



CABINET – FRIDAY 24 NOVEMBER

ORDER PAPER

ITEM DETAILS

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Mr. E. F. White CC

1. MINUTES (PAGES 3 - 14)

Proposed motion

That the minutes of the meeting held on 10 October 2017 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. REMOVAL (CLOSURE) OF RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES AT MAPLEWELL HALL SPECIAL SCHOOL. (PAGES 15 - 64)

- *Comments have been received from the local member Mrs. D. Taylor CC and also from Mr. P. C. Osborne CC, and Mr. G. Welsh CC which are attached to this Order Paper, marked '4a', '4b' and '4c'.*
- *Comments have also been received from several members of the public which are attached to the Order Paper, marked '4d' and '4e'*
- With the permission of the Chairman, Mrs D. Taylor CC and Mr. P. C. Osborne CC will speak on this item.

Proposed motion

- (a) That the online and written responses received to the first stage of consultation including an e-petition and a paper petition with a total of 11,592 signatures, 31% from Leicestershire, 18% from Leicester and 51% from outside, be noted;
- (b) That approval be given to proceed with the proposal to remove (close) the residential facilities at Maplewell Hall School with effect from September 2018;

- (c) That it be noted that the removal of the residential provision, if progressed, is not expected to have an adverse impact on the afterschool activities provided by Maplewell Hall School and that, subject to the outcome of further audit work, officers will work with the school to ensure the continuance of the afterschool activities;
- (d) That the publication of a Statutory Notice in early January 2018 supported by a statutory proposal as the next step to progress the removal (closure) of the residential provision be approved, and it be noted that this will be followed by a four-week 'representation period', during which further comment on the proposals can be made;
- (e) That the use of the Council's High Needs Block budget and the increasing pressures on it be noted;
- (f) That a further report be submitted to the Cabinet on 9th March 2018, after the representation period, to enable a final decision to be taken on the implementation or otherwise, of the closure of the residential facilities;
- (g) That in light of the petition having over 10,000 signatures, the decision of the Cabinet be reported to the Council on 6th December to enable the Council to debate the issue.

5. REVISED LEICESTERSHIRE YOUTH JUSTICE PLAN 2016 - 2019. (PAGES 65 - 68) (Appendices – Pages 3 –22 of the Appendix Pack)

Proposed motion

That the County Council be recommended to

- (a) Agree the updated Leicestershire Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2016 – 2019 as set out in the Appendix to the report;
- (b) Authorise the Director of Children and Family Services to make minor amendments to the Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2016-2019 as are considered necessary to ensure it remains current and conforms to the requirements of the Youth Justice Board.

6. ANNUAL DELIVERY REPORT AND PERFORMANCE COMPENDIUM 2017. (PAGES 69 - 76) (Appendices - 23 – 138 of the Appendix Pack)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered a report on the matter at its meeting on 15 November and a draft minute extract is attached to this Order Paper, marked '6'.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the overall progress during 2016/17 in delivering on the Council's Strategic Priorities, securing transformation and mitigating the impact of national funding reductions, as set out in the draft Annual Delivery Report, be noted;

- (b) That the current comparative funding and performance position and latest service data set out in the draft Performance Compendium be noted;
- (c) That it be noted that the national funding system is:-
 - (i) causing serious financial challenges for the Council, with major implications for the provision of services to the people of Leicestershire;
 - (ii) placing increasing pressure on the delivery and quality of services which require enhanced performance monitoring, contract and risk management;

and that the Council continues to press its case for a fairer funding settlement;

- (d) That the Chief Executive, following consultation with the Leader, be authorised to make any amendments to the draft Annual Delivery Report and draft Performance Compendium prior to its submission to the County Council on 6th December 2017 for approval and to produce a summary document for publication on the County Council's website.

7. LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC PLAN 2018 – 2022.
(PAGES 77 - 86) (Appendices - 139 – 188 of the Appendix Pack)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered a report on the matter at its meeting on 15 November and a draft minute extract is attached to this Order Paper, marked '7'.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the outcome of consultation on the revised Strategic Plan be noted;
- (b) That the draft Strategic Plan 2018 – 22 attached as Appendix A to the report be approved for submission to the County Council at its meeting on 6th December 2017.

8. LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE STRATEGIC GROWTH PLAN CONSULTATION DRAFT. (PAGES 87 - 94) (Appendices - 189 – 212 of the Appendix Pack)

- *Comments have been received from Mr S. J. Galton CC which are attached to this Order Paper, marked '8'.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the collaborative work undertaken to develop the draft Strategic Growth Plan for Leicester and Leicestershire, including its endorsement by the Members' Advisory Group (MAG), be noted and welcomed;
- (b) That the proposed consultation and engagement exercise on the draft Strategic Growth Plan and the timetable for that consultation as set out in the report be approved;

- (c) That further reports be submitted to the Cabinet in 2018 advising on the Leicestershire County Council consultation response which will be forwarded to the MAG and seeking approval for the final version of the Strategic Growth Plan.

9. LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE AUTHORITIES: JOINT STATEMENT OF CO-OPERATION. (PAGES 95 - 100) (Appendices – Pages 213 – 218 of the Appendix Pack)

Proposed motion

That the revised Joint Statement of Co-operation relating to Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (November 2017) as appended to the report, be approved.

10. HARBOROUGH LOCAL PLAN 2011 TO 2031 PROPOSED SUBMISSION CONSULTATION RESPONSE. (PAGES 101 - 108) (Appendices – Pages 219 – 222 of the Appendix Pack)

- *Comments have been received from local members Dr. S. Hill CC and Dr. P. Bremner CC, which are attached to this Order Paper, marked '10a'. Comments have also been received from another local member, Mr. S. J. Galton CC, which are attached as '10b'*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the detailed comments on the Harborough Local Plan Proposed Submission document as set out in the appendix to the report be submitted to Harborough District Council as the views of the County Council;
- (b) That the key comments set out in paragraphs 22 to 42 of the report be specifically drawn to the attention of Harborough District Council.

11. INTEGRATED SEXUAL HEALTH SERVICES – OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION AND RE-PROCUREMENT. (PAGES 109 - 118) (Appendices – Pages 223 – 288 of the Appendix Pack)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the outcome of the public consultation on the proposed new model for integrated sexual health services across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland be noted;
- (b) That the final model for integrated sexual health services detailed in paragraph 28 of the report so far as it relates to Leicestershire, be approved;
- (c) That the Director of Public Health following consultation with the Director of Law and Governance, be authorised to enter into any contractual arrangements necessary to bring into effect the provision of an integrated sexual health service across Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland with effect from 1st January 2019.

