

**ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE**

6 SEPTEMBER 2016

**LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING ADULT BOARD
ANNUAL REPORT 2015 - 16**

DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered the draft Annual Report of Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adult Board for 2015/16. A copy of the report, marked "Agenda Item 11" is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Paul Burnett, Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Boards, to introduce the report and answer any questions. Mr. Dave Houseman MBE CC, the Cabinet Lead Member for Adult Social Care was also present to comment on the draft Annual Report.

In introducing the report, the Independent Chair highlighted that it was the first year of Safeguarding Boards being a statutory body and as part of their obligations the Board was required to produce an annual performance report in which it should demonstrate its compliance with the Care Act 2014. The Committee was pleased to note that the Board complied in 47 out of 49 standards of the Care Act, with the areas requiring of additional work being effectiveness around prevention and engagement of the community, and the following up of impacts of training and development. Members were pleased to note that improvement in the seniority of the Board members was allowing for more effective work, including a more efficient communication flow.

Arising from discussion the following points were noted:-

- (i) The attendance of some key stakeholders at Board meetings remained a concern. Derbyshire, Leicestershire, Nottinghamshire and Rutland Community Rehabilitation Company had not attended meetings of the Board and representations from East Midland Ambulance Service and District and Borough Councils were not at present sufficient to enable an effective dialogue. The Committee was advised however, that the Independent Chair had written to the persistent non-attendees and low-attendees in an attempt to remedy this concern. The Cabinet Lead Member was pleased to confirm that attendance at Board meetings had been increasing over the past year;
- (ii) The Committee was pleased to have learnt that the previous spike in safeguarding referrals over 2013-14 had been addressed and the performance in 2015-16 was consistent with that from the previous year.

Members also noted that the previous backlog of Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards referrals had also seen an improvement;

- (iii) The area of concern for the Board for the next year was ensuring that partner agencies understood and applied correctly safeguarding thresholds for making referrals. In addition, it was noted that referrals from residential and community care settings were now more balanced as a shift in referrals from these settings had been observed;
- (iv) The 'Prevent' agenda was involved in coordination of the information made available to the stakeholders, including General Practitioners and schools, in an attempt concerns around the radicalisation of young people.

As Mr. Burnett's tenure as Independent Chair of the Safeguarding Boards would soon be coming to close, the Chairman took the opportunity to thank Mr. Burnett for the commitment and energy that he had brought to the role.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the draft Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adult Board Annual Report 2015-16 be noted.
- b) That the comments of the Committee be forwarded to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 16 September.



CHILDREN AND FAMILIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
5 SEPTEMBER 2016

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING
CHILDREN BOARD 2015/16

DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered the Annual Report of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Board for 2015/16. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 12' is filed with these minutes.

The Independent Chair outlined the main areas of success of the Board over 2015/16, and those areas where further work was required as detailed within the report. It was noted that the Board was fully compliant with Working Together and had been successful in the past year in addressing attendance concerns over key partners. There did however remain a concern over attendance by the probation service and it was now known that their financial contribution was to be lessened in the New Year.

The Board had strong relationships with both Leicestershire County Council and Rutland County Council internal bodies and committees, and there was a good culture of challenge from their respective Health and Wellbeing Boards, Scrutiny bodies, and Cabinets.

A key focus for the Board in the New Year was ensuring that improvements be made around the number of repeat and subsequent child protection plans that children in Leicestershire were subject to. The County Council had a number of actions being progressed to secure improvements and the Board was confident that the issues were being addressed appropriately. A further area that the Board would need to give greater consideration to in this financial year was around safeguarding children with disabilities which had not featured within previous Business Plans.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:

- i. The Committee was pleased to note the work completed around e-safety and in particular the Board's response to the prevalence of online Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE). It was reported that building resilience in individuals remained a key focus for the Board contained within the business plan and strategy document as part of a proportionate approach to managing the risk of CSE. It was also emphasised as part of training with education staff. It was felt that this was not properly articulated within the annual report and it was suggested that the Chair endeavour to include information around the work of the Board and its impact in building resilience in individuals;

RESOLVED:

- a) That the Annual Report of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Board 2015/16 be noted;
- b) That the comments made be submitted to the Safeguarding Children Board for consideration.

