



CABINET - FRIDAY 12 SEPTEMBER 2025

ORDER PAPER

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DETAILS</u>
--------------------	-----------------------

APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

None.

1.	MINUTES (Pages 3 -14)
-----------	------------------------------

That the minutes of the meeting held on 15 July 2025 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.	DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN PARTNERSHIP YEARLY REPORT 2024-2025 (Pages 15 - 84)
-----------	--

- *The Yearly Report was considered by the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 2 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked '4a'.*
- *Comments have been received from Mrs Kerry Knight CC and are attached to this Order Paper, marked "4b".*

Proposed motion

- a) That the comments of the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;
- b) That the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Partnership Yearly Report for 2024-25 be welcomed.

5.	DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2024-2025 (Pages 85 - 134)
-----------	--

- *The report will be presented by Seona Douglas, the Independent Chair of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board.*

- *The Annual Report was considered by the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 1 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked '5a'.*
- *Comments have been received from Mrs Kerry Knight CC and are attached to this Order Paper, marked "5b".*

Proposed motion

- a) That the comments of the Adults and Communities Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;
- b) That the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report for 2024-2025 be welcomed.

6. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY - BUDGET MONITORING AND MTFS REFRESH (Pages 135 - 184)

- *A report was considered by the Scrutiny Commission on 8 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked '6'.*

Proposed motion

- a) That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- b) That the significant financial challenges faced by the County Council be noted;
- c) That the Period 4 monitoring position from the current financial year be noted;
- d) That the proposed approach outlined in the report to updating the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), be approved;
- e) That the revised Capital Programme for 2025/26 to 2028/29 as set out in Appendix C to the report be approved;
- f) That additional investment in bank risk sharing product (capital release funds) in line with the Council's approved Treasury Management Strategy, up to a maximum investment of £20m at any one time, be approved;
- g) That the membership of the Investing in Leicestershire Programme Board be extended to include all members of the Cabinet.

7. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION (Pages 185 - 188 and Supplementary Report)

Proposed motion

- a) That the contents of the report be noted; the uncertainty about the progress of the English Devolution and Community Empowerment Bill following the resignation of the Deputy Prime Minister and the sacking of the Minister of State; and the expectation nevertheless that the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) will receive more final

submissions in November than the number of interim plans submitted in March;

- b) That the Cabinet anticipates an assessment by MHCLG after November of whether all reorganisation and devolution proposals can proceed to the Government's timetable of completion in the life of this Parliament;
- c) That the Cabinet acknowledges the decision of the County Council at its meeting on 30th July not to support any expansion of Leicester City Council's boundaries and the public unpopularity of the boundary changes proposed by the Mayor of Leicester, but also recognises the need to provide evidence of the financial, service and other impacts of those changes on the County, its residents and taxpayers;
- d) That the modelling exercise currently underway looking at six different options for reorganisation into a unitary structure for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland (LLR) be supported; and
- e) The outcomes of the modelling be considered as soon as possible and the Cabinet will welcome the views of the Scrutiny Commission and all members before a final submission on a unitary structure for LLR is made by the Cabinet.

8. HOME CARE FOR LEICESTERSHIRE PROCUREMENT (Pages 189 - 228)

Proposed motion

- a) That the procurement of contracts for the provision of services in respect of home care, continuing health care, and Live in Care/24-hour care under an open Framework, for the period 2026 to 2034, be approved;
- b) That the Director of Adults and Communities be authorised to enter into any contractual arrangements necessary to bring into effect the provision of services in respect of home care, continuing health care, and Live in Care/24-hour care with effect from 1 September 2026.

9. CORPORATE COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS ANNUAL REPORT 2024-2025 (Pages 229 - 262)

- *A report was considered by the Scrutiny Commission on 8 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked '9'.*

Proposed motion

- a) That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;
- b) That the Corporate Complaints and Compliments Annual Report 2024-2025 be noted.

10. OUTCOME OF THE 18-MONTH MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY STREET LIGHTING DIMMING TRIAL (Pages 263 - 298)

- *A report was considered by the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 4 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked '10'.*

Proposed motion

- a) That the comments of the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;
- b) That the outcome of the trial be noted;
- c) That the dimming of County streetlights to 30% intensity from 20:00 hours until 07:00 hours be approved;
- d) That the Director of Environment and Transport be authorised to make alterations to the dimming of streetlights following feedback from Leicestershire Police and other key stakeholders in accordance with the approved risk assessment.

11. A5 CONCEPT LINK (Pages 299 - 308)

- *Comments have been received from Mrs Ann Pendlebury CC and are attached to this Order Paper, marked "11".*

Proposed motion

- a) That the key factors that have led to the development of this scheme, as set out in paragraphs 21 to 23 of the report be noted;
- b) That the work undertaken to date to address the issues and constraints that exist along the A5 corridor in respect to transport, economic development and road safety that pose a potential barrier to sustainable development in the future and to develop a potential mitigation measure be noted;
- c) That the Director of Environment and Transport be authorised to:
 - i. Undertake, following consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member, necessary engagement activities with stakeholders, landowners and Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council to support work on the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Plan and to address other policy, technical and procedural matters necessary to progress the A5 Concept Link scheme;
 - ii. Continue to develop the proposed scheme, noting that further reports will be made to the Cabinet as necessary.

