



**CABINET – 14 SEPTEMBER 2018**

**ORDER PAPER**

**ITEM    DETAILS**

**APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Mr. J. B. Rhodes CC  
Mrs. P. Posnett CC

**1.    MINUTES (Pages 3 - 18)**

Proposed motion

That the minutes of the meeting held on 6 July 2018 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.    LEICESTER, LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18 (Pages 19 - 66)**

- *The Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report on the matter at its meeting on 10 September. Unfortunately the Chairman of the Safeguarding Board was unable to attend the meeting. The draft minute, which is attached to this Order Paper marked '4', includes a number of questions raised by the members of the Committee along with a written response by the Chairman of the Safeguarding Board.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the comments of the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;
- (b) That the Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children Board Annual Report for 2017/18 be welcomed and noted.

**5. LEICESTER, LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING ADULT BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2017/18** (Pages 67 - 110)

- *The Adult and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report on the matter at its meeting on 11 September and a draft minute is attached to this Order Paper marked 5.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the comments of the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;
- (b) That the Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Adult Board Annual Report for 2017/18 be welcomed and noted.

**6. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY UPDATE** (Pages 111 - 130)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered a report on the matter at its meeting on 12 September and a draft minute is attached to this Order Paper marked '6'.*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- (b) That the significant financial challenge faced by the County Council be noted;
- (c) That the approach outlined in the report to update the Medium Term Financial Strategy be noted;
- (d) That the update regarding Savings under Development, as set out in Appendix A of the report be noted;
- (e) That the response to the Technical Consultation on the 2019/20 Local Government Finance Settlement, as set out in Appendix B be approved;
- (f) That the Director of Corporate Resources following consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member for Corporate Resources be authorised to -
  - (i) submit an application (as part of a Pool) to participate in the 75% business rates retention pilot programme for 2019/20;
  - (ii) if the County Council's application is successful, take all action necessary to proceed with the pilot.

**7. ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT 2017/18** (Pages 131 - 136)

Proposed motion

That the report be noted.

**8. CORPORATE ASSET INVESTMENT FUND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2017 – 18 AND STRATEGY FOR 2018 TO 2022** (Pages 137 – 198)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered a report on the matter at its meeting on 12 September and a draft minute is attached to this Order Paper marked '8'.*

Proposed motion

- That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- That the performance of the Corporate Asset Investment Fund as set out in Appendix A attached to this report, be noted;
- That the Corporate Asset Investment Fund Strategy for 2018 – 2022, attached as Appendix B to this report be approved;
- That the revised Terms of Reference for the Corporate Asset Investment Fund Advisory Board and the amended delegations to the Director of Corporate Resources as set out in Appendices C and D of the report be approved.

**9. WHOLE LIFE DISABILITY STRATEGY** (Pages 199 - 244)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered a report on the matter at its meeting on 12 September and a draft minute is attached to this Order Paper marked '9'.*

Proposed motion

- That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- That the Whole Life Disability Strategy and associated protocol for young people with special educational needs or a disability, “Preparing for adulthood” be approved, subject to a change in the wording within the Strategy from ‘disabled people’ to ‘people with disabilities’.

**10. ‘THE LIVES WE WANT TO LEAD’ THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION GREEN PAPER FOR ADULT SOCIAL CARE AND WELLBEING** (Pages 245 - 344)

- *The Adult and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report on the matter at its meeting on 11 September and a draft minute is attached to this Order Paper marked 10.*

Proposed motion

- That the comments of the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;
- That the Local Government Association Green Paper ‘The Lives We Want to Lead’ be noted;

- (c) That the Director of Adults and Communities, together with the Director of Corporate Resources, following consultation with the Cabinet Lead Members for Adult Social Care and Corporate Resources, be authorised to respond to the consultation on behalf of the County Council, having regard to the comments now made.

**11. EQUALITY STRATEGY 2016 – 20 AND EQUALITY ACTION PLAN 2018-19**  
(Pages 345 - 348)

Proposed motion

- (a) That progress made in 2017/18 with regard to the aims in the Council's Equality Strategy be welcomed;
- (b) That the Equality Action Plan for 2018/19 be supported.

