



CABINET – FRIDAY 10 FEBRUARY
ORDER PAPER

ITEM DETAILS

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

1. MINUTES (Pages 3-12)

Proposed motion

That the minutes of the meeting held on 13 December 2016 be taken as read, confirmed, and signed.

2. URGENT ITEMS

None.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members of the Cabinet are asked to declare any interests in the business to be discussed.

4. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY 2017/18 – 2020/21 (Pages 13 - 190)

- *Comments have been received from Mr. S. J. Galton CC on behalf of the Liberal Democrat Group which are appended to this Order Paper, marked '4'.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That, subject to the items below, the MTFs which incorporates the recommended revenue budget for 2017/18 totalling £348m as set out in Appendices A, B and E of this report and including the growth and savings for that year as set out in Appendix C, be approved;
- (b) That the projected provisional revenue budgets for 2018/19, 2019/20 and 2020/21, set out in Appendix B to the report, be approved including the growth and savings for those years as set out in Appendix C, allowing the undertaking of preliminary work, including business case development, consultation and equality impact assessments, as may be necessary towards achieving the savings specified for those years including savings under development, set out in Appendix D;
- (c) That the early achievement of savings that are included in the MTFs, as may be necessary, along with associated investment costs, be approved subject to the Director of Finance agreeing to funding being available;

- (d) That the level of earmarked funds as set out in Appendix J be noted and the use of earmarked funds be approved;
- (e) That the amounts of the County Council's Council Tax for each band of dwelling and the precept payable by each billing authority for 2017/18 be as set out in Appendix K (including the adult social care precept of 2%);
- (f) That the Chief Executive be authorised to issue the necessary precepts to billing authorities in accordance with the budget requirement above and the tax base notified by the District Councils, and to take any other action which may be necessary to give effect to the precepts;
- (g) That the Director of Finance be authorised to approve changes to the Business Rates Pooling agreement, which might occur as a result of the creation of a Leicester and Leicestershire Combined Authority;
- (h) That the transfer of £2.85m from the Schools Block to the High Needs Block of Dedicated Schools Grant be approved;
- (i) That the 2017/18 to 2020/21 capital programme as set out in Appendix F be approved;
- (j) That the Director of Finance following consultation with the Lead Member for Corporate Resources be authorised to approve new capital schemes including revenue costs associated with their delivery;
- (k) That it be noted that new capital schemes, referred to in (j), are shown as future developments in the capital programme, to be funded from capital funding available;
- (l) That the financial indicators required under the Prudential Code included in Appendix L, Annex 2 be noted and that the following limits be approved:

	2017/18 £m	2018/19 £m	2019/20 £m	2020/21 £m
Operational boundary for external debt				
i) Borrowing	274.6	264.6	264.1	263.6
ii) Other long term liabilities	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2
TOTAL	275.9	265.9	265.3	264.8
Authorised limit for external debt				
i) Borrowing	284.6	274.6	274.1	273.6
ii) Other long term liabilities	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.2
TOTAL	285.9	275.9	275.3	274.8

- (m) That the Director of Finance be authorised to effect movement within the authorised limit for external debt between borrowing and other long term liabilities;

- (n) That the following borrowing limits be approved for the period 2017/18 to 2020/21:
- (i) Upper limit on fixed interest exposures 100%
 - (ii) Upper limit on variable rate exposures 50%
 - (iii) Maturity of borrowing:-

	<u>Upper Limit</u>	<u>Lower Limit</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Under 12 months	30	0
12 months and within 24 months	30	0
24 months and within 5 years	50	0
5 years and within 10 years	70	0
10 years and above	100	25

- (o) That the Director of Finance be authorised to enter into such loans or undertake such arrangements as necessary to finance capital payments in 2017/18, subject to the prudential limits in Appendix L;
- (p) That the Treasury Management Strategy Statement and the Annual Investment Strategy for 2017/18, as set out in Appendix L, be approved including:
- (i) The Treasury Management Policy Statement, Appendix L; Annex 4
 - (ii) The Annual Statement of the Annual Minimum Revenue Provision as set out in Appendix L, Annex 1;
- (q) That the Risk Management Policy and Strategy (Appendix H) be approved subject to consideration by the Corporate Governance Committee on 17th February 2017 and that the Director of Finance be authorised to make any necessary amendments arising from its consideration by the Corporate Governance Committee;
- (r) That the Capital Strategy (Appendix G) and Earmarked Funds Policy (Appendix I) to the report be approved.

