



CABINET – 23 JUNE 2020

ORDER PAPER

ITEM DETAILS

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

1. MINUTES (Pages 3 - 8)

Proposed motion

That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 May 2020 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. CORONAVIRUS (COVID-19) IMPACT AND RESPONSE OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL - RECOVERY AND FINANCIAL IMPACT (Pages 9 - 10 and Supplementary Report Pages 13 - 24)

- *This report was considered by the Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 22 June and a draft minute is attached to this Order Paper marked "4".*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- (b) That the actions taken to date in response to the pandemic be noted;
- (c) That the work that has commenced on recovery including the outcomes from the initial meeting of the cross-party Member Working Group be noted;
- (d) That the financial implications for the County Council and the actions proposed to begin to address the impact on the Council's finances be noted.

5. COMMISSIONING AND PROCUREMENT OF HOME CARE SERVICE POST-NOVEMBER 2020 - PROPOSED DEFERRAL ARISING FROM COVID-19 (Pages 11 - 18)

- *This report was circulated to members of the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee. No comments have been received.*

Proposed motion

That procurement of the new Home Care service for Leicestershire previously agreed by the Cabinet on 7 February 2020 be deferred for 12 months, subject to agreement by the East Leicestershire and Rutland and West Leicestershire Clinical Commissioning Groups' Governing Bodies.

6. LEICESTER, LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SUICIDE PREVENTION STRATEGY AND ACTION PLAN 2020-2023 (Pages 19 - 60)

- That the comments of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and the members of the Health and Wellbeing Board on the draft Strategy and Action Plan and changes made as a result, be noted;
- That the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Suicide Prevention Strategy 2020-2023 and associated Action Plan be supported.

7. LEICESTERSHIRE SEXUAL HEALTH STRATEGY 2020-2023 (Pages 61 - 82)

Proposed motion

- That the responses to the consultation including the comments of the Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee and changes made to the draft Strategy as a result be noted;
- That the Leicestershire Sexual Health Strategy 2020-23 (appended to the report) be approved for implementation.

8. 2019/20 PROVISIONAL REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN (Pages 83 - 122)

- *A report on the Outturn was considered by the Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 22 June. A draft minute is attached to this Order Paper marked "8".*

Proposed motion

- That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- That the 2019/20 provisional revenue and capital outturn be noted;
- That the prudential indicators for 2019/20 as shown in Appendix E to the report be noted.

9. ANNUAL TREASURY MANAGEMENT REPORT 2019/20 (Pages 123 - 138)

- *The Annual Treasury Management Report was considered by the Corporate Governance Committee on 12 June. The Committee noted the action taken and performance achieved during 2019/20.*

Proposed motion

That the report be noted.

10. MELTON MOWBRAY DISTRIBUTOR ROAD (Pages 139 - 142 and Supplementary Report Pages 3 - 24)

Proposed motion

- That the position of the County Council in respect of the masterplan for the South Sustainable Neighbourhood and the financial viability of the Neighbourhood as approved under delegated powers by the Chief Executive in following consultation with the Leader and the Deputy Leader, and communicated to Melton Borough Council prior to its Cabinet meeting, be noted;
- That the decision of the Cabinet of Melton Borough Council at its meeting on 17th June 2020, inter alia, to approve the masterplan, be noted;
- That the views of the Director of Law and Governance (set out in paragraphs 17 to 23 of this report) on the decision of Melton Borough Council's Cabinet of 17th June be noted;
- That the County Council's position as set out in (a) above, viz:

“To date no evidence has been provided by Melton Borough Council in the masterplan or elsewhere to demonstrate the financial viability of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood in its proposed form and for which no timescales are given for the different phases of development. Consequently, the County Council is still not in a position to accept the Housing Infrastructure Fund grant-aid offer towards the cost of the southern leg of the MMDR.”

be reaffirmed and that Melton Borough Council be also advised (i) of the views of the Director of Law and Governance and (ii) that the County Council notes that it has had no answer from Melton Borough Council as to exactly on what basis it believes the South Sustainable Neighbourhood development to be viable;

- That Homes England be advised of the County Council's position accordingly.

11. COALVILLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY (Pages 143 - 226)

- *Comments from Dr. Terri Eynon CC, the member for the Coalville North division and responses from the Director of Environment and Transport are attached to this Order Paper marked "11".*

Proposed motion

- (a) That the ongoing work to support North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC) to deliver the successful growth and evolution of Coalville and of Ashby-de-la-Zouch (Ashby) be noted;
- (b) That it be noted the outcomes of the recent transport study work:
 - (i) further evidences the importance of achieving the delivery of the A511 Growth Corridor Major Road Network scheme, without which growth in the area is forecast to have severe residual cumulative highway impacts;
 - (ii) evidences that transport projects in addition to the Major Road Network scheme are still required in and around Coalville and Ashby in order to mitigate forecast severe residual cumulative highway impacts;
- (c) That the revised list of projects covered by the Coalville Transport Strategy (CTS) as set out in paragraph 51 and in Appendix A to the report be approved;
- (d) That no changes be sought to the general level of developer contributions requested towards delivery of the CTS through NWLDC's 'Section 106 policy for the delivery of infrastructure in Coalville';
- (e) That the County Council as the Local Highway Authority uses the outcome of the recent study work to inform its advice to NWLDC on development proposals and developer contributions in and around Coalville and Ashby;
- (f) That it be noted that there may be circumstances where the County Council as Local Highway Authority will advise NWLDC to refuse development proposals on highways grounds regardless of a suggested developer contribution towards delivery of the CTS; and
- (g) That the County Council works with NWLDC to produce a formal CTS document.

12. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

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

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

None.

Officer to contact

Jenny Bailey

Democratic Services

Tel: (0116) 305 2583

Email: jenny.bailey@leics.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank



SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 22 JUNE 2020

CORONAVIRUS (COVID 19) IMPACT AND RESPONSE OF THE COUNTY COUNCIL – RECOVERY AND FINANCIAL IMPACT

MINUTE EXTRACT

The Commission considered a joint report of the Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources concerning the work being undertaken within the County Council and with partners:

- a) to address the on-going impact of the coronavirus (Covid-19) within the County;
- b) to plan the recovery and reinstatement of services linked to the gradual lifting of lockdown restrictions by the Government;
- c) the latest statistics which show the economic impact of the pandemic particularly on levels of unemployment;
- d) to outline the financial impact of the pandemic in the current financial year and the medium-term impact on the Council's finances

In introducing the report officers advised as follows:

- There continued to be significant senior officer involvement in the crisis management arrangements set up both by the LRF (Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Local Resilience Forum) and the Council to respond to the Covid 19 pandemic. The focus of activity remained on both response and recovery but with the latter becoming increasingly important.
- The cross member Working Party had now met and agreed the principles that would guide the recovery. Work had commenced on interim recovery plans and the outcome of these would be reported to the Working Party in July.
- The latest position regarding the impact of Covid 19 on the Council's finances suggested pressures up to £55.8million as shown in the table at paragraph 25 of the report. However, more recent assessments had increased this to £64m due to expected reductions in the Council's income from council tax and business rates and extra costs of home to school transport. The County Council was not in the position of some authorities who were considering issuing S114 notices, but the impact on the Council was nonetheless severe and it would require the use of reserves and drastically reducing the capital programme.

In response to questions members were advised as follows:

- (i) It was recognised that the recovery process would not be straight forward and that the recovery phase would be running alongside the Council's response to

the pandemic. Furthermore, there was still much uncertainty about what the new normal might be which made planning difficult and so would require several iterations of recovery plans.