- 12. A511 GROWTH CORRIDOR – TO COMMENCE CONSTRUCTION OF A SMALL SECTION OF WORKS ON THE BARDON LINK ROAD, COALVILLE** (Pages 309 - 320)

Proposed motion

- a) That the delivery of the works on the Bardon Link Road, which comprise setting out of the drainage pond and the construction of a short section of haul road, as illustrated on the drawing appended to the report, ahead of the scheme securing Full Business Case approval from the Department for Transport (DfT) be approved;
- b) That the latest position with regards to costs and timescales for the scheme be noted.

- 13. HARBOROUGH LOCAL PLAN - DUTY TO COOPERATE STATEMENT OF COMMON GROUND WITH LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL** (Pages 321 - 330)

Proposed motion

That the County Council becomes a signatory to the 'Harborough Local Plan Duty to Cooperate Statement of Common Ground with Leicestershire County Council'.

- 14. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY**

None.

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

None.

Officer to contact

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

This page is intentionally left blank

4a



CHILDREN AND FAMILIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

2 SEPTEMBER 2025

DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN PARTNERSHIP YEARLY REPORT 2024-25

MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Children and Family Services which sought views on the draft Yearly Report of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Partnership (LRSCP) for 2024-25. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 13', is filed with these minutes.

The Cabinet Lead Member for Children and Family Services emphasised that the reported demonstrated both the scale and the seriousness of safeguarding and highlighted the importance of early intervention.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

- (i) The Director explained that local authorities and statutory safeguarding partners had both a statutory obligation and a duty to safeguard and promote the welfare of all children. This included the reporting of safeguarding concerns. Elected Members also had a duty as corporate parents. In terms of the wider responsibility for safeguarding, the Department regularly undertook work through safeguarding partnerships on recognising the signs of abuse and campaigns focussed on helping communities to identify children at risk of abuse.
- (ii) In response to a question regarding group based sexual exploitation, the Director advised that it could not be possible to state that such activity was not taking place at any given time. However, members were assured that whilst the Director was not aware of any ongoing investigations or high-profile incidents relating to large scale grooming gangs in Leicestershire, robust methods of identification and monitoring continued to be utilised in order to respond to instances whereby exploitation was suspected and to support children at risk of exploitation.
- (iii) With regards to health information sessions which had been delivered by doctors and other healthcare professional within Family Hubs, members noted that the sessions had been piloted within a specific location in order to prevent unnecessary GP referrals relating to specific health issues. The sessions had a positive outcome, but it was not clear whether the sessions

had been delivered in Family Hubs in additional locations. Members noted that the Director would discuss with the Service the approach for ongoing delivery.

- (iv) Concern was raised regarding the sustainability of funding for the Partnership's work, as a shortfall had been reported. This shortfall had been made up from reserves. The Director stated that funding arrangements for the Partnership continued to be reviewed on an annual basis. Members received assurance that as part of the local implementation of national reforms to children's social care, the Department would review whether service delivery could be undertaken more efficiently. If savings could not be delivered within the Department, negotiations with partners regarding contributions would take place in order to address the shortfall in funding.
- (v) Members noted that a Race, Ethnicity and Excellence Forum (REEF) had been established in order to ensure that the best level of support was being provided to children from Black, Asian or Multi Ethnic backgrounds. The additional safeguarding needs of this group needed to be considered as a result of intersectionality, racism or discrimination. The forum allowed staff across the Department to bring cases to discuss in order to ensure the needs of black, Asian and Multi Ethnic children and young people were being fully considered and to analyse broader issues relating to race which could impact on safeguarding children.
- (vi) In response to a question asked of the Lead Member for Children and Families regarding his support for the work undertaken by the REEF, he stated that his most important priority as designated Lead Member for Children and Young People was that all children, regardless of background, were safeguarded. He assured members that he supported the best interests of all children and that this was fundamental in ensuring that he and the Director of Children and Family Services delivered their safeguarding responsibilities.
- (vii) With regards to the Partnership's priorities for 2025-27, members noted that work focusing on child exploitation would be delivered as part of work to be delivered as part of Harm Outside the Home. The Director stated that this would be made clearly within the final version of the Leicestershire & Rutland Safeguarding Children Partnership Yearly Report 2024-25.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That the draft yearly report assessing the impact of the work undertaken in 2024/25 on safeguarding outcomes for children in Leicestershire and Rutland be noted.
- (b) That the views expressed by the Committee would be presented to the Cabinet at its meeting on 12 September 2025.

4b**CABINET - 12 SEPTEMBER 2025****COMMENTS FROM MRS. KERRY KNIGHT CC IN RELATION TO
AGENDA ITEM 4****Draft Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Partnership Yearly
Report 2024-2025**

The County Council contributed £66,288 to the LRSCP in 2024-2025. This is 33% of the total funding for the LRSCP (£203,092). LRSCP current reserve funds stand at £117,721. What they are trying to do is great but surely this should already be embedded in LCC Policies and ways of working. They appear to be another external body delivering Policy and Training bolstered with help telephone numbers.