Submission to Cabinet

16 September 2016

From Robert Sharp CC,
Labour Leader

**Item 8 – Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme (SVPRS)**

It is disappointing to find Cabinet at odds with local partners on a topic of such importance and that to date, we are not seemingly playing a full part in delivering this Government scheme.

It is also of concern that at a time when we are seeking to develop closer ties with local Councils and others as part of a Combined Authority, we seem unable to establish an effective dialogue or working relationship that would prevent misgivings over governance, decision making and funding to be so publically aired even though the first two refugee families have already been accommodated in the County after almost 12 months of planning.

At the Cabinet meeting of 11 September 2015, the Labour Group sought Cabinet to resolve:

That a cross party panel be immediately established to work with officers to identify how this authority can provide assistance; ensure early and robust plans are put in place; and that effective co-ordination across partners is established.

Considering the position this Council now finds it in, it seems Cabinet was mistaken in rejecting this suggestion and the Labour Group would ask again for such a panel to be established urgently in advance of the next proposed arrivals in November. The panel could also consider actions taken under the National Transfer Scheme.

As a Group, we have readily acknowledged that our capacity as a Council to assist will inevitably be governed by available resources and whilst we have a desire to do more, have accepted the level of support for 250 refugees over five years as pragmatic. We have not sought political capital out of the issue with full and public praise given to the Conservative Leader of Charnwood Borough Council for his personal leadership on the matter.

We urge Cabinet to acknowledge our concerns and establish appropriate oversight.

This page is intentionally left blank

ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE -
12 SEPTEMBER 2016

DRY RECYCLING CREDITS MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY SAVINGS

DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport which sought members' views on the proposals to achieve savings on dry recycling credits identified in the Medium Term Financial Strategy agreed by the County Council. Subsequent to publishing of the report, a report to the Cabinet on the same issue had been published, which the Committee also considered as part of its deliberations. A copy of both reports is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mr. B. L. Pain CC, Cabinet Lead Member for Waste Management to the meeting. The Lead Member emphasised that the new approach to dry recycling credits had been under review since May 2015 and an ongoing dialogue had taken place with the district councils since this time. The proposals outlined in both reports, had followed a lengthy consultation process. It was noted that none of the options contained in the report were without risk, however the Council and Department were required to reduce their budgets to meet the Council's MTFS and the wider emerging financial challenge and the recommended way forward to pursue Option 4 would achieve the largest saving of all the options considered. The Lead Member, in recognising the difficult position, suggested that a new way of incentivising dry recycling credits was required at a national level as waste levels were known to be on the increase.

Arising from a discussion it was noted that the proposed direction of travel had been proposed with the County Council's challenging financial position in mind. The district councils had been involved in an ongoing dialogue regarding the plans, via the delivery of a number of workshop sessions. The pursuit of Option 4 had been independently assessed as balancing risk against the potential for significant savings.

A view was expressed that the high point of recycling levels in the County had probably been reached and that this was as a result of the public being educated to separate their recycling from their landfill waste. Though Option 2 would not achieve the same level of savings as Option 4, it would achieve the Department's initial savings target of just over £1 million. It was suggested that by pursuing Option 2, the Council would be giving the district councils the benefit of time to acclimatise and think through their approach going forward. A further view was expressed that, the pursuit of Option 4 may lead to an increase in tipping charges for the Council were the public to become less inclined to recycle.

Some members also felt that more needed work needed to be done with the manufacturers of products and packaging in an effort to reduce the potential for waste at source.