- (ii) Officers were aware that in promoting Digital Value there would be significant advantages and possible cost savings particularly in the way staff work. It was recognised that the Council would need to have regard to those service users who may have difficulties with the use of digital options. As plans for reintroducing services were prepared the specific needs of such groups would be considered.
- (iii) The Council needed to strike a balance between its interim recovery plan and the longer-term objectives for the Council and County. To that end it would need to ensure that the policies put in place did not deter or stifle economic activity and investment, but also ensured that where developments were planned this was accompanied by appropriate infrastructure to serve the communities affected.
- (iv) The Working Party on recovery was not a decision making body and as such, where decisions required member approval this would be done in the usual way of consulting scrutiny and seeking a final decision from the Cabinet. Members wishing to make comment on the recovery process should contact their Group representatives on the Working Party.
- (v) The planned recovery timetable was to focus on interim recovery – i.e. to the end of the year. Departments had started to plan on this basis and it was hoped that the outcome of this would be reported to the Working Party in July. Looking ahead, the aim would be to take stock in September and then begin planning for the following and subsequent years and to do this in the context of the review of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy.
- (vi) Recent comments from the MHCLG (Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government) and from ministers reported in the press seemed to indicate that there was recognition of the financial pressures being faced by local government and the need for financial sustainability. There also appeared to be recognition that investment in infrastructure projects would offer the best way to stimulate economic activity. It was hoped that this would result in the Government supporting councils by underwriting tax bases, business rate income and generally with additional revenue funding which would mean less would need to be taken out of the capital programme to support development.

RESOLVED

- a) That the contents of the report and the supplementary report be noted;
- b) That the principle and direction of the proposed recovery plan be supported;
- c) That the significant financial impact of Covid19 on the County Council be noted and that efforts continue to lobby Government to meet the full costs incurred in responding to the crisis and the resources required to support recovery.



SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 22 JUNE 2020

2019/20 PROVISIONAL REVENUE AND CAPITAL OUTTURN

MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources which provided information on the provisional revenue and capital outturn for 2019/20. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 9', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) Pressures in areas such as SEND, Children's Social Care and Adult Social Care, which existed pre Covid 19, continued to be an issue despite actions taken. The position was also being further exacerbated by the current pandemic. The Council would continue to lobby Government which had so far not responded to correspondence from the Lead Member for Resources on the issue of SEND funding.
- (ii) A member raised concern at the 18% increase in Adult Social Care legal costs, which it was noted had been driven by the type and number of cases that had recently gone to court.
- (iii) Whilst a member expressed disappointment at the increased costs regarding the use of the energy from waste plant, it was noted that there had been a larger reduction in landfill costs which had underspent by £556,000. The Coventry facility in which the Council had shares, had been used more and this had reduced costs in that area.
- (iv) A review of the Council's commercial services would be undertaken as part of the Council's recovery work, especially as it considered longer term impacts. The Council had already experienced significant losses in income (£500,000 alone, in the last two weeks at last financial year as the pandemic hit) and the future was uncertain in areas such as the provision of school meals which depended on plans for the re-opening of schools in September. Members noted that further reports would be brought to scrutiny on the outcome of this review as appropriate.
- (v) It was unclear what longer term adult social care reablement needs might be required as a result of Covid 19 and this would be looked at as part of the Council's recovery plans. The use of its new target operating model to monitor this going forward would be considered as part of that process.
- (vi) Whilst elements of the Lutterworth East SDA project had been put on hold, the Council would proceed with its planning application, integral to which was the proposed new spine road. Members noted that the application was due to be considered by the local planning authority in July. The unsuccessful outcome of the Council's HIF bid had been disappointing, and members agreed that consideration would need to be given to future delivery and finance options. Members further noted that the Council's

consultants had advised that the procurement of a joint venture partner should be delayed as the current pandemic would negatively affect this process.

