



CABINET – TUESDAY 20 JULY 2021

ORDER PAPER

ITEM DETAILS

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Mrs C. M. Radford CC

1. MINUTES (Pages 5 - 18)

Proposed motion

That the minutes of the meeting held on 22 June 2021 be taken as read, confirmed, and signed.

2. URGENT ITEMS

None.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

4. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY MONITORING (PERIOD 2) (Pages 19 - 40)

Proposed motion

That the 2021/22 revenue and capital monitoring position be noted.

5. LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH STRATEGY (Pages 41 - 92)

The Scrutiny Commission considered this report at its meeting on 12 July and a minute extract is attached to this Order Paper, marked '5a'.

Comments have been received from Mr. Max Hunt CC and are attached to this Order Paper, marked '5b'.

Proposed motion

- (a) That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- (b) That the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership be requested to make some further revisions to the draft Strategy to address

- (i) the comments set out in paragraphs 29 to 32 of the report;
- (ii) any issues arising from County Council departments (to be submitted to the LLEP by the end of July);
- (c) That subject to the revisions at (b) above being made the Economic Growth Strategy for Leicester and Leicestershire be welcomed.

6. CORPORATE COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS ANNUAL REPORT 2020/21
(Pages 93 - 118)

The Scrutiny Commission considered a report at its meeting on 12 July and a minute extract is attached to this Order Paper, marked '6'.

Proposed motion

- (a) That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- (b) That the Corporate Complaints and Compliments Annual Report, covering the period 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021 be noted.

7. CYCLING AND WALKING STRATEGY (Pages 119 - 226)

Comments have been received from the Quorn Community Action Group for Walking and Cycling and are attached to this Order Paper, marked '7'.

Proposed motion

- (a) That the results of the engagement on the draft Cycling and Walking Strategy be noted;
- (b) That the Cycling and Walking Strategy (CaWS) and Action Plan, attached as Appendix A to the report, be approved;
- (c) That it be noted that the Leicestershire Highway Design Guide will be reviewed to ensure its alignment with Government LTN1/20 cycle infrastructure standards, and that until this review is completed the Council will take a pragmatic approach as outlined in the report but will seek to align designs with LTN1/20 standards wherever possible;
- (d) That the Director of Environment and Transport, following consultation with the Cabinet lead member, be authorised to update the Action Plan and its targets annually as a result of evidence arising from the delivery of the CaWS and consideration of the future Medium Term Financial Strategy, noting that any significant changes to the CaWS will be the subject of a further report to members;
- (e) That it be noted that the next two areas to be prioritised for the development of Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans will be -

- (i) Loughborough
- (ii) the south-east quadrant of the Leicester Principal Urban Area.

8. DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTERIM MELTON MOWBRAY TRANSPORT STRATEGY (Pages 227 - 422)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the responses to the engagement, on the draft Interim Melton Mowbray Transport Strategy (MMTS) as set out in paragraphs 44 to 71 and Appendix A to this report, and the proposed revisions made to the Interim MMTS as a consequence, be noted;
- (b) That the revised Interim MMTS and Summary MMTS attached to the report as Appendices B and C respectively be approved.

9. MELTON MOWBRAY DISTRIBUTOR ROAD SOUTHERN SECTION - HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE FUND GRANT (Pages 423 - 426 and supplementary report pages 3 -8)

With the consent of the Chairman, Mr. J. T. Orson CC, Leader of Melton Borough Council, will speak on this item.

Proposed motion

- (a) That the County Council welcomes the indication from the Leader of Melton Borough Council:
 - (i) that, in regard to the provision of infrastructure, his Council will increase its cap to £1.75million in an agreement between the two Councils for Melton Borough Council to mitigate the financial risk to the County Council; and
 - (ii) that he will arrange for his Council to approve as soon as possible and by the end of 2021 a Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a replacement masterplan for the South Sustainable Neighbourhood, and a new masterplan for the North Sustainable Neighbourhood;
- (b) That in respect of the SPD, the County Council notes that the draft document on which consultation will follow prioritises contributions towards transport and education infrastructure, which the County Council will expect to see in a final version;
- (c) That in respect of the South Sustainable Neighbourhood masterplan, the County Council notes that following concerns about viability, it commissioned consultants to produce an updated masterplan, which now requires to be completed;
- (d) That in respect of the North Sustainable Neighbourhood masterplan, the