**12. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – CHOYCE CLOSE, COALVILLE – NO WAITING AT ANY TIME RESTRICTIONS.** (Pages 349 - 356)

Proposed motion

That the Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Choyce Road, Coalville development, as shown on drawing number TM4427/1/2016 appended to the report be approved for implementation.

**13. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – BEVERIDGE LANE, ELLISTOWN –SPEED LIMIT.** (Pages 357 - 364)

- *Comments have been received from the local member Mr. M. Wyatt CC which are attached to this Order Paper marked '13'.*

Proposed motion

That the Traffic Regulation Order associated with the Beveridge Lane, Ellistown development, as shown on drawing no.TM4445 appended to the report be approved for implementation.

**14. TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – LOWER CHURCH STREET AND SOUTH STREET, ASHBY DE LA ZOUCH – PERMIT PARKING AND RELOCATION OF NO ENTRY SCHEME.** (Pages 365- 382)

Proposed motion

That the Traffic Regulation Order associated with Lower Church Street and South Street, Ashby de la Zouch, as shown on drawing no.TM4471/T1/1 attached as Appendix A to the report be approved for implementation.

**15. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY.**

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

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

None.

**Officer to contact**

Matthew Hand  
Democratic Services  
Tel: (0116) 305 2583  
Email: [matthew.hand@leics.gov.uk](mailto:matthew.hand@leics.gov.uk)

This page is intentionally left blank

**Draft minute of the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee –  
10 September 2018**

**Annual Report of the Independent Chair of the Leicestershire and Rutland  
Local Safeguarding Children Board.**

The Committee considered a report of the Independent Chair of the Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children Board (LRLSCB) which presented the Board's Annual Report for 2017/18. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 9' is filed with these minutes. Any comments or proposed amendments would be addressed in the final report before it was presented to the Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children Board at its meeting on 12 October 2018.

The Independent Chair of the LRLSCB was unable to attend the meeting to present the Annual Report. Given the independence of the LRLSCB, members of the Committee did not feel that it was appropriate to raise their questions with any of the officers present at the meeting. However, it was felt that the Committee's comments and questions were important and there should be the opportunity for these to be presented. It was therefore agreed that any questions that the Committee would have asked the Independent Chair would be recorded and submitted to the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 September. The following questions and comments were raised:

- Were there any barriers to learning because of the capacity of workers across the children's social care workforce?
- Concern was raised regarding the capacity of officers to attend training and the non-attendance at this by the Probation Service.
- It was queried how the change in process around Police Child Abuse Investigation Unit cases being allocated to social workers would be monitored?
- Were the computer systems across partner organisations synchronised so that they were compatible?
- The LRLSCB would continue to monitor the notable reductions in referrals and child protection plans in Rutland, and it was queried whether this would also be the case in Leicestershire?
- Was the LRLSCB satisfied with Leicestershire County Council's procedures and did it feel that the arrangements the County Council had in place were adequate?
- Further detail was requested regarding the 'Section 11' peer challenge process; was this successful and how would it be taken forward?
- There had been a reduction in the number of Elective Home Educated children who had received a statutory visit. Why was this the case and what was being done to improve this?
- Had funding for the that the new local arrangements for safeguarding been secured from the Police, CCGs and local authorities?

Arising from the discussion, the following comments were also raised:

- i) The Committee was reminded that this would be the last Annual Report of the LRLSCB as the arrangements to replace the Board were now being finalised. A report would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee providing an update on the current position with this.
  
- ii) It was noted that one of the key messages in the Annual Report was that changes to the First Response service are improving assessment processes. In the light of current staffing issues facing that team, it was confirmed that the necessary arrangements would be put in place to ensure that the performance of the service was affected as little as possible.
  
- iii) A follow up inspection from Ofsted around the front door arrangements was expected and the outcome from this would provide a good indicator of the improvements that had been made. It was felt that there had been improvements, and the Annual Report of the LRLSCB also reflected this opinion.

RESOLVED:

That the questions now raised by the Committee be submitted to the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 September 2018.