- (vii) The Corporate Asset Investment Fund portfolio was performing well and generating a good capital return in respect of its industrial and office assets (6.4% and 7.8% respectively), but this was weighted against other rural and development assets which generated, as expected, a much lower rate of income and so reduced the overall capital return of the portfolio to 2.7%.
- (viii) Members were pleased to note that the Council had not been notified of any change to government funding for the A511 Major Road Network scheme which was an advanced project.

RESOLVED:

That the provisional Revenue and Capital Outturn for 2019/20 be noted.

Submission to Cabinet Item 11

18th June 2020

Comments and Questions from Terri Eynon CC, Coalville North

COALVILLE TRANSPORT STRATEGY

Comments

As Local Member for Coalville North I welcome this intervention from the Local Highways Authority and am willing to overlook a tendency to rewrite the past as an understandable attempt to maintain a reasonable relationship with my local Planning Authority, NWLDC.

I am pleased to see that recent transport study work has evidenced the risk of 'severe residual cumulative highway impacts' in the Coalville area and has recognised that traffic congestion will remain likely even after the much-needed Major Road Network Scheme (MRN) gets its funding.

I especially welcome point 2(f) which makes it clear that this Authority may use this evidence to justify advising NWLDC to refuse development proposals on highways grounds.

The Strategy notes (para 46) that the 'Section 106 policy for the delivery of infrastructure in Coalville' (the Policy) was established by resolutions of NWLDC's Cabinet in 2013 and that (para 48) around £8m has been secured and a further £20m 'expected'. Clearly this has been nowhere near enough. I have supported this Authority's bid for £49M of Government funding from the MRN. I also welcome this Authority's admission that even if that funding arrives, it will not be enough to resolve all the problems caused by unsustainable development in and around my town.

A-level English students will note the strange syntax and agentless passive construction in paragraph 49. *'It was recognised that at the time of the Policy's adoption, it would unlikely be capable of funding the entirety of the transport infrastructure required to support growth in the area'*. An agentless passive is a neat way of hiding the identity of the persons doing the recognising. Labour's town centre District Councillors have long memories and remember that we were very exercised by this problem. We 'recognised' the time-bomb being created by a Planning Authority only too willing to follow the drive for growth of the then Government's new National Planning Policy Framework. We were concerned by the decision to deem the Bardon by-pass unnecessary, a decision rewritten in this document as being due to it being unlikely to be funded. When we raised

these points in both private and public settings, we were reassured by the then NWLDC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Infrastructure that it would be 'short term pain for long term gain'.

The reality has been short term 'gain' for NWLDC in the form of new homes, New Homes Bonus, planning fees and Council Tax receipts. We now see the future long term 'pain' of congested town centre streets and lorries grinding along the residential A511 Bardon Road.

The future of our town centre is currently being debated as part of a 'Future High Streets Fund' and it is disappointing to see the state of the A511 corridor setting limits to local ambition. More social homes in the town centre are needed. So is the long-promised redevelopment of the Belvoir Centre. More traffic along Belvoir Road and High Street most certainly isn't needed. I would personally like to see the pedestrianisation of a short section of High Street, from Holmes Butchers to the Library, allowing people, post-Covid19, to sit outside Coalville's delightful town centre restaurants, encouraging drivers to park in the town centre and diverting through traffic back onto the A511. I am being told that, even with the MRN, the A511 cannot support the extra traffic a minor town centre improvement would load onto this already congested route.

I appreciate that (para 28) the A511 Growth Corridor MRN was 'never meant to – or ever likely to – deliver all of the measures required along the A511 corridor to deal with growth in Coalville'. I am pleased to see, at last, a strategy that is driven not just by the political imperative of 'growth' but one that will provide a 'coherent, justified and evidenced transport strategy'.

As Local Member, I hope this strategy will make it clear to the Government that, however cash-strapped they may feel after Covid19, short-changing this Authority on MRN funding would be a false economy and that further investment in transport infrastructure in North West Leicestershire, including the reopening of the National Forest/Ivanhoe Line, will be of economic benefit not just to residents in my division but to the East Midlands as a whole.