- 12. ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH – LEICESTERSHIRE HEALTH – NEW INSIGHTS INTO OUR POPULATION.**
(PAGES 119 - 122) (Appendices – Pages 289 – 352 of the Appendix Pack)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the Director of Public Health's Annual Report 2017 be noted and its recommendations supported;
- (b) That it be noted that the Annual Report will be submitted for consideration by County Council on 6th December 2017.

- 13. MODERN SLAVERY AND HUMAN TRAFFICKING STATEMENT.** (PAGES 123 - 126) (Appendices – Pages 353 – 356 of the Appendix Pack)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the Modern Slavery and Human Trafficking Statement attached as an appendix to the report be approved;
- (b) That it be noted that the Statement will be reviewed and updated at the end of each financial year and published on the Council's website.

- 14. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY.**

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

- 15. ANY OTHER ITEMS WHICH THE CHAIRMAN HAS DECIDED TO TAKE AS URGENT.**

None.

- 16. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

Proposed motion

That under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded for the following item of business on the grounds that it involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 3 and 10 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act and that, in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.

- 17. PURCHASE OF A SHARE IN A TECKAL WASTE MANAGEMENT COMPANY.**
(PAGES 127 - 164)

Officer to contact

Matthew Hand
Senior Committee Officer
Tel: (0116) 305 6038
Email: matthew.hand@leics.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cabinet 24 November 2017 – Item 4 – Removal (Closure) of Residential Facilities at
Maplewell Hall Special School**

Representation from Mrs. D. Taylor

I have spent a large amount of time looking into the proposal to close the residential facility at this school and I have had the delight of visiting the school and having a tour of the facilities and to find out more about what the school offers.

In a report by the Director of Children and Families Services on the provision of school places in Leicestershire it states that there is a long term trend towards increased demand in special education needs which has necessitated extending capacity in the area special schools. This Council have been allocated £2.1 million capital funding from the Department of Education for the development of SEND provision in Leicestershire for the period till 2020/21. I look forward to some of that money being spent at Maplewell to further enhance the school.

I see this proposal as very short sighted and something that will look good on a spreadsheet. I understand that we have limited budgets, we face tough times, we have to make difficult decisions and we have 3,600 children to consider and all their complex needs. I have tried to find out as much as I can about how we care for all our children with special needs. These children are our most vulnerable residents and we should be looking at supporting them more not less. If we do not support these children to achieve and become independent adults they will become a drain on the Adult Social Care Budget in the future and we will not be making any real savings.

In regard to funding if a child has mild learning difficulties they can be supported in mainstream schools. Children with severe learning difficulties are supported in specialist schools. Children with moderate learning difficulties are left in the middle of this and seem to lack the much needed funding and fall into a bit of a grey area. We are looking today at proposals to reduce funding from this grey area and this is the wrong decision.

I find this report very lacking in information and I will highlight some of my concerns.

The first issue is additional transport costs due to the children not staying for 2 nights per week. I have only received an estimate costing for this additional transport of approx. £5,000 but I suspect this figure will be much higher if it is looked at properly.

The second issue is the take up of residential care. The report states that each child stays 12-14 nights per year but this figure is per half term. The residential experience is offered to Key Stages 3 & 4. The take up is over 50% for this group.

The third issue is the lack of information included in the report about the further revenue costs that may arise to provide any individual support as a consequence of

the removal of facilities, without these figures you are asking us to vote blindfolded. These costs much be explored before a decision is made.

I asked prior to the meeting how the funding of £293,000 for residential facilities is distributed. I have been unable to gain this information. I get the feeling that there has been limited discussions between the school and LCC and I would like to see if there is a way forward to still provide residential facilities, possibly with reduced funding. This also needs to be fully explored as part of a more open review.

Under the Children and Families Act 2014 Part 3 of the SEND reforms the Local Authority has a duty to support the child and his or her parent in order to facilitate the development of the child and to help him or her achieve the best possible educational and other outcomes.

This is exactly what Maplewell Hall is doing and if you would like to read their last OFSTED report completed in September 2016 in all areas the school was considered outstanding. The first sentence of the OFSTED report states 'Young people make exceptional progress academically, socially and emotionally because of the residential experience' It is clear throughout the OFSTED report that the residential facilities offered to pupils enhances their learning and produces their excellent results. They show this school, including the residential facilities is providing the most excellent care for our vulnerable children.

A full service review should be undertaken to determine how we deliver the High Needs Block budget for all of our 3,600 children in the County not just at Maplewell Hall. There is not a one size fits all and we should not be looking at providing the same facilities county wide but looking at the different options available. Special Education is about understanding that all children are different and benefit from different styles of learning and we should be embracing the uniqueness of Maplewell Hall and building on that and not stripping facilities away.

The Education Act 1996 places a statutory duty on the County Council to:

a) 'Ensure a sufficient supply of school places with a view to securing diversity of provision and increasing opportunities for parental choice' and

b) 'Exercise its education functions with a view to promoting high standards'. I think Maplewell Hall and its residential facilities has a big tick in both of those boxes.

In summary, I don't think the huge impact of losing these residential facilities has been looked at and the budget savings has been the whole focus of these proposals. I would like these proposals dropped and a full review undertaken county wide on how we deliver for our 3,600 children with learning difficulties. We must keep in mind that one size does not fit all and embrace the differences each of our special schools bring to the table and offer as much as we can to our special children. I cannot understand how we can propose to close these residential facilities from a school that is providing this county's children with outstanding educational provision.

**Cabinet 24 November 2017 – Item 4 – Removal (Closure) of Residential Facilities at
Maplewell Hall Special School**

Representation from Mr P. C. Osborne CC

I wrote to the Leader on October 1st. to express my misgivings about what I felt was a flawed report. I have tried to outline my misgivings and would look forward to hearing a rebuttal on every point.

I am an ex Chairman of Governors, Maplewell Hall school was in my ward before the boundary changes and it is a school which I have known all my life. It is a valued part of the local community and whilst I would be protective of its contributions, I have tried to write an impartial paper.

PO Comment

Reasons for recommendation.

4. Whilst the largest ever response has been made, and many responders may have highlighted the benefit of respite care, that should not disguise the benefits of educational residential provision. The school can show the positive outcome for students who have used the facility, to those who have not. Those facts seem to have been ignored

Officers response

The facts have not been ignored. The value of the residential provision is acknowledged, however the quality of provision is not the fundamental driver for the proposals. This is about ensuring that funding for SEND provision continues to be targeted to areas of greatest need. Paragraph 59 of the Cabinet report makes clear that 'The proposal to remove the residential provision does not make any judgement on the quality of the (residential) provision'.