5. 2018/19 SCHOOL AND HIGH NEEDS FUNDING PROPOSALS (Pages 191 - 198)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the second stage consultations issued by the Department for Education on the implementation of a National Funding Formula for schools, and the formulaic distribution of the High Needs Block of Dedicated Schools Grant be noted;
- (b) That it be noted that the implications of the two consultations will be considered by the Schools Forum and the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee;
- (c) That a further report be submitted to the Cabinet in March 2017 setting out in detail the implications of the proposals for both the County Council and Leicestershire schools and academies, and a proposed response to the two consultations in light of any comments made by the Schools Forum and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

6. LEICESTERSHIRE'S POLICY ON ADMISSIONS TO MAINSTREAM SCHOOLS: DETERMINATION OF ADMISSION ARRANGEMENTS (Pages 199 - 204) (Appendices pages 3 - 44)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the recommendations of the Office of the Schools Adjudicator (OSA) which resulted in minor amendments being made to Leicestershire's School Admissions Policy in December 2016 be noted;
- (b) That the Leicestershire's School Admissions Policy for entry from September 2018, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be approved;
- (c) That Leicestershire's oversubscription criteria and the three co-ordinated schemes for the normal round of transfers for September 2018 entry, as set out in Appendix B to this report, remain unchanged.

7. DEVELOPMENT OF A RAIL STRATEGY (INCLUDING HS2) FOR LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE (Pages 205 - 214) (Appendices pages 45 - 150)

- *A revised version of Table 1 (Comparison of affected properties) contained in the Cabinet report has been received and a copy is appended to this Order Paper, marked '7a'.*
- *Comments have been received from Mr. S. D. Sheahan CC and Mr Steward, Chair of the Sir John Moore Foundation, which are appended to this Order Paper, marked '7b' and '7c' respectively.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the results of the consultation on the draft Leicester and Leicestershire Rail Strategy be noted;
- (b) That the Leicester and Leicestershire Rail Strategy attached as Appendix B to the report be approved;
- (c) That the Cabinet's support in principle for a HS2 route through the County to Toton, subject to the caveats set out in Paragraph 36 of this report, be confirmed with the additional caveat that there should be no diminution of rail services to London on the West Coast Main Line post-opening of HS2, in terms of journey time, frequency of service and general standard of rolling stock;
- (d) That the Director of Environment and Transport, following consultation with the Lead Member, prepare and submit more detailed comments on the revised route to HS2 Ltd in response to the consultation on Phase 2b, reflecting the potential impact on communities, businesses and infrastructure throughout Leicestershire.

8. COMMUNITY SPEED ENFORCEMENT (Pages 215 - 222) (Appendix page 151 - 154) and SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

- *Comments have been received from Mr M. Hunt CC, Labour Spokesperson on Environment and Transport, Mr D. Snartt CC, and Mr D. C. Bill CC, Liberal Democrat Spokesman on Environment and Transport, and these are appended to this Order Paper, marked '8a', '8b' and '8c' respectively.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the letter attached to the supplementary report be sent to the Department for Transport and copied to local MPs for information;
- (b) That Subject to the response received from the Department for Transport, the Council continues to campaign for change to the national policy guidance on safety cameras, notably for new siting criteria, and in any event for the retention of fine revenue by local authorities to fund the camera installation costs;
- (c) That Support for the Council's proposed approach be sought from partner organisations which comprise the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership;
- (d) That the Director of Environment and Transport:
 - (i) develop suitable trial schemes to prove the concept of the proposed community safety camera approach;
 - (ii) develop local criteria for the wider use of safety cameras in Leicestershire; and
 - (iii) submits a further report to the Cabinet detailing the response from the Department for Transport to the appended letter, the proposed trial sites, and the proposed local criteria.

