Emergency Committee held on 04 June 2020 be approved as a correct record.

369/19 – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

In line with the Council's temporary suspension of direct public participation the following questions were submitted in writing:

From Mrs Vicky Dewhurst, speaking as a Second Home owner in Bakewell on the re-opening of Bakewell market (Item 5 on the Agenda)

I read on Facebook that the Council is inviting comments from the public prior to its discussion of the possibility of reopening Bakewell market.

I would like to raise the point that Bakewell market is a popular attraction for local residents and visitors from outside the national park and attracts a large number of people. I would expect this to bring in much needed revenue to the locality.

If the market were to be reopened it would cause the mingling of people from near and far enabling the transmission of Coronavirus. Visitors from outside the national park could bring it in and pass it on to residents as they are doing right now by using the car parks which have been reopened in the park.

I am originally from Sheffield, but now live in London. I have a second home in a village close to Bakewell. I am unable to use my cottage as I am unable to travel to it and stay overnight (despite the example shown by the Prime Minister's aid Dominic Cummings). If I were able to stay in my cottage I could isolate myself from the other villagers by staying inside or in my garden (I would be 2 metres from anyone who walked past my garden on the adjacent road). I would be able to bring my own food with me and therefore would not need to go into local shops nor Bakewell market. I could also visit my 92 year old mother who suffers from COPD, has limited eyesight (glaucoma) is hard of hearing (wears a hearing aid) and is unable to walk without a stick as she broke her hip some years ago, who lives in Sheffield and who has been living on her own since lockdown started.

However under the current rules, I could drive from London and spend the day at Bakewell market wandering around and spending my money in the Peak District. And then drive home again the same day.

My village neighbours would be able to visit the market too.

Why would I be any more likely to spread the virus to friends and neighbours whilst staying inside my cottage than I would walking around Bakewell market?

Do you have any plans to enable second home owners to put in a request to the Council or the local Constabulary to stay in their own homes overnight?

Yours faithfully
Mrs Vicky Dewhurst

RESPONSE

Since 1st June, the restriction on daily travel was eased and Bakewell, like many other tourist areas, has been attracting day visitors. The Council cannot prevent members of the public from visiting Bakewell, as has been witnessed in the past two weeks. Social distancing is something that we all, as individuals, must adopt. The proposals set out in the report which would allow for the limited reopening of the market support the principles of social distancing, but I would stress again that compliance rests with those who wish to avail themselves of the services on offer.

In respect of the question asked, concerning the use of second homes, the current Government guidance states that 'you must not stay away from your home or your support bubble household overnight - including holidays - except for in a limited set of circumstances, such as for work purposes'. It would be inappropriate for this Council to offer any advice other than that which has been issued by Central Government.

From Ms Wendy Waite, speaking as a Bakewell resident on the re-opening of the market and public toilets in Bakewell (Items 4 & 5 on the Agenda)

Since the Government's partial relaxation of the lockdown measures, Bakewell has been inundated with visitors, many of whom are not maintaining social distancing, which is of great concern to local residents. Should the toilets and market reopen at this time, this will inevitably exacerbate the situation further by bringing many more people into the town, which in turn could effectively impose a secondary lock-down on older residents, who would be unwilling to visit the town shops for fear of possibly exposing themselves to Covid 19.

I would urge the Council to consider carefully their decision at Thursday's meeting, with a view to extending the closure until such time as it is deemed safe to do so by the Government relaxing lockdown measures completely.

Thank you.
Wendy Waite

RESPONSE

N/A - This is a statement, not a question.

From Dr Lida Ellsworth, speaking as a Bakewell resident on the re-opening of the market and public toilets in Bakewell (Items 4 & 5 on the Agenda)

I write to urge you to decide against reopening Bakewell Market and toilets until Covid 19 is under greater control and the Government removes the lock down altogether. And I urge this for these reasons ~

An influx of people with a re-opened market would effectively impose a second lock down on older townsfolk — of whom we have a high proportion — who not only will avoid the town on a Monday, but will do so for at least a few days thereafter;
Too many people are coming into the town now and not social distancing. To bring many more in for a market day would be unwise and close to criminal.

Lastly, my understanding (albeit from hearsay) is that people coming to the market do not spend a lot of money in the shops (other than coffee shops and pubs), and therefore to discourage those of us who do shop locally from going into town will in fact hurt the local economy.

Yours faithfully,
(Dr) Lida Ellsworth

RESPONSE

N/A - This is a statement, not a question.