County Council notes that its objections to an earlier draft have been incorporated in a revision which now requires to be shared and the work concluded;

- (e) That, accordingly, subject to:
- (i) assurances from Melton Borough Council in regard to an increase in the cap to £1.75million in an agreement between the two councils for the Borough Council to mitigate the financial risk to the County Council, in regard to approval of the SPD and masterplans for the South and North Sustainable Neighbourhoods to the satisfaction of the County Council; and
 - (ii) the provision of current information to Homes England on the estimated costs of the southern leg and further dialogue between the Director of Law and Governance and Homes England to reach an agreement on the terms of the Grant Determination Agreement,

the County Council will be in a position to accept conditionally the Housing Infrastructure Fund grant for the southern leg of the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road by decision of Cabinet at its meeting on 17th September 2021.

10. PROVISION OF SHORT BREAKS AND SUPPORTED LIVING SERVICES (Pages 427 - 446)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the outcome of the consultation on proposed changes to the provision of the Council's in-house short breaks services be noted;
- (b) That the refurbished facilities at The Trees in Hinckley be used for the provision of short breaks, taking the total number of beds at the site to 12;
- (c) That the Smith Crescent facility in Coalville be closed as a place for the provision of short breaks;
- (d) That alternative provision for existing users of the short break services at Smith Crescent, tailored for each individual, be provided at one of the other in-house short breaks facilities at Hinckley, Melton, and Wigston;
- (e) That the proposal for a replacement short breaks facility at the Cropston Drive site in Coalville, previously agreed in 2019, be withdrawn;
- (f) That revised development proposals for the Cropston Drive site in Coalville be developed for future consideration by the Cabinet.

11. SHARED CARE RECORD (Pages 447 - 454)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the development of a Shared Care Record between health and adult social care services be supported;
- (b) That the rationale for the development of a local Charter to formalise local stakeholder commitment and the core principles of the Charter as set out in the report and Appendix be supported subject to (c) and (d) below;
- (c) That it be noted that the Charter as currently drafted does potentially provide for an unquantifiable commitment to resources which requires clarification;
- (d) That the Director of Adults and Communities and Director of Corporate Resources, following consultation with their respective Cabinet Lead Members be authorised to
 - (i) agree with Integrated Care System partners such changes to the local Charter as are necessary to limit any unquantified risk to the Council's Resources,
 - (ii) sign the local Charter on behalf of the Council subject to any changes referred to in (i) above,
 - (iii) determine appropriate officer representation on the Yorkshire and Humber Care Record Delivery Board and enter into a Memorandum of Understanding concerning the partnership working as detailed in paragraph 40 of the report.

12. DEVELOPMENT OF THE 0-19 HEALTHY CHILD PROGRAMME - PROPOSED CONSULTATION (Pages 455 - 494)

Proposed motion

- (a) That the commencement of a consultation exercise on the proposed service model for the 0-19 Healthy Child Programme for a period of 8 weeks from 22 July to 16 September 2021, be approved;
- (b) That a further report regarding the outcome of the consultation and proposed service model be submitted to the Cabinet on 26 October 2021.

13. EXCEPTION TO CONTRACT PROCEDURE RULES - URGENT ACTION TAKEN BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE IN RELATION TO THE APPOINTMENT OF A SUPPLIER TO PROVIDE FREE SCHOOL MEAL VOUCHERS DURING THE SUMMER HOLIDAYS (Pages 495 - 498)

Proposed motion

That the urgent action taken by the Chief Executive to agree an exception to the Contract Procedure Rules to enable the appointment of Edenred to provide Free School Meal Vouchers until 30 September 2021 be noted.

14. EXCEPTION TO CONTRACT PROCEDURE RULES - URGENT ACTION TAKEN

BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE IN RELATION TO THE EXTENSION OF AN EXISTING CONTRACT FOR AN ELECTRONIC ROSTER SYSTEM (Pages 499 - 502)

Proposed motion

That the urgent action taken by the Chief Executive to agree an exception to the Contract Procedure Rules to enable the existing contract for the supply of a staff roster system to continue to be used by the Homecare Assessment and Reablement Team and Crisis Response Service teams be noted.

15. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

None.

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

None.

17. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

The public are likely to be excluded during the following item of business in accordance with Section 100(A) of the Local Government Act 1972:-

Proposals to Develop a New Primary School to Serve Castle Donington - Expressions Of Interest From Academy Proposers

Officer to contact

Jenny Bailey
Democratic Services
Tel: (0116) 305 6225
Email: jenny.bailey@leics.gov.uk

5a**Leicestershire
County Council****SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 12 JULY 2021****LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH
STRATEGY****MINUTE EXTRACT**

The Scrutiny Commission considered a report of the Chief Executive to be presented to the Cabinet at its meeting in July 2021 regarding the consultation draft of the Economic Growth Strategy prepared by Cambridge Econometrics on behalf of the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership (LLEP). A copy of the report and the draft Strategy marked 'Agenda Item 11' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Mr P. Bedford CC, Cabinet Lead Member for Covid Recovery and Ways of Working and the County Council's representative on the LLEP Board, to the meeting.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (a) The Strategy would be an important document given the significant impact of the pandemic on businesses in the area. There was currently no single strategy for the subregion which set out clearly the sectors priorities or vision for the local economy and members agreed that the Strategy would help fill that void;
- (b) The observations detailed in paragraph 32 of the report were strongly supported though some felt the Council's response should be more robust;
- (c) A Member questioned the lack of reference to the planned Freeport and how this might affect jobs and skills requirements in the area. It was noted that the establishment of a Freeport was predominantly being led by the relevant local authorities and private landowners, not the LEPs, and the Chief Executive confirmed that reference to this could be added to the Council's response to the draft Strategy;
- (d) A Member raised concern that the impacts of Brexit and how these might be managed to support local businesses had not been addressed in the draft Strategy. It was suggested that these could fundamentally affect trade nationally and locally for some time to come and so should be referenced;
- (e) There was currently a mismatch between the number of jobs available in Leicestershire and the number of people available locally who were appropriately skilled to fill those positions. A member raised concern that this would likely result in an increase in demand for housing in areas already

under pressure. It was agreed that this emphasised the importance of skills and training and the need to ensure that when vacancies arose, measures were in place to support local people not in work to access those positions. It was suggested that the Strategy should demonstrate a closer alignment to the Leicester/Leicestershire Strategic Growth Plan to 2050;

- (f) A member suggested that whilst the Strategy referred to inclusivity this did not seem to capture businesses in rural areas which had been significantly affected by Covid. A request was made for this to be strengthened and, in particular, for reference to be added to the 'Sustainable' leg of the Strategy Framework set out in paragraph 28 of the report which currently only referenced 'sustainable places, city and town centres';
- (g) A particular concern was raised about the negative affect the City Council's Transport Strategy and workplace parking levy proposals (currently the subject of public consultation) might have on those commuting to work in the City from rural areas of the County and how this could disproportionately affected young people in lower paid jobs. Members emphasised the need for the Economic Growth Strategy to take an overarching view of the wider implications of such local policies to ensure these dovetailed to support those seeking work across County, City and other regional boundaries. This was considered necessary to facilitate the growth planned across the region;
- (h) Concern was raised that the Strategy was too repetitive and backward looking and not sufficiently clear about future plans and the allocation of resources. As the Strategy would run to 2030 it was suggested that this need to be much more forward looking;
- (i) A member suggested that the Strategy was too high level with no clear tangible outcomes identified. It was emphasised, however, that the Strategy covered a wide geographical area which had a vast and diverse local economy with each area having its own strengths and priorities. It was also highlighted that much depended on other national and local plans which were yet to be determined (e.g. HS2, Devolution White Paper and Planning legislation). This therefore limited the degree of clarity that could be included and inevitably led to some generalisations;
- (j) Members acknowledged that the Council's observations set out in paragraph 32, provided a fair summary of many of the issues now raised and if addressed, would strengthen the Strategy and ensure this was more reflective. Members agreed that the development of an action plan, as proposed by the County Council in its response, would be vital in providing the necessary detail and clarity sought;
- (k) A member stressed the importance of partnership working and the need to ensure there was shared ownership of the Strategy across the region by all private and public sector representatives on the LLEP Board to improve the economic viability for the area.