9. PLANNING APPLICATIONS IN MELTON BOROUGH VILLAGES. (Pages 223 - 228) (Appendices pages 155 – 156)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the concerns of the County Council regarding the applications for housing developments in villages within Melton Borough be drawn to the attention of the Borough Council;
- (b) That in responding as a consultee on planning applications for housing development the County Council emphasise the need for the local planning authority to ensure that any development permitted is sustainable;
- (c) That Melton Borough Council be requested to put appropriate mechanisms in place to ensure that the necessary support, through s106 developer contributions, are secured from individual developers to ensure that the infrastructure needs arising from the developments can be fully provided in a timely manner.

**10. INTEGRATED COMMISSIONING OF MENTAL HEALTH RECOVERY AND RESILIENCE SERVICES – OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION (Pages 229 - 238)
(Appendices pages 157 - 218)**

Proposed motion

- (a) That the outcome of the public consultation on the future of mental health services across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, as set out in Appendix A to the report, be noted.
- (b) That the Director of Adults and Communities be authorised to take action as necessary to implement the proposed joint procurement and commissioning of preventative mental health recovery and resilience services as set out in paragraphs 49-55 of the report.

11. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY.

No items have been referred from the Overview and Scrutiny Committees.

12. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN HAS DECIDED TO TAKE AS URGENT

None.

Officer to contact

Joanne Twomey
Principal Committee Officer
Tel: (0116) 305 6462
Email: joanne.twomey@leics.gov.uk



Cabinet – 10th February 2017

Liberal Democrat Comments on the MTFS

As always the Council faces difficult choices. Due to the continuing withdrawal of Central Government funding we are seeing a budget full of cuts to services that under normal circumstances nobody would wish to make.

However, despite the difficult circumstances there are choices available and I am disappointed with some of the choices that the Cabinet seem to be making.

There are three areas in particular where we have concerns:

Prevention and Early Intervention

One of the Council's responses to the increasingly difficult financial situation has been to develop strategies to transform services and make them more coherent and holistic in how they operate. A key plank of these strategies is the importance of prevention and early intervention services that prevent larger costs occurring in later years.

Unfortunately, despite recognising the importance of prevention and early help these budgets are being slashed, often justified by the fact that the services aren't statutory. However, cutting these budgets now is likely to increase the pressure on statutory services further down the line. This is incredibly short sighted.

Bus Subsidies

Around a third of the County's buses depend on subsidies to operate. The MTFS includes plans to cut these subsidies and end most supported bus services from 2018/19, replacing them with a "once a week" DRT service. This would be a huge reduction in service and completely inadequate for those who rely on public transport to get to work.

At Scrutiny, the leader acknowledged that this would be unpopular with residents but stated that as it will occur in next year's budget, it's not "straight away" and doesn't need to be grappled with now. However, my understanding is that for this saving to be achieved the decision would need to be in place by 1st April 2018, meaning that the decision-making process, including consultation would have to be completed before then, to allow time for implementation.

If the MTFS goes ahead with this saving then by the time we debate it again at next year's Budget meeting, it will be too late; the decision will have been made. If we wish to save these services we need to act now.



Highways Maintenance

By the end of this MTFs, the budget for Highways Maintenance is expected to have a spending power that is 78% lower compared to ten years ago. This will inevitably impact heavily on the quality of Leicestershire's roads.

At its meeting in December, Cabinet endorsed an Asset Management Strategy containing some worrying statements such as *"It is important to recognise that the current condition of the network reflects ... the good overall condition that Leicestershire's road network was in at the beginning of the period of austerity. The consequences of the current levels of investment will not therefore manifest themselves fully for several years"* and *"we anticipate an increase in pothole numbers at a time when we were looking to move away from reactive repairs and the costly operation of our mobile road-menders"* and *"where we suffer any catastrophic failures we may have to consider temporary long-term closures"*.

The Liberal Democrat Group is greatly concerned that insufficient detail is being given to the public about the consequences of this reduction. The Administration insists on painting an overly rosy picture when they should be more open with residents about the impact of cutting £10m (revenue and capital) from the Highways Maintenance budget. If they are serious about protecting Leicestershire's services and winning Fairer Funding for the Council then they need to be more forthcoming about the damage this and other budget cuts will cause.