**LRLSCB Independent Chair's Addendum – Written Answers to the Questions raised by the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 10 September 2018**

Q. Were there any barriers to learning because of the capacity of workers across the children's social care workforce?

**Response**

***The Boards Training and Development Work is led by the Interagency Training, Group, which is shared with Leicester City LSCB. Agencies have given full assurance that caseloads that identify safeguarding children as a concern are allocated and managed. Leicestershire Children & Family Services have given assurance to the Board over the last three quarters that the annual report covers and the first quarter of this year that there have been no concerns raised by the service that this has restricted learning.***

***During 2017/18 evaluation of the interagency training programme was undertaken by Voluntary Action LeicesterShire (VAL), on behalf of the two LSCBs. Following introduction of a charging policy for no shows in 2016/17 the number of no-shows has reduced further by 25% this year to 106, in addition the number of cancellations halved to 71. Sickness was the main reason given for these with 'Other work priorities' was given as a non-attendance reason in 42% of cases. This is a small number of the total capacity offered***

Q. Concern was raised regarding the capacity of officers to attend training and the non-attendance at this by the Probation Service.

**Response**

***The Probation Service provide training for their staff. In relation to training, all NPS staff, regardless of role, must complete the Child Protection and Safeguarding Children, and the Domestic Abuse e-learning modules. All front-line staff who supervise or have contact with offenders also have to complete the two-day Safeguarding Children face to face training. As of April 2018, no staff had the e-learning outstanding, and only just under 10% of staff still require the face to face input. Whilst additional training offered by the LRLSCB agencies has been offered, take-up has been low due to workload demands; this is acknowledged as action required for the coming year.***

Q. It was queried how the change in process around Police Child Abuse Investigation Unit cases being allocated to social workers would be monitored?

**Response**

***The partnership has noted a sustained increase in the average caseload of the Police Child Abuse Investigation Unit non-recent team, however the Police report they are able to appropriately manage cases. Monitoring of these caseloads is via the Safeguarding effectiveness of the Board and a task and finish group led by a local authority Board representative has been established***

***to review the standard expectations for a range of child protection meeting. The police are also subject to external inspection.***

Q. Were the computer systems across partner organisations synchronised so that they were compatible?

***Response***

***The computer systems across agencies are not synchronised or compatible however there are systems in place to share information electronically. Validation of the data sometimes requires staff from agencies to manually check data together to understand why some differences may appear in data reports, this can often be due to different interpretation or recording practices, or different time capture periods and processing.***

***There is an NHS England national project, Child Protection-Information Sharing (CP-IS) which Leicestershire health systems are introducing. The aim of the project is that where a child is subject to a Child protection plan, a looked after child, or a mother of an unborn child on a pre-birth protection plan attends an unscheduled health care setting the CP-IS alert is visible, and a notification is sent to the child's social worker within the Local Authority that the child originates from. This enables an open dialogue earlier between: parents/carers, children's social care and health leading to an earlier intervention (where needed) for the most vulnerable children and young people.***

***The LRLSCB also has set templates which are used to provide data for case referrals***

Q. The LRLSCB would continue to monitor the notable reductions in referrals and child protection plans in Rutland, and it was queried whether this would also be the case in Leicestershire?

***Response***

***Monitoring referrals and child protection plans are key responsibilities of the local authority and the data is available to the LRLSCB. Should there be a significant fluctuation in the data the LRLSCB would want to monitor and understand the reasons from this and seek assurances from the local authority through the safeguarding effectiveness sub group.***

Q. Was the LRLSCB satisfied with Leicestershire County Council's procedures and did it feel that the arrangements the County Council had in place were adequate?

***Response***

***While we can never eliminate risk entirely. The Board is assured that, whilst there are areas for improvement, workers and agencies are working well together to safeguard children in Leicestershire and Rutland.***

***Children Services report they now have a Performance and Quality Assurance Framework. Monthly audits are undertaken to assure managers that children***

**are safe and protected. Managers and senior leaders have a clear line of sight to the quality of front-line practice**

**The Board shares its Multi-agency procedures with the Leicester City LSCB. Throughout the year the Board has reviewed and revised Multi-Agency Procedures in line with developments in practice and learning from reviews and audits. The Board updated the thresholds document for referral to children's services and has also revised procedures relating to: Reports for Child Protection Conference and the Whole family approach**

Q. Further detail was requested regarding the 'Section 11' peer challenge process; was this successful and how would it be taken forward?