PO Comment

5. Already stated, afterschool activities are afterschool activities and to include them in this report, is to cloud the issue at hand.

Officers response

There has been continued reference throughout the consultation to the Ofsted judgement of the residential provision. In their report from the last inspection in September 2016, Ofsted draw extensively on the value of afterschool activities to improving the residential experience, it would therefore be disingenuous to seek to separate these activities from the residential provision.

PO Comment

6. There are no pupils with the residential need on their EHCP. The council have refused to give educational residential provision even though it has been requested. Furthermore, the council has not made known its threshold for that provision and consequently, the normal process of challenge is not available to parents.

Officers response

This is incorrect. The Council has not sought to prevent the naming of residential need on any child's EHCP, however clearly the assessed needs of those pupils currently attending the school do not warrant this. The EHCP process has been conducted fairly and wholly in keeping with the legal obligations placed on the Local Authority, as set out in Part 3 Children and Families Act 2014 and the DfE 'Special Educational Needs and Disability Code of Practice: 0 to 25 years'. This provides that parents have a statutory right of appeal to an independent Tribunal at every stage of the process (eg, whether to undertake an assessment, whether or not to issue an EHC Plan, the type and level of support and the name of the school or other placement and whether to reassess following a request to do so by parents). At every stage parents can also access independent advice from the Special Education Independent Advice Service (SENDIAS) and parents are told about this in formal letters from the SEN Team and all information is published on our SEND Local Offer Website.

PO Comment

7. Every school is special. The reason no other school has that facility is irrelevant

Officers response

The Cabinet report is predicated on the needs of children of children and young people and by implication outlines the shift away from residential provision in Leicestershire, this also reflects the national picture. It is not about making comparison of the quality of facilities in one school or the next, although some parents and the local elected member have chosen to introduce this as a reason to keep the residential facilities open (making reference for example to the swimming pools in some area special schools).

PO Comment

8. The budget is being used to fund educational residence and is not there for respite care or short breaks however beneficial that might be.

Officers response

This is incorrect. Analysis of comments from the consultation and advice provided by the school clearly confirms that much of the budget is used to fund the respite provision.

PO Comment

9. HNB budgets. The council has money within its funds which could be used to help the pressure on disabled and disadvantaged children. To say that one child with disabilities is more deserving than another is unfair, every child should have an equality of opportunity.

Officers response

Paragraph 21 makes clear the position of the HNB budget. This budget overspent by £2 million in 2016/17. The £63 million budget is forecast to overspend again in 2017/18 by £1 million. This is despite an approved increase in the budget of £2.8 million. There is therefore no capacity to make further funds available. It is agreed that every child should have equality of opportunity; however

available funds do have to be targeted to those most in need. The current arrangements are inequitable as children with the same or more significant assessed needs at other schools do not have residential provision.

PO Comment

10. No budgets have been made which would give cabinet an idea of how much extra this appropriate support would cost so Cabinet are being asked to make a leap of faith and not make a decision based on facts. Cabinet has not been told exactly what appropriate support looks like. In addition, if Cabinet wished, it could make the money available by not wasting money on other schemes and increase its income without consequences for any council policy.

Officers response

The costs for social care provision if assessed as necessary for pupils (if the residential facility is closed) are expected to be low given that the majority of pupils attending Maplewell Hall School are designated as MLD, a relatively low area of SEND need. Transport costs have been identified as circa £5000 and no more, this is because the impact to minibus and taxi routes (most carrying more than one child) will be minimal.

It is not clear what schemes Mr Osborne is referring to when he suggests the Council is 'wasting money'.

PO Comment

13. Again, the report writes that a parent could appeal if their child is denied entitlement to an overnight short break from social care. The issue is about educational residential provision and the known positive outcomes from that provision.

Officers response

Paragraph 46 makes clear that for a child to be assessed as needing residential education provision, an Educational Psychologist assessment would have to indicate the need for a 24-hour curriculum to meet that child's educational needs. None of the children attending Maplewell Hall School and using the residential unit have been assessed as needing this.

PO Comment

60. The report writes and gives the impression that the school has children with MLD only, yet fails to say there is a large unit for autistic children, there are children with aspergers and there are children with behavioural difficulties. This is not the low SEND need

Officers response

The primary assessed need for the majority of pupils attending the school is Moderate Learning Difficulties, however paragraph 35 makes clear that there is also a specialist unit at the school for 20 pupils diagnosed as having a Autism Spectrum Disorder as their primary need.

PO Comment

61. The consultation document was not accurate in all aspects nor did it provide essential evidence to support the case for closure. Responses may have been made with no clear idea of the cost or outcomes.

Officers response

Information was provided in the consultation to enable consultees to make an informed response on the proposal. This included detail on the funding arrangements and the reasons for the proposal.

PO Comment

62. The occupancy rate is unlikely to be 100%. There has to be a separate facility for male and female children and there has to be provision for those autistic children who may have to be on their own. That argument has no relevance. The 16 beds available are well used and there is a waiting list.

There are 2 rooms which have been taken out of use because of a change in fire regulations but that still leaves 16 beds with no additional costs involved.

Officers response

This is incorrect. There are now 20 beds available for pupils at the School. The layout of the bedrooms over two floors is such that there is sufficient flexibility to accommodate children sleeping on their own if required. However analysis of the school register confirms that periods of low occupation are not as a consequence of high usage by pupils with ASD.

PO Comment

63. If further work will have to be done, that information should have already been done and should have formed part of a well-informed consultation. Much of the financial case has been withheld and not given to Scrutiny.

Officers response

No information has been withheld.

PO Comment

69 The accessibility of the building and consequent costs apply the main building and not just to the residential provision if that argument were to be relevant to the cabinet report.

Officers response

The residential provision is located on the first and second floor of the main building. It is not therefore possible to improve access to the bedrooms without addressing adaptations for the whole of the main building. For example, much of the accessibility costs would relate to the installation of a lift in the hallway area, which by implication would require ramps and hydraulic lifts to the main entrance to the building to access.

PO Comment

70. The paragraph is clearly starting to layout the future reasons why a decision will come to Cabinet for the full closure of the school.

The school has published the results on its web site which clearly demonstrate the outcomes, that evidence should not be ignored

Officers response

All information put forward by consultees (including the school) will be taken into account by Cabinet in considering the proposal.