Simon Galton

Liberal Democrat Group Leader

DEVELOPMENT OF A RAIL STRATEGY (INCLUDING HS2) FOR LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE

Amendment to Table 1 – Comparison of affected properties - contained in the Cabinet Report (page 211)

Ordnance Survey's AddressBase Premium dataset was used to identify the number of "Properties" within specific distances of the proposed HS2 line.

Following a review of the exercise, flaws in the translated version of AddressBase Premium were identified, namely that certain addresses were duplicated multiple times, inflating the totals. The exercise was re-run in February 2017 with duplicate addresses removed.

Furthermore the DfT High Speed Two "Properties Above Tunnels Factsheet" suggests that properties above tunnels may be eligible for "Tunnel Guarantees" and therefore the data below only includes those buildings within 50m of the Airport Tunnel. The data is also presented on a parish by parish basis for additional clarity:

Parish	"Properties" within 50m (inc. tunnel)			"Properties" within 120m (exc. tunnel)			"Properties" within 300m (exc. tunnel)		
	Old	New	Diff	Old	New	Diff	Old	New	Diff
Appleby Magna	3	15	12	7	21	14	13	33	20
Ashby de la Zouch	3	2	-1	19	6	-13	206	247	41
Breedon on the Hill	1	1	0	3	4	1	16	9	-7
Castle Donington	18	0	-18	1	0	-1	37	0	-37
Coleorton	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	-1
Isley cum Langley	1	0	-1	1	0	-1	2	0	-2
Kegworth	3	2	-1	3	10	7	4	130	126
Lockington-Hemington	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	-1
Long Whatton and Diseworth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4
Measham	15	3	-12	84	13	-71	408	270	-138
Oakthorpe and Donisthorpe	0	0	0	1	0	-1	8	0	-8
Packington	0	0	0	1	2	1	18	49	31
Stretton en le Field	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	-1
Twycross	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Worthington	1	0	-1	3	6	3	16	14	-2
Total	27	23	-22	123	62	-61	733	760	27

Limitations: A "Property" in this context would include everything within the dataset, including where the same property may include multiple addresses (e.g. outbuildings, blocks of flats/offices). Consequently there will be a margin of error between the number stated, and the actual number of landowners or properties affected. Properties which are only partly affected may be excluded if the point which represents the property is not within the specified distance from the HS2 centreline. These limitations are consistent across both the old and new HS2 centrelines, meaning that they estimated and designed for direct and quick comparison between the previously and newly published route, rather than for individual property identification. It is worth noting that use of an alternative datasets may give different results.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 10 FEBRUARY 2017

**DEVELOPMENT OF A RAIL STRATEGY (INCLUDING HS2) FOR
LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE (ITEM 7)**

COMMENTS FROM MR. S. D. SHEAHAN CC

Rail Strategy (HS2)

The revised figure for properties impacted in Leicestershire by HS2 has turned around the assessment of the new route. It is now shown to affect more properties, not fewer, in comparison to the old route.

As well as this adverse data, the Cabinet might care to weigh up the issue of whether an acceptable degree of mitigation can be achieved for the impacted properties, businesses and local amenities.

If, after due consideration, doubt remains as to how some impacts can be mitigated, those responsible for finalising our response could justifiably conclude that it is in the best interests of Leicestershire residents for the County Council to register its opposition to the new route.

Sean Sheahan

9th February 2017

This page is intentionally left blank

From: Fred Steward
Sent: 10 February 2017 09:20
To: Phil Crossland
Cc: Richard Blunt; Mr. N. J. Rushton; Miss. H. Worman; Ann Carruthers; John Sharpe
Subject: HS2 Sir John Moore School

Dear Mr Crossland

I have read your rail strategy document going to cabinet today. I appreciate your inclusion of the issues I raised in my letter to you (though my name is spelled incorrectly in the report).

However I remain dissatisfied. My concerns about the future of a Leicestershire school and a Leicestershire Grade 1 listed building are merely being treated as an individual representation.

Yet the matters raised fall clearly under the education and heritage responsibilities of Leicestershire County Council. Your report states that 'council officers are working with HS2' regarding the Ashby canal restoration. Yet no such active engagement by your officers has been evident or is proposed regarding the threat to a thriving primary school and a unique Christopher Wren building.