**Response**

**This Peer Challenge approach was found to be a positive experience and more informative than the previous document-based approach. There was a good participation and contribution from partners in this process leading to a balance of challenge and support. This 'Section 11' peer challenge process is to be considered as part of a two-year model subject to future safeguarding arrangements for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland.**

Q. There had been a reduction in the number of Elective Home Educated children who had received a statutory visit. Why was this the case and what was being done to improve this?

**Response**

**Local authorities have no statutory duties in relation to monitoring the quality of EHE on a routine basis. However, under Section 437(1) of the Education Act 1996, local authorities can intervene if it appears that parents/carers are not providing a suitable and efficient education. The Local Authority seeks to engage regularly with home educating families, to determine whether the education is suitable and efficient and to ensure the child/ren are safe. However, families do not have to engage with the local authority, unless there are other reason for statutory intervention.**

**The LSCB requested a specific report regarding safeguarding and Elective Home Education. The report from the Local Authority outlined processes and procedures in place and provided assurance that arrangements in place were supporting safeguarding of children who are home educated and known to the authority. It showed that in Feb 2018 80% of parents/carers were engaging with visits from an EHE Officer.**

**It is helpful that this was raised by the Committee and the final LRLSCB Annual report will amend the wording to explain that the number of visits is due to lack of engagement by families not by problems in offering a service.**

**The number of EHE Children continues to increase**

	Q2 17/18	Q3 17/18	Q4 17/18	Q1 18/19
Number of children educated at home – Leicestershire	387	386	496	537

Q. Had funding for the new local arrangements for safeguarding been secured from the Police, CCGs and local authorities?

**Response**

***The named statutory agencies in WT 2018, the Local Authority, the CCG and the Police are aware of their statutory duty to fund the new arrangements and a commitment has been given to sustain this. The detailed budget plans are still to be finalised as the final structure of the arrangements and support systems are still to be agreed.***

***As Independent Chair I have indicated in my view that the current level of funding should be sustained at least for the first year to enable a smooth transition. The current funding level is sustained by underspends in previous years from budgets which have been set aside to fund serious case reviews. It is unlikely that the number of local case reviews will decrease therefore a sustainable agreement on how these should be resourced in the future is needed and will be part of the new arrangements. I believe these should be separate to the core budget and a separate agreement as the number and cost of these is difficult to forecast.***

**Draft Minute of the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny – 11  
September 2018**

**Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report**

The Committee considered a report of the Independent Chair of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adult Board (LRSAB) presenting the draft Annual Report of the Board for 2017/18. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 12', is filed with these minutes. Any comments or proposed amendments would be addressed in the final report before it was presented to the LRSAB at its meeting on 25 October 2018.

Arising from the discussion, the following comments were raised:

- i) In response to concern that the final multi-agency discussion and analysis in relation to the Strategy Meeting audit had not taken place by the end of the year, assurance was given that this had now been completed and any actions arising from the audit were being undertaken.
- ii) Attention was drawn to inaccuracies in the financial information within the Annual Report. The Independent Chair noted this and undertook to review the figures.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

This page is intentionally left blank

**SCRUTINY COMMISSION: 12 SEPTEMBER 2018****MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY UPDATE****DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT**

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources which would be considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 September and explained the approach to updating the current Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) and advised of the recent Government announcement with regard to 75% business rates retention pilots for 2019/20.

The Director of Corporate Resources, in his introduction to the report, advised members that the Council's financial position was challenging, although it was expected that balanced budget would be set for the next two financial years. The Government had recently announced that it would make additional funding available to the NHS: given the current national financial position, it was therefore expected there would be no further funding available for local government over the next few years.