PO Comment

Cabinet will have read the review published this month, Good intentions, Good enough. That review was ordered by Mr Timson MP, then Minister, and was conducted by Prof. Lenehan. That report clearly and unequivocally supports educational residential provision.

Officers response

The Dame Lehenan review refers more particularly to children requiring full time residential special school/care provisions rather than the activities of schools such as Maplewell Hall. It does not support residential provision for those children that do not require this and makes clear that many of the children and young people currently placed in residential special schools and colleges could be educated in their local communities if better support were available.

PO Comment

Maplewell Hall school is being inspected by Ofsted and hopes to yet again be judged outstanding.

Officers response

The residential provision has been inspected again by Ofsted earlier this week. The results have not yet been announced. However it is the view of the headteacher that the inspection has progressed well.

PO Comment

Every Child matters. A good quality education is the right of every child, it only comes once in a lifetime, and due weight should be given to those with learning difficulties whatever their disadvantage.

Officers response

This is accepted. The Council has carefully considered the potential impact of the proposal on pupils who attend the school as will Cabinet in considering the proposal.

This page is intentionally left blank



Cabinet – 24th November 2017

Comments on the Closure of Residential Facilities at Maplewell Hall Special School

THIS DECISION IS PREMATURE

If Cabinet approve the recommendations on this paper then they would be making a decision to close Maplewell Hall's residential facilities before the petition has been debated and considered at Full Council.

This is the first time that this Council has been presented with a petition large enough to trigger a debate at Full Council.

Getting over 10,000 signatures for a Local Government petition is phenomenal achievement and at the least these residents deserve to have their views properly discussed and considered before the Council moves forward with a decision.

The report sets out an aim to publish the Statutory Notice in early January. This timetable could be kept to, even if this decision was deferred until after the petition had been discussed at Full Council, at the December Cabinet meeting.

There is no requirement for this decision to be made today, so there is no excuse for Cabinet to ignore the petition and press ahead with the decision before it has been fully considered.

I urge you to respect the democratic rights of signatories of this petition and defer the decision until after Full Council.

Geoff Welsh

Liberal Democrat Spokesperson for Children and Families

This page is intentionally left blank

Cabinet 24 November 2017 – Item 4 – Removal (Closure) of Residential Facilities at Maplewell Hall Special School

Representation from Mr and Mrs Miles

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing in response to the report circulated to the cabinet in preparation for the meeting to be held on 24th November regarding the proposed closure of the residential facility at Maplewell Hall.

I have previously written directly to each member of the council to express my concerns but felt impelled to write once again. This is to provide further insight on this matter having read the above report which I believe is riddled with inaccuracies and is highly skewed to the clear agenda of closure regardless of the cost, both financially and personally, to everyone involved.

Let me take each point in the report in turn.

1)The removal of funding will not have an adverse impact on the afterschool activities.

The sum of money we are talking about for the provision of the residential element alone is £283,000. The residential timetable runs from 7.30pm until school starts the next day.

I would very much like to know exactly how much of that money can possibly be used for this?

This begs the question of how much money is therefore going in to the school 'pot' and being used elsewhere in the school to support vital activities. If this is the case how can you realistically say that removal of funding will not have an adverse impact on the afterschool activities. It simply does not make sense. **What about the financial impact on the rest of the school?**

2)Subject to the outcome of the audit officers will work with the school to ensure continuance of the afterschool activities.

This suggests to me that no consideration has been given to any other area of the school that may well be deprived of funding as a consequence. Any additional sums required (be it in support of afterschool provision or other areas of the school) following the removal of the £283,000 diminishes the actual saving that you are purporting to be making. In which case, it makes a nonsense out of this whole proposal. Any potential savings would be minimal compared with the impact it will have on students, their families and the wider community.

3)The online and written responses received to the first stage of consultation contained a total of 11,592 signatures, many from outside Leicestershire.

Rather stating that many were outside Leicestershire suggesting that councillors need not to worry that they will lose votes over this matter, state the facts. **How many were from within Leicestershire?**

4)" *In response to the consultation many refer to the use of facility as respite care.*"

Use of the word many is not helpful and is not statistically accurate.

May I refer you to the **Department for Education document, 'Short breaks for carers of disabled children Departmental advice for local authorities.'** I wonder how many of you have read it?

5)" *There are no pupils at Maplewell Hall who are assessed as having a need for educational residential provision in their EHCP.*"

I recognise that officers have found that this currently is the case but it does not reflect that parents and pupils understood that the residential opportunity at Maplewell Hall was simply part of the school offering, not requiring specific written detail on the plan.

I for one, wish to challenge this finding and have requested that my daughter's EHCP is amended to reflect this element of education. I feel that the officers are riding rough shod over parents' wishes and have found a loop hole that they wish to manipulate to their own advantage. I'm quite sure that other parents given the chance, or told that they could amend their EHCPs would also do so. We are not specialists in EHCP law and rely on the professionals who write reports on our children to guide us. Most of us only go through the process with one child and so do not appreciate the difficulties any omissions could pose later on.

I would implore members to familiarise themselves with the Preparing for Adulthood Programme that has been funded by the Department of Education. The main purposes of which is to improve outcomes for people with learning difficulties and disabilities. These include achieving paid employment, independent living, good health, friendships, relationships and community inclusion. Specific guidance on EHCPs states that consideration should be given to pupil aspirations, activity and provision that can support progress towards the Preparation for Adulthood outcomes and what this might mean at different ages and stages of development. For example:

"Young people have opportunities to spend time with their peers outside of school and college. They are supported to develop and maintain friendships and relationships. They can access their community and feel safe and confident."

They have created a list of things to remember to include in an EHCP and these are listed as follows:

- The outcomes will need to be personalised and focused on the young person's aspirations, supporting as independent a life as possible
- Children develop at different rates. For some young people indicators included in early childhood may continue to be outcomes they are progressing toward as they

get older. Therefore, it is important that each new age/stage continues to develop and build on the previous ones

- At review meetings, the tool can be used to support development of imaginative yet achievable ways to support progress under each outcome
- This tool should be used as part of a personalised approach and can therefore be used as a starting point to develop EHC plans across a wide range of need.
- Use creative approaches to embed activities in the curriculum and in everyday activities outside of the classroom
- Raise aspirations and expectations and encourage thinking about what the future might look like for children from an early age
- Promote a focus on outcomes that are transferable to the real world
- Local authorities should make sure they focus on the Preparation for Adulthood outcomes in EHC plan reviews and make sure related information is covered in the local offer

You will note that education for independent living including social and communication needs fits in exactly with what is being provided for pupils at the residential facility at Maplewell Hall. This is a programme funded by the Department for Education. **How can anyone possibly argue that learning independent living skills, social skills and increasing confidence (which reflects in better outcomes for students) does not constitute education? How does closing the residential facility at Maplewell Hall fit in at all with the concept of preparing our young people for adulthood which the government is promoting?**

Relevant legislation: Section 21 of the Children and Families Act 2014

9.73 Health or social care provision which educates or trains a child or young person **must** be treated as special educational provision and included in Section F of the EHC plan.