RESOLVED:

That the comments now made be presented to the Cabinet at its meeting on 20th July for consideration.

This page is intentionally left blank

Submission to Cabinet
20th July 2021

5b



From Max Hunt CC

Item 5: LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE ECONOMIC GROWTH STRATEGY 2021-2030

I support the points made in Para 32 and note the criticism of the lack of clarity on so many areas.

I have several further concerns and queries which the LLEP might want to consider.

- As a strategy to deliver for the *next ten years* is it very clear which external changes are going to impact on our economy and which changes can be effected within Leicestershire?
- The document states that *60,000 skilled workers* are likely to be needed at the EMEGG Freeport. Should it say something about their training and travel to that employment?
- Will there be any fundamental changes to Leicestershire's economy due to *Brexit*? They are already affecting the agricultural economy.
- The strategy lacks a *sector by sector* analysis. Is it not important to assess each sector's economic needs and prospects?
- As the Cabinet paper says, climate change is not fully addressed but LLEP needs to decide whether to focus on the *Green Economy* (cf [Midlands Engine 10 point Plan](#)) or simply address mitigation.
- The *Circular Economy* is mentioned but not addressed. Is this something the LLEP needs to give more thought towards?
- Transport is rather left to Midlands Connect yet LLEP has funded major road works. Is LLEP continuing in that role?
- Are new measures including the [UK Prosperity Index](#), rather than strict use of GVA, likely to determine future public investment.
- Is major road building generating less economic growth than formerly anticipated?

It is not clear in what capacity *Cambridge Econometrics* have authored the draft document since it is not named in the report. A list of references to the any contributing evidence would be useful.

This page is intentionally left blank

6**Leicestershire
County Council****SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 12 JULY 2021****CORPORATE COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS ANNUAL REPORT
2020/2021****MINUTE EXTRACT**

The Commission received a report of the Director of Corporate Resources on Corporate Complaints and Compliments for the period 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2021. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 10' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) A Member questioned whether the Local Government Ombudsmen (LGO) might restrict workflow and if so, what effect this might have on residents seeking further redress of their complaints. The Director advised that it was currently understood the LGO would not restrict workflow but would instead undertake more lower level assessments at the triage stage of referral. This was to ensure their resources were targeted at those cases where more in depth assessment was warranted, where a finding of fault was more likely and where action could be taken to address this. Assurance was provided that internally the Council's processes had been changed to include a second review stage. This was not required but intended to make sure all avenues to resolve a matter internally had been exhausted before referral to the LGO;
- (ii) The increased number of complaints relating to home to school transport were noted, but it was acknowledged that this was exacerbated by the late issuing of guidance by the Government on how Councils were expected to deliver this service in a Covid safe way. Members agreed that the Council had done all it could in the short time available to respond to resident's needs, including the secondment of additional staff, but that this had not been possible for all those affected in time for the start of the academic year;
- (iii) It was acknowledged that complaints around the Council's waste transfer sites were targeted towards the arrangements and implementation of the new booking system which had been introduced because of Covid. It was highlighted that this process would not continue once restrictions had been removed;
- (iv) A question was asked whether an assessment had been undertaken on whether the temporary restrictions on the use of waste sites had resulted in an increase in fly-tipping. A fellow Member confirmed that a correlation exercise had been undertaken by the Environment and Transport Department last year and this had not identified any link between the

reduced ability to use the Council's residual household waste facilities and fly tipping;

- (v) Members were pleased that the number of grass cutting complaints had fallen and suggested that this stemmed from the reprioritisation of green and environmental issues;
- (vi) Complaints relating to highway works were focused on smaller, non-urgent repairs and whilst resources had been increased to begin to address such issues, there was still a need to better manage residents' expectations;
- (vii) It was accepted that generally people were less likely to write in to report when they were pleased with a service and it was suggested that the 255 compliments received were likely only a small fraction of those who had been at least satisfied with services provided. Members welcomed the Council's continued approach to use complaints received as a constructive way of seeking to improve service delivery;
- (viii) A Member questioned the proportion of complaints raised by a single person. It was noted that inevitably there were some individuals with more than one complaint, but these were each captured separately unless they related to a particular theme and so grouped and managed together.