It was subsequently moved by Mr. D. C. Bill MBE CC and seconded by Mr. G. A. Boulter CC:-

“That the Cabinet be advised that the Committee supports ‘Option 2: Reach local agreements to reduce the value of the recycling credits’ as outlined on paragraph 30 of the Cabinet report.”

In response to the concerns expressed, the Lead Member suggested that, as a result of not being a single waste authority, the Council was unable to look at the whole system for waste collection and disposal. The sovereignty of the districts as waste collection authorities therefore had to be recognised. He added that residents had become frustrated by the varying collection practices across different districts, though the Council would continue to promote recycling in an effort to reduce landfill waste.

A view was expressed that the circumstances under which the proposals were made reflected very different needs for recycling which the current strategy no longer addressed and the approach offered by Option 4 was a long-term one that was sustainable.

Accordingly, an amendment was moved by Mr. D. Jennings CC and seconded by Mr. J. G. Coxon CC: -

That the motion be amended to read as follows:-

“That the Cabinet be advised that the Committee supports ‘Option 4: The County Council to procure capacity for all Waste Collection Authority dry recycling and direct the Waste Collection Authorities to use it’ as outlined on paragraph 32 of the Cabinet report.”

The amendment was put and not carried, three members voting for the amendment and six against.

The original motion was then put and carried.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Cabinet be advised that the Committee supports ‘Option 2: Reach local agreements to reduce the value of the recycling credits’ as outlined on paragraph 30 of the Cabinet report;
- (b) That the comments of the Committee be forwarded to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 16 September.

**Leicestershire County Council
Liberal Democrat Group**



Cabinet – 16th September 2016

**Liberal Democrat Comments on the
Dry Recycling Credits Savings Strategy**

At the last meeting of the Environment and Transport Scrutiny committee, a cross party selection of members voted in favour of following the advice of our Waste Collection Authority partners and opting for Option 2.

This option would continue to give the WCAs the flexibility to deliver locally tailored recycling schemes.

We have been warned that selecting Option 4 would almost inevitably lead to a reduction in services and incur large transition costs. I therefore urge you to follow the advice of the Scrutiny Committee and opt for Option 2.

David Bill

Liberal Democrat Spokesperson for Environment and Transport

This page is intentionally left blank



**ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE – 6
SEPTEMBER 2016**

**FUTURE STRATEGY FOR THE DELIVERY OF LIBRARY SERVICES. OUTCOME
OF CONSULTATION ON KIRBY MUXLOE AND UPDATE ON DESFORD
LIBRARY**

DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Adults and Communities concerning the outcome of consultation with the Kirby Muxloe community regarding alternative library provision and providing an update on development with Desford Library. The matter was due to be considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on 16 September and any comments of the Committee would be forwarded to the Cabinet for its consideration. A copy of the report, marked “Agenda Item 13”, is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman drew members’ attention to a submission which had been received by the Desford Community Hub which included a number of questions concerning the future arrangements for the transfer of Desford Library. A copy of the submission is filed with these minutes. The Chairman emphasised that, given the length of the submission, she had agreed that the submission would not be covered under the “Question Time” procedure and that, instead, representatives from Desford Community Hub would be able to address the Committee after the Director had been given the opportunity to respond to the key issues raised in the submission as part of his introduction.

Accordingly, the Director made the following key points in introducing the item:

Kirby Muxloe Library

- Following the withdrawal of Kirby Muxloe Parish Council’s offer to run the Library a period of further consultation had been undertaken. Another group had now come forward and subsequently submitted an outline business plan that has been assessed as meeting the criteria to progress to transfer to community management. It was intended that a recommendation would be made to the Cabinet to enable this group to run the library;

Desford Library – current position

- The Desford Community Hub group had come forward with a successful business case to run Desford Library, however Officers and the group had to date been unable to resolve concerns raised by the group over the condition

of the fabric of the building. Officers had advised that the work outlined in the building's conditions survey as part of information supplied to Desford Community Hub was not viewed as being priority to merit funding prior to take up of any lease arrangement with the group and did not pose a risk to the health and safety of occupants or result in legislative non-compliance. The group felt that that they could not progress with their plan to manage the library unless the Council funded these repairs;