9.74 Decisions about whether health care provision or social care provision should be treated as special educational provision **must** be made on an individual basis.

9.75 Agreement should be reached between the local authority and health and social care partners about where provision will be specified in an EHC plan.

9.76 In cases where health care provision or social care provision is to be treated as special educational provision, ultimate responsibility for ensuring that the provision is made rests with the local authority (unless the child's parent has made suitable arrangements) and the child's parent or the young person will have the right to appeal to the First - tier Tribunal (SEN and Disability) where they disagree with the provision specified.

Education

9.113 High needs funding can also be used to commission services from schools and colleges, including from special schools. In practice, this will mean the funding from the local authority's high needs budget for the SEN element of a Personal Budget will vary depending on how services are commissioned locally and what

schools and colleges are expected to provide as part of the Local Offer. The child's parent or the young person should be made aware that the scope for a Personal Budget varies depending on their school preference. For example, as part of their core provision, special schools and colleges make some specialist provision available that is not normally available at mainstream schools and colleges. The particular choice of a special school, with integrated specialist provision, might reduce the scope for a Personal Budget, whereas the choice of a place in a mainstream school that does not make that particular provision could increase the opportunity for a Personal Budget.

Social Care

9.118 For children and young people under 18, local authorities are under a duty to offer direct payments (see paragraph 9.123 below) for services which the local authority may provide to children with disabilities, or their families, under section 17 of the Children Act 1989.

SEN and Disability a guide for parents

Making sure that all reviews of Education, Health and Care plans (see section in this guide on Support for children and young people with special educational needs) for young people from age 13 - 14 onwards, include a focus on preparing for adulthood.

SEND Code of Practice 2015

Children and young people with EHC plans: preparing for adulthood reviews

8.9 Local authorities must ensure that the EHC plan review at Year 9, and every review thereafter, includes a focus on preparing for adulthood. It can be helpful for EHC plan reviews before Year 9 to have this focus too. Planning must be centred around the individual and explore the child or young person's aspirations and abilities, what they want to be able to do when they leave post-16 education or training and the support they need to achieve their ambition. Local authorities should ensure that children and young people have the support they need (for example, advocates) to participate fully in this planning and make decisions. Transition planning must be built into the revised EHC plan and should result in clear outcomes being agreed that are ambitious and stretching and which will prepare young people for adulthood.

8.10 Preparing for adulthood planning in the review of the EHC plan should include:

- support to prepare for higher education and/or employment. This should include identifying appropriate post-16 pathways that will lead to these outcomes. Training options such as supported internships, apprenticeships and traineeships should be discussed, or support for setting up your own business.

The review should also cover support in finding a job, and learning how to do a job (for example, through work experience opportunities or the use of job coaches) and help in understanding any welfare benefits that might be available when in work

- support to prepare for independent living, including exploring what decisions young people want to take for themselves and planning their role in decision making as they become older. This should also include discussing where the child or young person wants to live in the future, who they want to live with and what support they will need. Local housing options, support in finding accommodation, housing benefits and social care support should be explained
- support in maintaining good health in adult life, including effective planning with health services of the transition from specialist paediatric services to adult health care. Helping children and young people understand which health professionals will work with them as adults, ensuring those professionals understand the young person's learning difficulties or disabilities and planning well-supported transitions is vital to ensure young people are as healthy as possible in adult life
- support in participating in society, including understanding mobility and transport support, and how to find out about social and community activities, and opportunities for engagement in local decision-making. This also includes support in developing and maintaining friendships and relationships

It is essential for children and young people with additional needs to have opportunities for developing independence and friendships, as these are the 'ingredients' for a good life, with better well-being outcomes and greater likelihood of employment in adulthood- as, if you can participate in a team and have skills to work, then a greater likelihood of employment can occur. Only 5.8% of adults with learning difficulties are in employment, according to the National Audit Office (2015 figure). The Code describes 'Preparing for Adulthood from the earliest years' in chapter 8, as to live fulfilling lives, we need to prepare in a systematic way, our children and young people, at an earlier stage than in the past.

There absolutely is the need for the residential element for students at Maplewell Hall and it is a gross misrepresentation to state otherwise. If it currently is the case that none of the students have residential included in their EHCPs then as a council perhaps you should be asking why not? If you are serious about implementing this preparation for adulthood programme then surely all of the professionals you employ should be ensuring all EHCPs adhere to these principles.

6) *"Councils high needs budget should not be used for respite care or short breaks."*

After seeking advice, I have been informed that councils have a legal obligation to provide short breaks for children in need and these children include those with special educational needs. Further to this the council should be able to provide the criteria required for students to be eligible for this. **Please can you provide clarification?**

Under section 17 of the Children Act 1989, a child in need will be considered in need if:

- They are unlikely to achieve or maintain a reasonable standard of health or development without provision of services from the local authority

- Their health or development is likely to be significantly impaired, or further impaired without the provision of services from the local authority
- They have a disability
- **Children in need may be children with SEND**

7) *"Closure of the facility will allow savings to be made and be directed to other areas."*

Young people are entitled to be educated in a way that prepares them for adulthood and as such would lose out should the facility close. Parents would be entitled to request that this was taken into account in their child's EHCP and the opportunity for residential education and also short breaks and respite care provided elsewhere would need to be taken into account when calculating any savings to be made. This must be done on an individual basis. It is simply unacceptable to say that all EHCPs have been reviewed and this is not deemed necessary. When an EHCP is reviewed it is a legal right that parents and students must be involved.