In terms of the Council's fair funding campaign, the Director indicated that the Institute of Fiscal Studies had recently recognised that London received proportionately more funding than the rest of the country. He was cautiously optimistic regarding the success of the campaign, bearing in mind the context of no additional resources being available.

The report highlighted savings under development. These were all proposals for achieving greater efficiencies and finding different ways of working and would therefore be technically challenging to deliver.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Lead Member for Resources, Mr J B Rhodes CC, advised that the Cabinet was likely to recommend that the County Council add a 1% precept to Council Tax to fund adult social care. It was not yet clear whether Council Tax increases, excluding the adult social care precept, would be capped at 2% or 3% by the Government. The settlement would be confirmed in the autumn.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:-

- (i) The Government was expected to cease its plans to implement negative Revenue Support Grant. This meant that the County Council would gain an extra £2 million funding.
- (ii) It was agreed that there was an imbalance between the levels of funding received across the Midlands, in favour of the West Midlands. This was driving the current proposal for a Strategic Alliance between the upper tier and

unitary authorities in the East Midlands. This was in an early stage of development and it was acknowledged that the governance arrangements would need to be robust in order to attract Government funding.

- (iii) Leicester and Leicestershire were applying to pilot the retention of 75% of business rates. The nine councils were close to agreeing how the money would be allocated; it would be used to fund infrastructure and financial sustainability. If successful, the pilot would generate an additional £14 million
- (iv) It was queried whether, if there were currently difficulties in funding school places, it would be possible to meet the infrastructure requirements set out in the Strategic Growth Plan. However, members were reminded that the Strategic Growth Plan addressed the period between 2031 and 2050 and that without a plan in place it would be more difficult to bid for funding for infrastructure.
- (v) The funding pressure relating to school places had arisen because, when new schools were built, they were not fully occupied and needed subsidising for the first couple of years. It did not relate to issues around children from Leicester City attending schools in the county.

RESOLVED:

That the comments now made be submitted to the meeting of the Cabinet on 14 September 2018.



**SCRUTINY COMMISSION: 12 SEPTEMBER 2018****CORPORATE ASSET INVESTMENT FUND ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT  
2017-18 AND STRATEGY FOR 2018 TO 2022****DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT**

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources which would be considered by the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 September and set out the performance of the Corporate Asset Investment Fund (CAIF) to date, as well as seeking Cabinet approval to the revised CAIF Strategy for 2018 to 2022 which set out the Council's approach to future asset investments utilising the CAIF. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 10' is filed with these minutes.

The Deputy Leader and Cabinet Leader Member for Resources, Mr J B Rhodes CC, confirmed that he chaired the CAIF Advisory Board. Its membership also comprised Mr Rushton CC, Mr Blunt CC, Mr Ould CC and Mr Shepherd CC. It did not make decisions, but reviewed proposals and sought views from external advisors. It met in private due to issues around commercial sensitivity. If it supported a proposal, this would be reported to the Cabinet for a decision if appropriate.

The report suggested that, in order to increase the CAIF, options including incurring additional prudential borrowing would need to be considered. Mr Rhodes confirmed that this was not required at present. Over the last seven years, the County Council had reduced its level of debt by £100 million, but still had £265 million of debt. He would be nervous about adding to the level of debt in case it created a problem for the next generation. However, if there was confidence that borrowing would produce a greater level of return, it might be appropriate to do so.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:-

- (i) The overborrowed position on the capital programme referred to the fact that the Council was putting money aside to pay off debt, but the long-term nature of debt meant that it could not currently be paid off. The money that had been put aside was the money that would be invested.
- (ii) In response to a query about whether the types of property the Council was investing were flexible enough to respond to changes in the market, it was confirmed that commercial investments would be considered on a case by case basis to ensure that the level of risk was manageable. It was also possible, should the market change, for the Council to cease developing and either act as landowner or sell the land it had invested in, depending on which was the best way to ensure the liquidity of the fund. Advice on changes to the market was sought from external specialists.