- Despite the stalemate, a timescale was required for the situation to reach a conclusion in order that any future decisions with respect to the running of the Library could be made. It was intended to hold further meetings between County Council officers and the group over the coming weeks in an effort to establish whether the situation could be resolved;
- It had been recommended to the Cabinet that, were no successful conclusion to be reached with the group by the end of September, a further three month period of consultation would be undertaken to give any other interested groups the opportunity to come forward with a business case and also to consult on alternative library provision through the mobile library service;

Desford Library – response to points raised by the Desford Community Hub

- No decisions had been pre-emptively made with regard to the future of the Library. Hope remained that any issues could be resolved with Desford Community Hub and that the Library could remain open;
- If the Cabinet agreed to a further period of consultation, a further report would be submitted to the Cabinet in the New Year making a recommendation on how best to progress the matter in light of any submissions received;
- The Council had been clear throughout the process that it was not in a position to invest in non-essential maintenance prior to the transfer of any library into community hands. The group had continued to contest that the County Council would need to pay the estimated £49,000 repair costs to the building's windows, roof and heating system before it could transfer;
- In a small number of cases the Council had been flexible in altering the leasing arrangements with community groups during the transition phase in cases where the elapsed time required for transition brought the life of the building within a close proximity of the 25 year life expectancy. The Desford Library building had a life expectancy of 60 years and was therefore designated a full repairing lease. No flexibility would therefore be offered;
- The case of Market Bosworth Library had proven different to Desford's case. A sum of c£45,000 had been allocated to enable the Library to be separated from the Academy by way of a separate entrance. Paying for the alterations on the Academy site was therefore a lease condition laid down by the Academy for allowing the County Council to transfer the Library to community stewardship with the premises then sub-leased to the group. Without these

measures, the County Council would not have been in a position to offer the Library to the community group and this was considered to be more cost effective than vacating the premises, withdrawing from the lease, and re-locating the Library. In the case of Desford, the County Council was able to offer the Library to the group, but the group had requested that the non-essential building costs be met first;

- If no agreement could ultimately be reached over Desford Library the County Council would consider the group's bid to manage the Library as withdrawn in an effort to find alternative solutions.

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting Ms. Margie Regan from the Desford Community Hub who was present to make representations on the future of the Library. Ms. Regan delivered a presentation lasting three minutes which covered the following key points:

- The Desford Library building had suffered from years of neglect which had resulted in the estimated £49,000 repair costs highlighted in the County Council's building conditions survey. This represented a significant financial risk for the group;
- There were some concerns around the cost of any associated works to enable full disabled access at the Library;
- The village had experienced a large rise in population and its requirement for a library and community facility had therefore grown;
- Instances were highlighted where other groups had been given internal repairing leases when originally they had fell outside of the 25 year threshold. An example was given of Kegworth Library which had been assessed as having a life expectancy of 27 years but had been granted an internal lease.

The Chairman thanked Ms. Regan for her contribution.

The Chairman then welcomed to the meeting Mr. D. A. Sprason CC, the local County Councillor for Desford, Markfield and Thornton, who had requested the opportunity to speak on the matter. Mr. Sprason circulated a document outlining the repair costs and life expectancy of some libraries, including Desford, and delivered a presentation lasting three minutes which covered the following key points:

- The building's slate roof was the principal concern. The Council's lack of maintenance of the building over a period of many years has resulted in a building which required significant repair and imminent works;
- The document circulated outlined that Kibworth Library had an estimated repair cost in the region of £90,000 yet had been granted an internal lease. It was felt that Desford Library should similarly be made a special case and that compromises would be needed on behalf of the County Council to enable the

Library to transfer to the group.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Sprason for his contribution.