There needs to be rigorous, joined up calculations across multiple departments that take account of all of the different streams of potential costs that could be incurred as a result of this proposal. I cannot see that there is a genuine attempt at this. **Have you considered all of the long term additional costs if students don't learn the skills they need to know for adulthood?**

7) *"No other school in the county has been provided with funding being used for a residential element."*

The residential facility at Maplewell Hall currently works extremely well for all who use it. Once accurate costings for it have been established, I would be very surprised if any proposals to cover the loss of education and social care requirements would come in at anywhere near the cost effectiveness of the facility in question. Only a fraction of the £283000 you wish to save is currently spent on the residential facility even by performing the most generous calculations. So, presumably most of the saving will come from elsewhere in the school. **If this is correct, all possible alternative means of keeping the facility open surely must be on the table? If not why not?**

My understanding is that students are chosen specifically by personality and education requirement when they attend the residential facility on any particular night. This maximises the experience of those young people and in turn maximises the efficiency of the facility for potential student outcomes on their journey into adulthood. Members really ought to take this into consideration as I believe it genuinely is an unbelievably cost-effective way of spending precious funding. It is a win-win situation for both students and council.

It was identified in the officers' report that any additional transport costs would be no more than £5000. Interestingly I was offered earlier on in the year the sum of £3000 from the council to make my own arrangements to take my daughter to school and back. I did not take up the offer however, this was for one child making approximately 80 trips so I do not

follow the logic on the projected additional transport costs. In addition, students live all around the county and so multiple buses or taxis would be required every day.

The fact that no other school in the county provides a residential facility could be seen as something that possibly could be considered in the future. However, I presume that it is currently the case because of a lack of facilities at these schools which prevents this from being a realistic option. Also, the increased medical and nursing care required for the students at the other schools in the county would need to be considered along with specialist equipment and appropriately trained staff which is not needed for the students at Maplewell. The residential facility at Maplewell Hall is as near to a normalised environment that you could hope to achieve and of course it has the added benefit that the students are in familiar surroundings and with people they are familiar with.

There is a comment in the report that the High needs budget should be reserved for those of the highest need. As a parent, I know from personal experience the increased array of difficulties that are present when you have a child with special educational needs but it is simply unfair to say that funds should be spent on those with the greatest need. The students at Maplewell Hall have needs too. They aren't able to cope for whatever reason with a main stream education and do not get the usual opportunities in life that typically developing children do. But their difficulties do not require them to attend a school which caters for the most severe disabilities and behaviour issues. So, they fall into this middle area. But their development does matter. As a council, it is a false economy to ignore the educational opportunities the residential facility offers. You are wasting the chance to teach skills to these students in a cost-effective way that will mean that they hopefully will not require so much assistance later in life. Assistance that will most probably will fall on the council to provide incurring costs that will go on. **How much will that cost?**

8) *"Significant financial pressures."*

There may be significant financial pressures but it is the council who decides where money is spent and where any savings could be made. **Out of interest have you compared the cost to the council of funding a place for a student at an independent special school?**

The amount of money that the council wish to save is £1 million. This amounts to 1.6% of the total High Needs Budget. The proposed £283000 saving would mean that Maplewell Hall would be accounting for 28% of the total savings required. This disproportionately hurts our school. A 1.6% cut across the whole county would be a much fairer way of making the £1million saving. This would allow for the opportunity of being able to consider as a school how the facility could be managed in a more cost-effective way rather than lose it entirely.

9) *"Officers within CF&S have re-reviewed all children currently attending the school and who are currently supported by children's social care. None of these children are likely to require any additional support over the existing plans that are in place for them."*

Any review of an EHCP must involve the input of parents and the student involved and cannot simply be re-reviewed by officers within CF&S. I believe that the level of additional

support has been seriously underestimated should this facility close. Those students who have been able to access the residential facility will lose out greatly all students would need this to be addressed appropriately in the EHCPs. It is quite wrong to assume this can just be overlooked.

All the arguments that have been presented by myself and others have surely demonstrated the huge educational benefit to students and their families that the residential facility provides. I have suggested an alternative way you could save the money you require and ask that even if you remove the sum of £283,000 from the school that we be granted the opportunity to seek funding from elsewhere, if necessary, to ensure that the facility remains open. Would this be an option? If not why not?

Having attending both meetings at the school and the scrutiny committee meeting at the council building it comes across that you do not wish to close the facility simply on financial grounds. I feel in my heart that you made your decision long before it was even mentioned to us and the officers' reports have been so skewed to your agenda that I can hardly believe it. As elected members, you have a duty to be open and honest about this as the arguments and support we have for keeping it open are unequivocal.

Most parents who have a child with special educational needs have an uphill struggle right from the start and this residential facility means so much to us but so little to you. It is not simply a sleep over it is a vital part of education for our children which repeatedly receives outstanding reports from OFSTED. To not even give us the chance to try and raise the money ourselves to fund the facility is absolutely abhorrent to me and utterly heartless. In a nutshell, what you are trying to do here is simply wrong and should sit very uneasily with you.

I trust you will give careful consideration to this letter.

Yours Faithfully

Mrs Pamela Miles and Mr Robert Miles

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cabinet 24 November 2017 – Item 4 – Removal (Closure) of Residential Facilities at
Maplewell Hall Special School**

Letter for consideration at the meeting of the Cabinet

Dear Mr. Rushton, Mr. Blunt, Mr. Ould, Mr. Pain, Mrs. Posnett, Mr. Rhodes, Mr. Shepherd and Mr. White,

I am writing to you in my capacity as carer for my grandson who has lived with us since he was two months old under a court residency order. He has foetal alcohol and foetal drug disorder. He has global developmental delay and is assessed as having moderate learning disabilities. He is on the autistic spectrum. A feature of foetal alcohol disorder is severe social and emotional delay. He only transferred to Maplewell Hall School in September and is in Year 7. One of the reasons for selecting Maplewell Hall School was the residential facility and its glowing Ofsted Report. As yet he has not been assessed as suitable to participate in the after school activities and residency. He is only just settling in to the new class and transport and needs to develop further trust in the school and its staff before this can happen.

When my grandson's EHCP was being discussed at his Primary School enquiry was not made as to night time needs. A full discussion about the school day and its impact was undertaken but school holidays and night needs were not considered. I have asked other parents subsequently and their experience has been similar. I believe I should be asking for revision of the EHCP if this is for 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. These children are not privileged but are some of the most vulnerable in society. Due to his disability he does not make friends easily. He has no friends out of school. Sadly he believes people he talks to on line are 'his friends' and we have no way of assessing whether or not these are suitable contacts. He does not get invited to parties or sleepovers like other children who do not have the behavioural problems. He walks around wearing ear defenders because he hates loud noises. He cried watching 'Paddington 2' because he was frightened. My grandson is 11 years old but socially and emotionally he is younger than his cousins aged 7 and 6. Wherever he goes I have to stay. He often wets the bed at night. He gets up during the night and checks on me or comes to my room because he has had a bad dream.