From Mrs Margaret Elsworth, speaking as a Matlock resident on the funding for social distancing measures (Item 6 on the Agenda)

I have two questions to put to the Emergency Committee to be held on 11th June.

1. After reading the report on Agenda Item 6 I think that the amount of work that will be required to be done by any Town/Parish Council will be far too demanding for such a

small amount as £10,000. So my question is - Can a Town/Parish Council refuse the task?

2. Does the District Council consider it to be best practice to put an item on tonight's agenda which will result in Town/Parish Councils being overwhelmed by bureaucracy without the courtesy of any prior warning or consultation?

Thank You,
Mrs Margaret Elsworth

RESPONSE

The County Council sent the District Council a list of potential social distancing interventions on 13 May. The District Council sent this list to Matlock Town Council on 14 May, for their suggestions. Since the town councillors have detailed knowledge of their locality, we felt that consulting the Town Council was the right course of action for the District Council to take. Matlock Town Council sent their suggestions back to the District Council on 18 May, and we forwarded them to the County Council the same day. It is for Matlock Town Council to determine whether they wish to participate in this initiative or not.

From Councillor Clare Gamble:

Members were presented with a report on 21st May that ruled out using the authority's staff in waste and recycling collection under options one and two of the report, then it transpired in the report presented to the next meeting, 4th June, that a staff member had, in fact, already been allocated a driving task, in the collection of waste and recycling who was to be replaced by an agency driver hired by Serco, because of the authority's health and safety concerns. Can the chair provide an update to Committee if any other authority staff members are currently working on collection of waste and recycling, and if so who is responsible for their health and safety and provision of PPE?

Kind Regards
Clare Gamble
Cllr Litton and Longstone

RESPONSE

I can confirm that no District Council staff are working for Serco collecting waste, nor have they been throughout the pandemic. The Clean & Green Team have been and still are delivering new containers to residents but they are our staff using our vehicles. Serco supplied copies of their risk assessments for this procedure that our Clean & Green team used as a basis for their own risk assessments. The teams are not touching old bins that are full of waste; these bin removals are being redirected back to Serco.

From John Green, speaking as a Matlock resident on the re-opening of public toilets (Item 4 on the Agenda)

I noticed that the Emergency Committee at the District Council was to decide, or discuss, the matter of reopening the public toilets this Thursday.

I also noticed that the officers had recommended they remain closed "until the safety of the public and cleaning staff can be guaranteed".

Could you please ask the officers making this recommendation to quantify exactly what this means? That is, that they lay down, and make public, specific and reasonable conditions that need to be met before opening can be permitted.

Workplaces, hospitals and many other facilities have continued to have shared toilets in operation and on June 1st the government issued guidelines for the reopening of outdoor sports facilities which included the use of indoor toilets.

Many other councils, especially in tourist areas, have reopened their public conveniences.

This council had already closed a lot of the district's public conveniences (a move which I strongly object to) and would, I have no doubt, close them all were it allowed to.

Public conveniences are most used and required by the elderly, vulnerable, those with young children and others with specific medical conditions.

So could you please ask the officers to define, and make public, reasonable criteria which need to be met for reopening? A vague "to ensure safety" is inadequate.

Yours sincerely,
John Green

RESPONSE

A number of options have been put forward for consideration this evening and Officers have provided Members of the Emergency Committee with the necessary information to make a decision on this issue. The report outlines the measures that the Council will put in place should the Members decide to reopen the toilets. The key risks have been identified in the attached Risk Assessments and we aim to mitigate these risks by introducing new measures such as increased cleaning schedules, Personal Protective Equipment, signs and limited access, to name a few. We will address the relevant criteria within the meeting in order to conclude whether or not the toilets can reopen.

From Peter Dobbs, speaking as a Ashbourne resident on the Black's Head sign Incident
Ashbourne 8th June 2020

Black's Head sign Incident Ashbourne 8th June 2020

Having read the statement issued by DDDC on Tuesday 9th June I would be grateful if you could clarify the timeline of events following the publication of the Council's intention to 'remove the head from the sign with immediate effect' made on Monday 8th June.

In particular could you confirm that permission to remove the head was granted as is reported in the local press - I am assuming that 'granting permission' means the same as 'we did not object' (statement by DDDC 9th June).

If so, which council officer gave this 'permission' for these works to be carried out and at what time?

Alternatively which officer communicated the message that the Council 'did not object' and at what time was this?