- (iii) Members welcomed the focus in the revised CAIF on investment in Leicestershire for the benefit of Leicestershire residents. The proposed use of the fund to develop new or existing assets to meet Council service needs where this would reduce operating costs was also welcomed. The Council was currently considering investing in adult social care facilities as a way of reducing the cost of care. This would support the adult social care market and ensure that the right type of facilities, such as extra care, were available. The business case was currently being developed and would be submitted to the Cabinet in due course. In response to this it was queried whether the County Council, in selling all its residential care homes, had been short-sighted. However, it was confirmed that this had generated over £3 million in capital receipt and that these were old facilities that had required significant investment.
  
- (iv) It was confirmed that Loughborough University Science and Enterprise Park (LUSEP) development had arrangements in place to mitigate risk. For example, it was let on a full repairing, insuring lease and if the current tenants pulled out the building could easily be sublet on a floor by floor basis, or even on a part-floor basis.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet be advised at its meeting on 14 September 2018 of the Scrutiny Commission's support for the Corporate Asset Invest Fund Strategy.

**SCRUTINY COMMISSION: 12 SEPTEMBER 2018****WHOLE LIFE DISABILITY STRATEGY****DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT**

The Commission considered a joint report of the Director of Adults and Communities and the Director of Children and Families which presented the County Council's Whole Life Disability Strategy and associated document "Preparing for adulthood – a protocol for young people with special education needs or a disability" which described how children and young people should be involved in decisions about their care and support. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 11' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion the following points were raised:-

- (i) The Commission requested that the description 'disabled people' be changed to 'people with disabilities' as 'people first' language is considered more appropriate and respectful. It was agreed that this request would be put to the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 September.
- (ii) The Commission welcomed the development of the Strategy and the aspirations set out in, particularly the aspirational opportunities available to children with disabilities once they reached adulthood. However, some concern was expressed that they would be difficult to achieve and could unfairly raise expectations, especially given the Council's current financial position. The Commission was assured that the Strategy was honest as well as aspirational. Where difficulties had been identified through the consultation they were referenced in the report and information and signposting advice would be provided, even where a solution could not be found.
- (iii) The Adults and Communities Department sought to manage expectations and demand through working with people to enable them to become more independent. This included living independently, being engaged in employment activities and having control of a Personal Budget. The Department needed to consider the way in which it provided services to people in order to facilitate their independence, recognising that there were some people with complex disabilities who would always require support from the State to meet their needs.
- (iv) The consultation used to inform the Strategy had been undertaken by PeopleToo and a report, providing a detailed breakdown of the consultation, had been produced. The Children and Families Department engaged closely with the Parent Carer Forum on an ongoing basis and had also employed a Voice Worker to ensure that children and families' voices were regularly heard

as part of service development. The Adults and Communities Department also had advocacy arrangements in place. These methods of continuous engagement would be used to support the implementation of the Strategy. Members welcomed the effort that had been put into consultation and engagement in this area of work.

- (v) Members commented on the importance of monitoring delivery of the Strategy. It was noted that performance indicators which related to the Strategy were already reported to the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee. A report the previous day had confirmed that, during Quarter 1, 11.6% of people with Learning Difficulties were in employment; this was the second highest figure nationally. The stretch target was set at 9%; this would be altered as it ought to be more challenging than current performance.
- (vi) Although the Council already had a range of transition services in place, the development of the Strategy had encouraged the two departments to work more closely together. The Transitions Team and the Children with Disabilities Team met regularly and identified those children who would transition into adult services at an early stage. The intention was for the assessments to also take place earlier, preferably when the child was 14 rather than 17 as was currently the case. This should be followed up with light touch engagement from the Transitions Team and a named contact.
- (vii) Not all children in receipt of children's social care services would meet the eligibility criteria for adult services; however the Strategy clarified that these children would still need support in preparing for adulthood and identifying opportunities. It was noted that, whilst the Strategy focused specifically on the offer available to children with disabilities, all children required some support in preparing for adulthood; this was addressed through the Education Excellence Partnership.
- (viii) One of the pillars of independence related to the availability of accessible and adapted housing. The County Council was working with district councils to ensure that existing housing was adapted and also thinking about the future accommodation offer, which should include lifetime homes. A business case was currently being developed proposing capital investment to meet both the specialist and non-specialist needs of people with disabilities.
- (ix) Concern was expressed that some colleges assessed people with learning difficulties for apprenticeships without allowing them to use assistive technology. The Commission was advised that a Preparing for Adulthood reference group, including representatives from Further Education Colleges. It was intended that this would address issues such as the one now raised.