I tend to over protect my grandson. Every day is a struggle for him and in a different way for us as well. I am looking forward to the opportunity he will have to develop educationally, socially and emotionally in the safe environment of the residence under the reassuring care of staff he and I will trust. Once the extracurricular enrichment topics and clubs will have ended the learning continues. Staff encourage the pupils to be independent, to develop self confidence and to learn and practise life skills, albeit bed making, washing up or preparing a simple supper. The pupils have the chance to spend time with other children and develop their friendships. He has never needed much sleep. Despite a late bedtime he gets up at 5.30 to 6.00am. Perhaps he will learn to stay in bed longer in the morning?

MLD schools in the country cannot be directly compared. Some, for example, have wonderful new buildings and integral swimming pools. Of course these have been built to modern standards to address and accommodate the needs of disabled people. Maplewell Hall School is housed in an old country house, the decoration of which is very tired. When we were looking for a secondary school for him we were greatly impressed by the standard of education it offers, the flexibility of courses and the the dedication of the staff which is exemplary. In my opinion the school should be revered as a flagship of Leicestershire Education Authority and the residence, a real strength of this educational provision, should be maintained and promoted.

Yours sincerely,

Signed by the Grandparent of a Year 7 student

This page is intentionally left blank



SCRUTINY COMMISSION

ANNUAL DELIVERY REPORT AND PERFORMANCE COMPENDIUM 2017

DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 15TH NOVEMBER

The Commission considered a report and presentation from the Chief Executive which presented the draft Annual Delivery Report and Performance Compendium for 2017. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 10' and the slides forming the presentation is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:-

- (i) The Commission welcomed the overall message of the report; that the County Council performed well but that there were risks and issues in the future if a fairer funding settlement was not received from the Government. It was suggested that a summary version of the report, highlighting the key messages, should be produced.
- (ii) The narrative in the Annual Delivery Report was largely intended to look back at performance during the previous year. However, the Council also had a responsibility to undertake effective forward planning and some of the narrative in the report therefore reflected the emerging priorities for the coming year.
- (iii) The County Council had limited influence over the performance of academies. This was now the responsibility of the academies themselves and was expected to be driven by market forces. The County Council had a role through the Leicestershire Education Excellence Partnership (LEEP) and through sharing performance data with schools to help them identify areas for improvement.
- (iv) Concern was expressed by some members that the sections in the Annual Delivery Report relating to economic development and strategic transport included proposals which residents had not yet been consulted on and that the cumulative effect of developments on the landscape, particularly in the south of the county, was not yet understood. The Commission was assured that the key plans outlined in the report which affected the economy had all previously been considered by the Cabinet and the Scrutiny Commission. Each stage of the

Strategic Growth Plan would also be considered by the Commission prior to being submitted to the Cabinet. It was acknowledged that the reliance on partnership working to deliver economic development meant that the governance and accountability process for this area were complicated. However, it was important for the Council to engage effectively with these partnerships, especially regional partnerships such as the Midlands Engine.

- (v) The Government had committed to honouring funding for projects supported by the EU Structural Investment Fund until 2019. It was thought that a new Shared Prosperity Growth Fund was being developed nationally which would replace EU funding. The County Council should be able to bid for funding from this.
- (vi) Although the most recent bid for national funding for the Desford Crossroads transport scheme had not been successful, the scheme was still a priority for the County Council and further bids for funding would be made when the opportunity arose.
- (vii) It was suggested that details of the work of the Leicestershire Market Towns Group to help maximise the economic contribution of towns should be reported to a future meeting of the Scrutiny Commission. The Commission was advised that it would be appropriate to wait until the outcome of the bid for piloting local retention of business rates was known as, if successful, this could result in more funding being available for economic development in market towns.

Mr D C Bill CC asked for it to be placed on record that he opposed the section of the Annual Delivery Report relating to the economy and strategic transport as he felt that consultation with the affected communities on the cumulative impact of development in South Leicestershire had not yet been undertaken.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the comments now made be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 24 November;
- (b) That the work of staff across the County Council be recognised and appreciated;
- (c) That officers be requested to submit a report on the work of the Leicestershire Market Towns Group to a future meeting of the Scrutiny Commission.



SCRUTINY COMMISSION

LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S STRATEGIC PLAN 2018 - 2022

DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT FROM THE MEETING HELD ON 15TH NOVEMBER

The Commission considered a joint report of the Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources which set out the results of an engagement process with key stakeholders on the County Council's revised Strategic Plan 2018 – 2022, presented the revised Strategic Plan and outlined the changes required to deliver an outcomes-based approach in the Council. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 8' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed the Leader of the Council, Mr N J Rushton CC, to the meeting for this item. Mr Rushton thanked the Committee for the comments it had made when it had previously considered the matter. These had led to significant changes being made to the Strategic Plan. Mr Rushton confirmed that the Strategic Plan would drive the Council's agenda and inform the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) to enable departments to focus on delivering their strategic priorities. The Transformation Programme would also be refreshed so that it could be aligned to the outcomes in the Plan. Achievements would be monitored through the Annual Delivery Report.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:-

- (i) The Commission welcomed the revised Strategic Plan and was pleased to note that the comments and concerns it had raised previously had been taken into account. In particular, the Commission was pleased to see the introduction of a performance framework with measurable outcomes to support delivery of the Plan.
- (ii) It was suggested that the performance framework should include measures related to economic development and transport infrastructure, such as housing developments being linked to employment sites or a reduction in the number of people unable to get a job due to a lack of transport. It was confirmed that the performance framework was still being developed and consideration would be given to the inclusion of these measures. References in the Strategic Plan to transport infrastructure and access to employment had

been strengthened following feedback from the Scrutiny Commission and stakeholders.