To whom was this permission / message communicated?

What risk assessments were carried out and by whom, and does a written record exist? The photographs in the press suggest an absence of PPE e.g. hard hat for at least one person.

Were the police consulted about the volatility of the crowd and was any attempt made to encourage social distancing?

Thank you.
Peter Dobbs

RESPONSE

The Council's media statement issued on Tuesday 9 June clearly explains the events leading up to the removal of the 'head from the sign' on Monday evening.

In response to the specific questions asked, the Leader of the Council was made aware of a situation developing in Ashbourne on Monday evening by local Ashbourne Councillors.

Confronted with a dynamic situation which required an immediate response, the Leader of the Council consulted with the Chief Executive at 9.15pm on Monday evening, and it was jointly agreed that in the interests of public safety and to safeguard the long-term future of the sign itself, no objection would be raised to its removal. This message was communicated to an elected councillor on the ground in Ashbourne. As indicated in an earlier press release on Monday 8 June, the Council had already announced its intention to remove the sign and appropriate arrangements had been made to do so on Tuesday 9 June.

In responding to this developing situation, the Council was not engaged in any discussions regarding the methods of removal or assessment of risk. No Council officers were on the ground at the time.

The District Council did not request police attendance.

From Councillor Claire Raw

Will the object that has been recognised as causing offence to our communities remain removed, or put in a place where it's relevance in history in the context of the experience of black British people can be explained?

Councillor Claire Raw
Eyam resident

RESPONSE

No decision has been taken on the future of the 'head' that has been removed from the sign in Ashbourne. In due course, that is a matter upon which Council will consider following a process of public consultation.

From Councillor Claire Raw

I would like to ask the council to consider providing financial support to the <https://www.peakdistrict.gov.uk/donate/fire-fund>.

This is an urgent appeal to support the need to effectively respond to wild fires of our moorlands. The fund will help our beautiful countryside and protect wildlife habitats. Could the consideration of a £5,000 donation to the fund be put on the agenda of the next Emergency Committee meeting? I would suggest that a paper is drawn up for this money to be taken out of capital reserves to support the current crisis situation.

Councillor Claire Raw

RESPONSE

The introduction of new business whilst we are dealing with the current emergency situation needs to be carefully balanced and whilst this appears a worthy cause, care needs to be taken when making decisions on un-budgeted obligations. We need to consider the interests of the whole authority and demands on its resources which have been severely disrupted. The most appropriate timescale would be when normal business resumes with our policy committees, so that we can take stock on demands on our finances from a District wide perspective.

A donation of this nature would be revenue expenditure and would therefore be financed from the General Reserve, rather than capital reserves.

370/19 – REOPENING OF PUBLIC TOILETS

The Committee considered a report outlining the options available to the District Council for reopening the Public Toilets during the COVID-19 pandemic.

The 10 public toilets owned and operated by the District Council were listed in the report.

Under normal circumstances, the service was accessed by a pay-on-entry system and the toilets were inspected and cleaned on a regular basis, with cleaning taking place twice a day. None of the sites operated with a full-time cleaner.

On 10th May 2020 the Government announced the easing of lockdown, which had attracted many tourists to our hotspots. The current guidance issued by Government (www.gov.uk/government/publications/coronavirus-outbreak-faqs) regarding the provision and use of public toilets stated that:

“Councils are responsible for public toilets and this decision is up to them. You should avoid using the public toilets where possible. If you need to use these facilities, you should practise social distancing and good hygiene (i.e. washing your hands thoroughly).

You can travel to outdoor spaces irrespective of distance, as long as you can return the same night and do not put others at risk because of the services you may need in the time you are away.”

In considering the closure of public toilets, the District Council considered the risk of infection and cross-contamination, as explained in the report. Furthermore, following the Government’s announcement regarding the phased reopening of non-essential retail/services throughout June and July, the District Council had risk assessed the potential reopening of its public toilets, whilst also considering its capacity to deliver the service.

Some of the options considered were set out in the report along with steps that could be considered to mitigate against these risks to staff and visitors.

At the time of writing the report, the Government had advised that all other non-essential retail businesses would be expected to be able to reopen from 15 June and other facilities and services, such as pubs, restaurants, cafes, etc. could follow, but no official date had yet been announced. However, it was not possible to open the public toilets before 15 June, as neither staff nor resources were available to safely and effectively do so until that time.