#### RESOLVED:

- (a) That the Cabinet at its meeting on 14 September be advised that the Scrutiny Commission supports the Whole Life Disability Strategy;

- (b) That the Cabinet be recommended to change the wording in the Strategy from 'disabled people' to 'people with disabilities'.

This page is intentionally left blank

**Draft minute of the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee**  
**– 11 September 2018**

**'The Lives we Want to Lead' The Local Government Association Green Paper**  
**for Adult Social Care and Wellbeing**

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Adults and Communities and Director of Corporate Resources, which was due to be presented to the Cabinet on 14 September 2018, on 'The Lives We Want to Lead' – the Local Government Association Green Paper for adult social care and wellbeing. The Government had stated its intention to publish a Green Paper on adult social care, but the publication of this had been delayed a number of times. It was anticipated that this would now be published in the autumn, alongside a ten year plan for the NHS would be developed. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 8', is filed with these minutes.

The Lead Member for Adults and Communities stated his support for the main principles within the Green Paper. He made particular reference to the individual stories within the Green Paper of people who had required adult social care services but were not aware that this was not part of the NHS and hence not a free service.

The current draft response to the LGA Green Paper from Leicestershire County Council was proposing free personal care as being the most equitable and transparent solution but that, whilst a 'cap and floor' mechanism would provide people with protection of assets, it would also require a bureaucratic and resource intensive process, and would mean that a large number of people who currently funded their own care would have to create an account with the local authority and the local authority would have to assess everyone.

Members welcomed the LGA Green Paper and the report, which outlined the County Council's perspective and initial assessment. The Committee was of the view that the issue of funding social care had been avoided for too long and that, given the pressures facing the sector, the LGA needed to lobby hard for Government action to address the funding issue.

In respect of the response to the LGA Green Paper, the Committee asked the Director of Adults and Communities and the Lead Member to have regard to the following when formulating a Council response:

- i) Making personal care free would lead to greater simplicity and help with the integration of health and social care, although it was recognised that this may be too expensive. As such, the 'cap and floor' appeared to be a sensible way forward.
- ii) It was agreed that the responsibility for social care services should not be transferred to the NHS. The local authority, with elected members representing their constituents, was better placed to understand local needs and be more effective at commissioning primary and social care. The NHS should focus on its strengths, that being providing acute care.

- iii) The challenges facing social care could not, as the LGA paper made clear, be addressed by narrowly focussing on social care. The interdependence of housing, public health and other services provided by local authorities needed to be addressed. In this regard, planned reductions in public health funding were unhelpful.
- iv) The important role of the carer's workforce needed to be recognised, both in terms of remuneration as well as improved career prospects and training. Failure to do so would lead to a greater turnover of staff and threaten the sustainability of the care sector.

The Committee recognised that all of the above required bold decisions on funding and that there needed to be national funding formula for social care.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet be advised of the comments made by the Committee.



Item 13 – Traffic Regulation Order – Beveridge Lane, Elliston – Speed Limit

Comments from the Local Member Mr. M. Wyatt CC

Paragraph 16 contradict paragraph 17. Parish council objects and agrees with me that the rd should be 30mph even though it was 60mph. We feel the road would benefit from continuing to be 30mph due to pedestrian traffic that use the road and for safety purposes.

The bridge which is situated on Beveridge Lane is a major safety concern due to the lack of proper footpath, and speeding traffic is a danger when trying to walk or cycle over the bridge. I have personally walked this area and I can say without doubt that traffic speed is an issue.

I would like to ask members to keep the whole length of the Lane a 30mph zone for public safety for the driver and a growing number of pedestrians that use this regular stretch of rd.

Cllr Michael Wyatt

This page is intentionally left blank