From a more parochial perspective, I am pleased to see the Highways Authority showing it has teeth and look forward to NWLDC, as Planning Authority, using this strategy as evidence to resist unsustainable development. I also look forward to seeing detailed proposals come forward, from both authorities, to address the congestion in Coalville's town-centre streets and evidence further bids for national funding.

With these comments in mind I would like to suggest that Cabinet members consider the following questions:

Questions

Responses of the Director of Environment and Transport have been provided (in italics) below.

1. How high is the risk that the Government will cut the expected funding from the Major Road Network Scheme?

A: We continue to proceed with work to develop the scheme and the Final Business Case, albeit with some impacts resulting from Covid19. The scheme offers strong benefits and was the only East Midlands MRN scheme to be taken forward initially by Midlands Connect/Department for Transport. We have received no indication from either body that funding for the project will be 'cut', but as the Cabinet report highlights there is a potential risk that the total value of MRN projects across the country could ultimately exceed the level of funding available. Whilst it is not possible to quantify the level of risk, it should also be considered that other MRN schemes' timetables might slip or that projects originally put forward might be 'dropped', as could be the case for the Hereford Bypass. Additionally, Government is indicating that infrastructure investment will play a major role in the UK's economic recovery.

Notwithstanding the above, in the event that no MRN funding were to be available in this first round, then other funding options include:

- *Continuing to secure develop contributions, underpinned by the latest evidence work and policies of the adopted North West Leicestershire Local Plan;*
- *Pursing future Government bidding opportunities that might arise, including potentially MRN round 2.*

In practice, such an approach would likely result in the eventual delivery of the MRN project, albeit in a piecemeal fashion and over a longer timescale.

2. What is the risk to the Leicestershire economy if the MRN funding were to be cut?

A: As the Cabinet report sets out, without investment in the corridor the traffic impacts of growth are likely to be 'severe'. Notwithstanding the response to Q1, if no funding were to be available from any source (which is extremely unlikely), it is potentially possible that growth could be delivered elsewhere in the district instead, such as the potential for an earlier move to the delivery of growth in the Strategic Growth Plan Leicestershire International Gateway. However, such matters would be for North West Leicestershire District Council to consider as the Local Planning Authority and Development Plan making Authority.

3. What role will there be for the National Forest Line in resolving traffic problems along the A511 corridor?

A: Supported by a £10,000 contribution by the County Council and ongoing assistance from officers, the Campaign for the Reopening of The Ivanhoe Line (CRIL) will be undertaking work to revisit the Business Case for the line's reopening to passenger traffic. As set out in the Cabinet report, the Strategy will take into consideration the outcomes of CRIL's work when it is completed. However, short to medium term investment in highway measures to unlock growth has the potential to bolster the case by helping to generating potentially high levels of future passenger demand.

4. How will this Strategy meet our obligations to the Climate Change agenda?

A: By improving the flow of traffic along the corridor, this should help to reduce vehicular pollution impacts. The A511/A50 corridor is also an important passenger transport link between settlements in the north west of Leicestershire and Leicester; reduced congestion will bring journey time reliability benefits, improving the attractiveness of services and encouraging new passengers who might otherwise have travelled by car. In addition, the scheme will look to build on the considerable investment already made in Coalville and the A511 to improve walking and cycling routes in the past 10 years.

5. How might Highways propose to address the congestion through Coalville town centre?

A: The County Council is working with NWLDC on its Future High Street Fund bid which aims to reduce traffic levels in the town centre by enhancing the public realm to promote walking and cycling supported by a parking strategy.

6. What role will there be for District Councillors and members of community groups interested in the regeneration of Coalville in shaping these plans?

A: In working jointly with NWLDC to prepare a Coalville Transport Strategy document, consideration will be given as to how other parties might be involved. Where specific projects are being taken forward, the County Council will follow its normal processes for undertaking 'public' consultations, as has been the case with the MRN scheme.

Dr Terri Eynon