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Lead Member for Heritage, Leisure and Arts, Mr. R. Blunt CC to comment. Accordingly, the Lead Member made the following points:

- The efforts of Kirby Muxloe to overcome any stumbling blocks and enable a successful transfer of the library into community hands should be celebrated. The Desford Community Hub group had produced an excellent business case and the skills and passion of the group was not in doubt;
- Further meetings were planned with the group to hopefully enable a successful transfer. The Council remained committed to the aim of having all libraries remain open and transfer into community hands. It was felt that the Council's £150,000 contingency fund for non-routine repairs could prove an avenue through which the repair of Desford Library building's slate roof could be achieved. This contingency fund was part of a wider support package which had been developed by a cross-party Scrutiny Review Panel which had received Cabinet support.

The Chairman invited the Cabinet Lead Member for property, Mr. B. L. Pain CC to comment. Accordingly, the Lead Member made the following points:

- The document circulated by Mr. Sprason CC was an internal officer document which had been obtained by the group at a meeting with the Lead Member and officers;
- The Council's Property Services section had a policy of regular upkeep of its assets to ensure they did not become a financial burden on the Authority;
- Were the Council to offer an internal repair lease to Desford, a change in policy would be required which would jeopardise all 27 existing library transfers to community management. It was felt that this would be unacceptable.

Arising from the Committee's debate on all the information received, the following points were noted:

- A view was expressed that the £45,000 provided to Market Bosworth was a deviation from Council policy and that Desford Library required a similar arrangement to enable it to successfully transfer to the community. Were the projected repair costs of libraries in the County likely to exceed the £150,000 contingency fund offer from the Council then the future of several libraries might be placed in jeopardy. In response, it was noted that the County Council's contingency fund offer was known to be significantly higher than other authorities who had pursued the "community management" library model;

- Only urgent repair work was known to have been carried out as required to the Desford Library building. No major refurbishment work had been carried out in recent years;
- The estimated £49,000 repair costs to Desford Library were regarded as “non-urgent” and low priority. Whilst it was difficult to know with any degree of certainty exactly when these works might be required, it was confirmed that the building was built to modern building standards, was well constructed and that it was likely that for this reason any projected repair costs would come at a higher cost;
- Though Desford Community Hub were being asked to take on liability for the building costs going forward, this was consistent with other community groups who had taken on the management of other libraries in the County.

A view was expressed that, whilst it was clear that further negotiations were needed with the group in order to bring the situation to a successful conclusion, it would be necessary for the Cabinet to consider further how long the £150,000 contingency fund would be made available to communities and whether it was sufficient to serve the full library portfolio.

Accordingly, it was moved by Mr. Sheahan CC and seconded by Mr. Mullaney CC:-

“That the Cabinet strongly be urged to consider replenishing the £150,000 contingency fund in future years should there prove to be a demand which warranted it.”

A view was expressed that the £150,000 contingency fund had been developed by the Scrutiny Review Panel to meet a specific need and that it had never been intended to provide this level of financial support in perpetuity. It was further noted that other grant funding was available from the Council in addition to the contingency fund.

Accordingly, an amendment was moved by Mrs. Camamile CC and seconded by Mr. Richardson CC:-

That the motion be amended to read as follows:-

“That the Cabinet be advised that the Committee is of the view that the period for which the £150,000 contingency fund is made available should be extended until such time as it is exhausted and that future provision be reviewed at that time.”

The amendment was put and carried, five members voting in favour and three against.

The substantive motion was then put and carried.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet be advised that the Committee is of the view that the period for which the £150,000 contingency fund is made available should be extended until such time as it is exhausted and that future provision be reviewed at that time.

Leicestershire County Council
Liberal Democrat Group



Cabinet – 16th September 2016

**Liberal Democrat Comments on the
Market Harborough Transport Study**

I welcome this report and believe it is long overdue. I have felt for some time that something of this nature was needed for the town, but previously there has been an unwillingness to use modelling to inform Highways planning.