The Risk Assessment (attached as Appendix 1 to the report) would guide the team on how to best to proceed. In addition, a site-specific risk assessment would also be undertaken. The Director of Community and Environmental Services agreed that the risk assessment would be submitted to the relevant Trade Unions for comment.

It was moved by Councillor Susan Hobson seconded by Councillor Chris Furness and

RESOLVED

(unanimously)

1. That the public toilets be re-opened on 22 June 2020 between the hours of 11am and 3pm on a phased basis;
2. That charges be reinstated;
3. That the situation be reviewed after a two-week period with a view to extending the opening hours and assessing the cleaning regime.
4. That authority be delegated to the Director of Community and Environmental Services and the Clean and Green Manager to engage Agency staff to increase the frequency of cleaning if necessary in the meantime.

371/19 – BAKEWELL STALL MARKET

The Committee considered a report outlining the options available for reopening Bakewell Monday Market following its temporary closure due to the COVID-19 pandemic.

The Council's Markets team had continued to monitor the Government Guidance regarding markets since the closure of Bakewell Market and had also been in regular contact with other operators of large and local markets, the National Market Traders Federation (NMTF) and the National Association of British Market Authorities (NABMA).

The decision to close Bakewell Market was taken to help reduce the number of visitors to the local area and protect the local community from a potential increase in infection. However, on 25 May the Government announced that many retail services could reopen in June; this included outdoor markets which could open to both essential and non-essential trade. The announcement included a stipulation that Government guidelines relating COVID-19 must be adhered to, including social distancing measures. Both NABMA and NMTF were encouraging the reopening of all outdoor markets including Bakewell Market. Although they had provided guidelines for traders, they stressed that markets could not be operated in the same manner, in order to achieve social distancing measures and create a safe environment. At the time of writing the report, 65 of the 79 licenced traders had expressed an interest to return to the market; 2 had said they do not want to return and 12 had yet to respond.

It was recommended that Bakewell market reopened with reduced opening hours for licenced traders only, until further notice. The proposed new market layout, as in Appendices 2 and 3

attached to the report, illustrated how the one-way system would be implemented and Appendices 4 and 5 attached to the report showed the current layout of the market with no amendments, for the purpose of comparison.

It was also recommended that full rent should be reintroduced in a phased approach, as set out in the report, based on 90 stalls being occupied.

It was reported that the market operation would change over a period of weeks as the new measures put in place were assessed each Monday by the Markets Team. This could include further reductions in stalls and tighter measures or complete closure of the market. Should further guidelines be issued by Central Government regarding social distancing, it could include the opening of further stalls.

It was recommended that changes to the market should be carried out after risk assessments by the Events Team, which would then be presented to the Director of Community and Environmental Services and local Ward Members. The 5 options explored to date were tabled in the report together with assessments of each, resulting in the recommendation of Option 4, which:

- would allow all traders the option to trade but within Government Guidelines
- would increase footfall to Bakewell which in turn could boost local economy
- was a similar approach taken by other market operators.

It should be noted that the provisions in the report only related to Bakewell Monday Outdoor Market. As government guidelines still did not allow for all non-essential items to be sold in an indoor market, the Bakewell Monthly Farmers Market would remain closed for the foreseeable future. The Market Team would continue to monitor the situation.

It was moved by Councillor Susan Hobson, seconded by Councillor Sue Bull and

RESOLVED

1. Bakewell Market reopens with 90 traders as outlined in Option 4 from 22 June onwards, dependent on all safety measures being available;
2. Opening times of the Market are reduced to 9.30am until 2.00pm;
3. Stall hire is reduced to £10 per stall for the first three weeks after reopening and 50% of full rent for the subsequent four weeks, as outlined in paragraph 2.10 of the report;
4. That Members authorise the Markets team to make necessary changes to the market, following consultation with the Director of Community & Environmental Services and Local Ward Members.

An Amendment was moved by Councillor Paul Cruise and seconded by Councillor Claire Raw to include the following additional recommendation:

RESOLVED

That Bakewell Market reopens with 45 traders one week and 45 on alternate weeks on a 4-week rotation, to be reviewed thereafter with a view to accommodating 90 traders.

Voting:

For	3
Against	5
Abstentions	0

The Chairman declared the amendment LOST.

The substantive motion was then put to the vote, and it was

- RESOLVED**
1. Bakewell Market reopens with 90 traders as outlined in Option 4 from 22 June onwards, dependent on all safety measures being available;
 2. Opening times of the Market are reduced to 9.30am until 2.00pm;
 3. Stall hire is reduced to £10 per stall for the first three weeks after reopening and 50% of full rent for the subsequent four weeks, as outlined in paragraph 2.10 of the report;
 4. That Members authorise the Markets team to make necessary changes to the market, following consultation with the Director of Community & Environmental Services and Local Ward Members.