This cannot be right and I request that the County Council face up to its responsibilities to protect the education and heritage assets of the Sir John Moore School against the enormously greater threat of the new Measham reroute of HS2 compared to the earlier proposed route.

Yours sincerely

Fred Steward
Chair of the Sir John Moore Foundation

This page is intentionally left blank

Submission to Cabinet

3rd February 2017



From Max Hunt CC,
Labour Spokesperson on Environment & Transport

Item 8: COMMUNITY SPEED ENFORCEMENT

The Labour Group supports this proposal to call upon the Government to change the regulations in the two respects cited in the report.

Given the frequent references to the “community” in the title and content of the report, the scheme should be clearly differentiated Community Speed Watch which it is assumed will not be affected either way.

The paper does not explain how many more speed cameras could be sited. There is presumably a limit to the authority’s capacity to process the results, and meet public expectations. The Cabinet will also want to understand how the Council will respond to many Community Speed Watch teams who would want to see such safety cameras installed in their areas.

We recommend the lobby is a joint exercise with Leicester City Council Leicestershire Police and other neighbouring counties, and would have expected them to be consulted at an early stage.

We are surprised that this matter was not addressed in the Director’s last report on Road Casualties to Overview and Scrutiny last September. No doubt some of the issues above would have been explored and perhaps settled had that been so.

This page is intentionally left blank

CABINET – 10 FEBRUARY 2017**COMMUNITY SPEED ENFORCEMENT (ITEM 8)****COMMENTS FROM MR. D. SNARTT CC**

I would like to bring to your attention my support for the recommendation in the Cabinet Paper, Community Speed Enforcement.

Since I have been representing Bradgate Division there has been an increase in the number of concerns and complaints about excessive vehicle speeds through the villages. So much so Woodhouse was one of the first Parishes to be involved with Community Speed Watch, which brought together volunteers from the community to try and make a difference in making their village roads safer, especially for pedestrians, cyclists and horse riders. Following on from this the Parish invested in Vehicle Activated Signs (VAS) which also record vehicle speeds, VAS have also been purchased by Thurcaston and Cropston Parish Council. The recorded results from both Parishes are, in my view, frightening, with some speeds recorded twice the speed limit and above.

I was pleased to see in the report reference to Average Speed Cameras, which, in my opinion, would be an enormous benefit in making our County roads safer through our rural villages, where we not only see a high percentage of speeding vehicles but also an increase in overall traffic levels.

I note information from Bedford Borough about Average Speed Cameras where they are already installed. It is stated the installation of Average Speed Cameras has seen speed limits across the Borough lowered, especially in rural areas, going on to say Average Speed Cameras communicate wirelessly meaning they can be moved around to target known speeding hotspots. These cameras also have the benefit of smoothing traffic flows, where with fixed cameras drivers will slow down and then speed up again afterwards.

I believe the Parishes like the two I have mentioned above have captured enough evidence to make the case for Average Speed Cameras and I am sure they would be pleased to share this information and support Leicestershire County Council with their recommendation outlined today in the Cabinet Paper. I also believe they would be interested in being consulted and involved in any trial schemes that come forward.

David Snartt.
County Councillor Bradgate Division.

This page is intentionally left blank



Cabinet – 10th February 2017

Liberal Democrat Comments on Community Speed Enforcement

A number of my Liberal Democrat colleagues across the Country, including the Mayor of Bedford, have been campaigning for the proposals in this paper for a while now. It will be good to see this Council joining the effort.

Cameras are a much preferable solution to address speeding compared to other traffic calming measures such as road bumps, which are also a pain for responsible drivers.

Speed bumps are not popular as they are uncomfortable and noisy and appear to have no impact on particular drivers who regards them as a challenge rather than a deterrent. HGVs driven at speed over these humps in residential areas only exacerbate the problem which is even more acute at night when the background noise drops.

It makes sense that the fines be used to fund enforcement measures rather than go to central Government coffers. However, this measure must be seen as a means of controlling speeds rather than as yet another tax raising measure imposed on the already hard pressed motorist. We need to make it clear that the money will only be used to fund the enforcement measure and that the Council will not benefit from any surplus.

The Liberal Democrats support the recommendations.

David Bill

Liberal Democrat Spokesman for Environment and Transport

This page is intentionally left blank