I would like Cabinet to note that recent indications from the District Council mean that housing numbers are likely to be greater than the projection to 2031 figures used in the report. This means that the measures outlined in this report are even more needed.

I would like Cabinet to also note that the work done by the County Council shows that there are significant capacity issues in the town centre. This impacts on Northamptonshire as traffic diverts away from a congested town centre. This does not agree with the Jacobs report, commissioned by Harborough District Council, which claimed that there would be “*Negligible impact on Market Harborough town centre*” regarding link capacity.

As the LCC work is more detailed, I would urge the District Council to use the findings of the LCC study in preference to the Jacobs work in evidencing future highways improvements.

I will await the outcome of the public consultation with interest.

Dr Sarah Hill

Member for Market Harborough East

This page is intentionally left blank

Leicestershire County Council
Liberal Democrat Group



Cabinet – 16th September 2016

**Liberal Democrat Comments on
LTP3 Hinckley Area Project Zone 4**

This report contains a number of highways improvements in, and near, my division, many of which are long overdue.

The measures to improve the various junctions will be mostly welcomed by residents, although I feel that the measures for the Rugby Road/Hawley Road junction don't go nearly far enough. This is the most complained about location in town, from all directions, and many residents would prefer to see the roundabout returned.

To really get to the root of this problem we need to conduct a holistic assessment on improving traffic flow around Hinckley, particularly at peak times.

I also support the proposal for a pedestrian crossing on Lancaster Road and would also like to ask for consideration for one on Mount Road too, near Hurst Road. This would support new leisure centre as well as the flow of pedestrians walking into town from the Burbage and Southfield Road area. It would be great to see this happen as part of Phase 2.

I welcome the introduction of further 20mph zones but am not keen on further speed humps. There have been many complaints about the number of humps being installed around town.

Lastly, I would like to bring it to your attention that parking in the town centre is horrendous and that residents have been asking for some sort of residents parking scheme.

Stuart Bray

Member for Burbage Castle

This page is intentionally left blank



**Leicestershire
County Council**

From County Councillor Lynton Yates

Cabinet – 16th September 2016

**Agenda Item 13 – A50 Bradgate Hill, Markfield Road, Groby Road and
Leicester Road in the Parishes Of Groby and Glenfield – Proposed Traffic
Regulation Orders**

I feel that closure of the central reservations would substantially reduce accidents and that the speed limit should either remain at 50MPH or have it increased to 60MPH

**Lynton Yates CC
County Councillor
Glenfields.**

UKIP Members Group Room
Leicestershire County Council, County Hall, Glenfield, Leicestershire LE3 8RA
Telephone: 0116 232 3232

www.leics.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

From County Councillor David Sprason

Cabinet – 16th September 2016

**Agenda Item 13 – A50 Bradgate Hill, Markfield Road, Groby Road and
Leicester Road in the Parishes Of Groby and Glenfield – Proposed Traffic
Regulation Orders**

Dear Director

I wish you to raise my serious reservations to cabinet regarding your proposals for a 40mph speed limit on the A50 corridor. You are aware that I would support a scheme as long as it included other measures to enforce the new speed limit. I indicated that the scheme should include average speed cameras as a way of making sure drivers would observe the new limit. I use the A50 on a daily basis and a large number of vehicles do not adhere to the current speed limits apart from the small section on Markfield Road that has enforcement cameras. This proposal will do nothing to reduce traffic speed along this section and is a futile attempt to appease local concerned residents with a cheap fix.

I am disappointed that you have ignored the number one issue of putting in measures to enforce the new speed limit and as such I am unable to support your proposal.

I do however support the closure to the gaps in the central reservation this was requested the last time the speed limits were reviewed so hopefully this time it will be implemented.

Regards

David Sprason CC
Markfield, Desford and Thornton

This page is intentionally left blank