Voting:

For	5
Against	3
Abstentions	0

The Chairman declared the motion CARRIED.

372/19 – FUNDING FOR SOCIAL DISTANCING MEASURES

The Committee considered an updating report on consultation undertaken for Derbyshire County Council's urgent social distancing highways works, and that sought approval for use of the Reopening High Streets Safely Fund to support such measures.

On 12 May Derbyshire County Council informed the district and borough councils that it would be undertaking works to improve pedestrian and cycling circulation, in order to improve social distancing in time for the expected wider re-opening of shops on 15 June.

The County Council's plan, as transport authority, was to prioritise the main towns in Derbyshire for these works, listed as Ashbourne, Bakewell, Matlock and Wirksworth. In addition, in light of poor social distancing evident in Matlock Bath immediately following the Prime Minister's announcement that lockdown restrictions would begin to ease, the County Council included Matlock Bath on their priority list.

On 13 May, the County Council provided a list of potential measures and asked districts and boroughs to respond by 15 May for each town by stating where and which measures might be initially undertaken. The menu of immediate measures, from which the County Council were looking for quick interventions in time for lockdown easing, were listed in the report. Officers consulted ward members and town/parish councils and responses were received from Ashbourne, Bakewell, Matlock and Wirksworth via their Town Councils, which were passed onto the County Council. A detailed request for Matlock Bath was sent by the Parish Council on 15 May direct to the County Council and requests received from Hathersage and the Hope Valley

were passed straight on to the County Council, as these areas both experienced high visitor footfall in constrained spaces on major roads.

In the meantime the County Council had developed schemes for Ashbourne and Bakewell (see plans attached at Appendices 1 and 2 to the report). Initial works took place in Ashbourne in late May; work in Matlock, Matlock Bath, Wirksworth and Hathersage was understood to be programmed in after completion of these initial towns.

On 26 May, the District Council received notification from the Government of an allocation of £63,808 under its newly-announced Reopening High Streets Safely Fund (RHSSF). However, this would equate to little more than £10,000 for each of the abovementioned locations. The RHSSF guidance published by the Government on 29 May was attached as Appendix 3 to the report, with Frequently Asked Questions published on 5 June 2020 in Appendix 4 to the report. It was anticipated that the County Council would ask for some or all of this funding to support its own highway works in support of pedestrians and cyclists described in section 1 of the report and that subject to liaison with the County Council team carrying out the works described in section 1 of the report, the remainder be passed direct to town/parish councils.

The expenditure rules for the RHSSF were extremely onerous for £63,808, as set out in the report. It was therefore recommended that the Emergency Committee should allocate the District Council's RHSSF allocation according to the principles shown in the report.

The Director of Regeneration and Policy confirmed that liaison would also take place with Town and Parish Councils in this regard, which was not made clear in paragraph 2.8 of the report.

The Derbyshire Dales economy had been greatly impacted as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, as set out in Section 3 of the report. The re-opening of public toilets and Bakewell Market and the social distancing measures being implemented in town centres by Derbyshire County Council would help the initial stages of recovery, and in addition it was recommended that a specific Derbyshire Dales District Recovery Plan be developed by the District Council, and brought to Members for consideration at a future meeting.

It was moved by Councillor Clare Gamble, seconded by Councillor Sue Bull and

RESOLVED
(unanimously)

1. That consultation with town and parish councils and ward members re DCC work is noted;
2. That RHSSF fund is allocated as set out as follows:
 - 2.1 First, allocation to Derbyshire County Council to support their immediate social distancing work in Derbyshire Dales communities;
 - 2.2 Then, six equal sums to be passed to the town/parish councils of Ashbourne, Bakewell, Hathersage, Matlock, Matlock Bath and Wirksworth, subject to agreeing a spending plan with each town/parish council which ties in with (1).
3. That a Derbyshire Dales District Recovery Plan be developed and brought to a future meeting

373/19 – DERBYSHIRE HOMELESSNESS COVID-19 RESPONSE

The Committee considered a report on how Derbyshire authorities had been working in partnership to support the ‘Everyone in’ approach to street homelessness during the Covid-19 crisis. As lockdown measures were being slowly lifted, Councils now needed to consider moving people into settled accommodation to prevent a return to sleeping on the streets. Such a move would require the provision of a new dedicated floating support service led by Chesterfield Borough Council and financed by a wide partnership of Derbyshire authorities and other agencies, as set out in the report.