RESOLVED:

That the update provided be noted and that the now comments made be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 20th July 2021

Quorn Community Action Group for Walking and Cycling - Leicestershire County Council Cycling and Walking Strategy – July 2021.

Please find below the comments of the Quorn Community Action Group for Walking and Cycling (Quorn Active Travel) in relation to the Leicestershire County Council draft Cycling and Walking Strategy.

1. **Praise where praise is due.** We are pleased to see that there is, at last, an understanding of the importance of Walking and Cycling as credible, zero carbon, low environmental impact methods of transportation and an acknowledgement that action must be taken to promote and support these activities with suitable infrastructure and cultural support.
2. **Ambition or lack of it.** Throughout the strategy document the terms “Bold and Ambitious” are used to describe the proposals. In reality, the proposals, which are to increase the amount of walking and cycling by 10 to 15% over 10 years, or 1% to 1.5% per annum, are modest and unambitious. The strategy acknowledges that Leicestershire is starting from an already low point compared to other areas of the country. This level of ambition will only serve to maintain this position for the longer term.

It should also be noted that this level of increase is unlikely to enable Leicestershire to meet either of the Department for Transport targets for walking and cycling in 2025 or 2030, both of which are highlighted in the strategy documents. For example, the target for 2030 is for 50% of all journeys in towns and cities to be by walking and cycling.

3. **Investment and budget.** In the presentation document a projected expenditure of £10m to £20m plus is identified to cover infrastructure and behavioural changes to support the strategies. It is not stated but we assume this expenditure is for the 10 year period of the strategy.

This level of investment is insufficient in the extreme. It is equivalent to £2.83 per head per annum across the population of the county over 10 years. In comparison, Leicester City Council is planning to spend £37.14 per head per annum for the same 10 year period and Greater Manchester £53.

In 2014 the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group recommended that councils should aim to spend £10 per person per annum on cycling infrastructure. LCC has never achieved this target and the proposed strategy documents continue with this trend.

Expenditure on roads in Leicestershire averages £40 million per year or £56 per head per year. The Benefit Cost Ratio for roads is 2/1, whereas the same ratio for cycling infrastructure is typically 13/1 or 6.5 times better.

The number of people cycling continues to increase year on year and bikes continue to outsell cars annually. The level of investment proposed in this strategy is insufficient to enable significant behavioural changes away from motor vehicle to walking and cycling.

4. **Action Plan.** The proposed timescales do not reflect the urgency of the situation. The Action Plan - Appendix B seems to have extended timescales. The short-term actions over 5 years appear to be largely focussed on bureaucracy rather than delivery with only one LCWIP likely have commenced delivery at the end of the period.
5. **Investment in Quorn.** We estimate that Quorn will need approximately £2M in infrastructure investment to enable a substantial culture change away from cars to walking and cycling.

Based on the budgetary proposals in the strategy document Quorn would attract £2.83 x 6000 (pop.) = £16980 per year. This level of infrastructure investment will have little or no effect on current motor vehicle usage habits or the amount of walking and cycling.

6. **Section 3.31 Quality homes.** Housing developments recently approved for Quorn would certainly fail the standards set out in LTN 20 and yet it will be some time before these developments are started. We recommend a pause in approvals so that the development plans can be revised. This would be an “easy win” and a significant saving on the expenditure required in the future to bring the developments up to the new standards. Why build it wrong now when the building has not started?
7. **LCWIP.** The LCWIP process could be considerably shortened with the involvement of the local parish councils, community organisations and community volunteers. Existing OS maps have many routes already highlighted. A simple questionnaire and supporting photos could gather a lot of information quickly by involving local people. This would also help to raise public awareness.

Summary.

The strategy document is disappointingly lacking in ambition and investment. It is unlikely to create the level of behavioural change that is needed to enable a shift away from motor vehicles to walking and cycling.

Quorn Active Travel is ambitious, we want to see walking and cycling as the preeminent modes of transport in and around the village and its adjoining neighbourhoods. Unfortunately, the ambitions, funding and timing proposals offered in this strategy document are unlikely to help and may even hinder our ambitions.

Quorn Community Action Group for Walking and Cycling

July 2021.