- (iii) Some concern was expressed that the measures identified in the performance framework for ensuring that cultural and historical heritage and the natural environment was enjoyed and conserved would not provide sufficient protection for the environment. This should be addressed through the development of performance measures relating to open spaces, especially given the positive impact these had on mental health, and biodiversity. It was also suggested that there was a conflict between the Council's roles of promoting economic development and protecting the environment. However, the Commission was assured that, despite the requirement for housing to be built across Leicestershire, there would be an emphasis placed on protecting the green spaces and areas that people valued.
- (iv) Concern was expressed that not all of the Council's key strategic partners had responded to the Plan. However, the Commission was assured that, where responses had been received from partners, these had generally been positive and confirmed that there was alignment with the strategic direction of their own organisations.
- (v) The Commission emphasised the importance of communicating the final version of the Strategic Plan to partners so that they were aware of the Council's strategic priorities and future areas of focus. It was confirmed that the Plan would be made available on the Council's website, shared with partners including MPs and publicised through the mainstream media and social media.
- (vi) It was noted that delivery of some of the outcomes in the Strategic Plan would rely on partnership working. The County Council aimed to foster good relationships with partners and the bid to be a pilot area for the retention of business rates was a good example of successful partnership working. With regard to the outcome around affordable and quality homes, although the Council was not the relevant Local Planning Authority, its influence would come through its support to the planning process and the provision of services such as Supported Living.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the revised Strategic Plan be welcomed;
- (b) That the comments now made be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 24 November.



Cabinet – 24th November 2017

Comments on the Leicester and Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan

The Plan invites every council in Leicestershire to sign up to a development strategy which seeks to predict in 2017 how many houses and employment sites will be needed in 20-30 years time. The world will be a very different place by then. The covering report refers to the strategic planning framework which existed prior to 2010.

Regional Plans and their predecessors (County Structure Plans) sought to plan ahead for 20 years at a time recognising the inevitable economic and social changes which take place. The National Planning Policy Framework states that councils should “Ensure their plans are based on adequate, up-to-date and relevant evidence about the economic, social and environmental characteristics and prospects of the area.”

The SGP acknowledges that there are no reliable estimates of population or household change and that the projected housing needs are based on estimates. It is difficult to understand how it is possible to produce a credible or sound plan on this basis.

The proposed housing numbers are eye watering - they will no doubt make a lot of developers and landowners happy but for residents in the areas expected to take this growth it will cause huge concern and uncertainty for many years.

Liberal Democrats



Leicestershire

Sadly this is a car dependent strategy which relies on the Government funding and building an expressway around the south and east of Leicester which City planners claim would "open up the area for development." At this stage it is a concept which has no status and is a long way from being a done deal.

Many people will question why some County politicians have already signed up to this road without any assessment of its environmental impact on the historic landscape of Leicestershire. Evidence from organisations such as CPRE suggests that new roads fill up quickly and that in the end you can't build your way out of congestion.

Furthermore there is a real concern that housing developments served off the road will become dormitory commuter villages where the vast majority of people commute by car. For these reasons we wish to place on record our serious concerns about the proposal to allocate 40,000 houses in a growth corridor along a mythical road and a southern gateway.

A series of massive commercial developments are already proposed across much of southern Leicestershire, a move which can be expected along the length of the proposed Expressway. Whilst these will provide employment it has to be asked whether the loss of great swathes of countryside can be justified in return for the fairly minimal contribution to employment numbers bearing in mind that most of the warehousing will be the subject to fully automated processes.

No acknowledgement is given to how local communities in the County will feel about having to accommodate significant levels of unmet housing need arising in the City. There has been general support and acceptance over many years for spatial strategies which prioritised urban concentration and regeneration.



Within the last few weeks the Government has spoken about a renewed emphasis on brownfield land and funding for infrastructure in cities and urban areas to bring forward more housing on previously developed land. Local Authorities are now required to produce a brownfield land register which will, in principal, grant planning permission on sites in the register. Any re-distribution of housing numbers from the City must be fair, reasonable and justified.

The SGP fails to demonstrate how these issues have been addressed and as a result many people will feel the distribution of housing in the plan is inherently unfair.

Simon Galton

Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group

This page is intentionally left blank

**Cabinet 24 November 2017 – Item 10 – Harborough Local Plan 2011 to 2031 Proposed
Submission Consultation Response**

Representation from local members Dr S Hill CC and Dr P Bremner CC

Market Harborough is a growing market Town with great rail connection but the infrastructure in the road network needs addressing to cater for this growth. Long term bypass planning would be welcome.

But with development comes the consequential pressures especially hydrologically. The river Welland and River Jordon are the main drainage point for flood water in the town and given historic flooding incidents in the town, there is a need to robustly guard against this.

As well as road infrastructure there is a need for other infrastructure such as cycle ways, drainage, schools etc.

A robust process to hold developers to account for their part in building communities not just homes is also needed.

Sarah and Paul

This page is intentionally left blank



Cabinet – 24th November 2017

Comments on the Harborough Local Plan

The proposed Strategic Development Area at Scraptoft relies heavily on improving and upgrading Keyham Lane West to serve as the principal means of access to the site. At this stage it has not been demonstrated that the traffic impacts of an SDA of 1,200 dwellings can be satisfactorily mitigated. Keyham Lane West falls entirely within the City of Leicester. Significant frontage development has taken place recently, traffic calming has been installed and a 20mph speed limit has been introduced along part of the route.

If Keyham Lane West cannot be widened and improved to fulfil the function of a primary access route, traffic will find alternative routes through residential areas in particular, the one way system through Scraptoft village.

In assessing the various locations put forward for SDAs in Harborough, highway consultants referred to the poor connectivity of the eastern side of Leicester to the north, west and south. Their report made the following comments: "The road network near a possible development is primarily single lane suburban roads which have a lower capacity. Development at this location could be hindered due to poor connectivity to the West of Leicester and the rest of the country. Many of the movements are occurring on residential or rural highways which may be a concern to the highways authority."

Similar concerns were raised by the County Council in 2006 when it gave its advice to the then Regional Assembly on housing provision in Leicester and Leicestershire for the East Midlands



Regional Plan. Officers commented that this area is remote from the national road network. The supporting evidence noted the lack of transport infrastructure was the main reason for discounting this location for a major SUE although it went on to say that the area "Could contribute a small SUE of 500 to 1000 dwellings however, a detailed transport assessment would be required to assess the capacity of and scope to implement mitigation measures required to accommodate this."

Since then over 960 dwellings have been built or gained planning permission in the Scraptoft and Thurnby area without any mitigation/improvements to the local road network except a few speed cushions. The proposed SDA would bring the figure to over 2,000 dwellings, a situation which is of increasing concern to the local community.

The transport section of the report setting out the County Council's response to the Harborough Local Plan contains little detail on how the community's concerns about the traffic impacts of the SDA will be addressed going forward. By their own admission the consultant's study referred to above is high level and only provides a strategic overview. I understand a detailed transport assessment will be required together with use of LLITM. I believe the comments made by the highway consultants should be of concern to the County Council as highways authority and seek assurance they will be addressed as part of the Local Plan process.

Simon Galton

Launde Division