In Derbyshire, councils had brought in over 100 people, the majority of whom had been placed in hotel accommodation. However the existing provision would end on 26 June and therefore the people brought in would need support to help them through the next phase. Partner agencies had been working on a plan to put the necessary resources in place to support and re-home as many people as possible into longer term accommodation, as explained in the report.

The proposal sought to operate a new 12 month wrap-around service at a cost of £260,000, funded from contributions from partner councils, other public bodies and existing grants already received. The Derbyshire Dales had 7 people in the current hotel and B&B provision and it was therefore proposed that a contribution of £15,000 be made available by DDDC to support the scheme, to be met from the Council’s existing Homelessness Grant provision. The Housing Strategy Officer advised at the meeting that the total £260,000 had now been raised.

The proposed delivery of the service was set out in the report, with Appendix 1 to the report providing a model showing the pathway into the service.

If approved, officers from the Community Housing Team would continue working with colleagues across the county to bring the new support service on line.

It was moved by Councillor Chris Furness, seconded by Councillor Susan Hobson and

RESOLVED
(unanimously)

1. That Members note the work to date to support people who had been sleeping rough and
2. That the allocation of £15,000 as a contribution to the ‘Derbyshire Keeping Everyone’ in service be approved.

374/19 – OPERATIONAL UPDATE

The Chief Executive provided a verbal update on the District Council’s phased return to services in response to the current pandemic:

In addition to the work undertaken on the preparation of the papers considered this evening, the Corporate Leadership Team continue to lead the District Council’s Covid-19 response on a number of fronts.

This includes:

- Administration of the Discretionary Grants Fund, approved by Members last Thursday and launched on Monday of this week. This will provide valuable financial assistance to

those businesses who have not qualified for funding to date, subject to them meeting the criteria laid out in the Council's approved scheme.

- Working in partnership with the County Council's Director of Public Health, the Council is participating in the development of the Track and Trace initiative
- Working in partnership with DCC on the development of a Derbyshire County and Derby City Covid-19 Outbreak Management Plan
- Continuing to liaise with Town and Parish councils on the proposals or re-opening the high street and implementation of social distancing measures.
- Working on various LRF sub-groups including Strategic Recover, Community Engagement and Community Response.
- Organisational Recovery Plan

In addition to the above, the vast majority of the Council's services continue to be operated from remote locations albeit with reduced resources in some services

The Chief Executive then took questions.

Councillor Claire Raw:

Councillor Raw commented on the events that took place on Monday evening in Ashbourne, in relation to the Black's Head, and was concerned at how the Council was managing equality and diversity, particularly as she had heard that local Members had been involved in the removal of the item in question. If this were indeed the case, she requested that the Council put in place training in equality and diversity for those Members.

Councillor Raw also advised that the car park barriers that had been erected at the start of the pandemic at Eyam car park were removed without prior consultation. They were owned by Eyam Marathon Group, who were seeking the return or reimbursement.

The Chief Executive advised that he had not been made aware of the removal of the Eyam car park barriers, which he would follow up and report back.

With regard to events in Ashbourne, as covered by the national and local media, the removal of the item part of the sign structure had been undertaken during what was a dynamic and fast-moving situation; the item was now back in the Council's possession and in safe storage. The event itself leading up to the removal of this item had been a challenging situation and a review would be initiated if Members requested, with the engagement of the Monitoring Officer if necessary.

Councillor Clare Gamble:

Councillor Gamble asked the Chief Executive to confirm that there would be a thorough review as to how this event unfolded; what time and what day was the item returned to the Council; did

the person who was in possession of the item refuse to return it to the Council when first asked, and were any Councillors involved and who made the decisions at the time?

The Chief Executive advised that the item was returned to the Council at 4pm on Thursday, and with regard to Councillor Gamble's other questions, he was unable to comment and these would be covered by the review, which would hopefully be reported back to Council within a 6 month timescale.

Councillor Paul Cruise suggested that a broad consultation including minority groups be undertaken, after which Members should be consulted on the future of the item. Councillor Cruise supported an independent review.

Councillor Garry Purdy advised that another Councillor had already requested that the Council's other assets be scrutinised.

MEETING CLOSED 20:14PM

CHAIRMAN