Given the current LCC debt can we afford to fund this year?

Kerry Knight

County Councillor for Melton West

This page is intentionally left blank

5a



ADULTS AND COMMUNITIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1 SEPTEMBER 2025

DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2024-2025

MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report of the Independent Chair of Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board (LRSAB) for 2024/25. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 13' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed Ms. Seona Douglas, Independent Chair of the LRSAB to the meeting for this item. During the presentation of the report, there was a short video on '[Self Neglect](#)' shown.

Arising from discussion and questions, the following points were made:

- i. The Independent Chair advised the video was just one way of communication to help people in the wider community understand issues relevant to safeguarding to the wider community. Accompanied with learning in the past year, the priorities for the Board for 2025 to 2027 equality, diversity, and inclusion.
- ii. Members raised concern given the importance of meeting, that attendance data provided in the report showed the absence of approximately 21% of expected attendees, some of whom had submitted multiple apologies for meetings, and asked the Independent Chair what steps were being taken to improve consistency, which was essential for continuity and progress. The Independent Chair noted it was an important issue that was a concern, but that she was actively engaging with organisations. It was further explained that, in some cases, late apologies were received due to the operational demands on frontline staff.
- iii. Referring to the financial section of the report, Members noted that income remained flat in 2023–24 and 2024–25, yet running costs increased significantly in 2024–25, and that reserves were used to cover the shortfall. Clarity was sought on whether contributing partners were expected to maintain their current funding levels for 2025-26, and if so, what steps were being taken to align expenditure with income. It was explained that the Board had operated on a goodwill basis, with contributions from partners remaining unchanged for several years. However, the Independent Chair had been working to establish a more sustainable financial model, including regular reviews and annual percentage increases to reflect rising costs. The financial structure combined adult and children's Safeguarding Board budgets from which reserves had been drawn on

the manage increased costs. The Independent Chair was also advocating for a Memorandum of Understanding with all contributing partners to formalise commitments and ensure long-term financial stability, especially in light of changes within the Integrated Care Board. It was confirmed the organisation held £117,000 in reserves.

- iv. A Member voiced concern as to why, given the Mental Capacity Act had been in place since 2005, there was such a strong emphasis on training which should be already embedded in practice across organisations and was a fundamental aspect of safeguarding. The Independent Chair responded it was concerning that consistent application was still lacking, but the issue had been identified not only locally but nationally, with safeguarding adult reviews frequently highlighting gaps in mental capacity assessments. Over the past two years, significant work had been undertaken to address the issue, with all partner organisations having responsibility to assess mental capacity, and training has been prioritised to ensure this is understood and implemented. The recurring issues flagged in both local and national reviews underscore the need for continued investment in this area to improve practice and outcomes.
- v. In response to a query, it was the responsibility of board members to disseminate information and ensure learning within their own organisations, which was monitored through audit processes and self-assessments. The Board operated as a partnership, and all partners shared equal responsibility for challenge and assurance, both within the Board and sub-groups, to ensure accountability and improvement.
- vi. Members reflected on the video on self-neglect and were concerned that, whilst planning to move forward with initiatives around diversity, language access, and technology, gaps in community engagement around isolation and lack of support in local communities had not been addressed. The Independent Chair clarified that the video and associated work aimed to raise awareness and promote engagement across all parts of the community in places such as libraries, places of worship, community halls, and informal gathering spaces, and that people were empowered to support one another and report concerns. It was recognised that progress was ongoing and that challenges remained.

The Chairman thanked Ms. Douglas for the report.

RESOLVED:

That the annual report of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board (LRSAB) for 2024/25 be noted and welcomed.

5b

CABINET - 12 SEPTEMBER 2025

COMMENTS FROM MRS. KERRY KNIGHT CC IN RELATION TO AGENDA ITEM 5

Draft Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report 2024-2025

The County Council contributed £46,375 to the SAB in 2024-2025. This is 30% of the total funding for the SAB (£154,808). SAB's current reserve funds stand at £117,721.

What they are trying to do is great but surely this should already be embedded in LCC Policies and ways of working. They appear to be another external body delivering Policy and Training bolstered with help telephone numbers.

Given the current LCC debt can we afford to fund this year?

Kerry Knight

County Councillor for Melton West

This page is intentionally left blank

6

**SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 8th SEPTEMBER 2025****MINUTE EXTRACT****Medium Term Financial Strategy – Budget Monitoring and Strategy
Update 2024/25**

The Committee considered a report and a supplementary report of the Director of Corporate Resources which provided an update on the County Council's short and medium term financial position in light of the current economic climate and detailed changes proposed to the previously agreed 2025-29 capital programme following the latest review. The report also set out the specific revenue budget monitoring position as at the end of Period 4 (the end of July). A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 8' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion and questions asked of the Leader, the following points were made:

- (i) Members raised significant concerns about the Council's current financial position and the level of progress being made to deliver a proposal for a balanced budget for 2026/27. Noting the Cabinet's stated position that it would not make service cuts, Members asked the Leader to outline some of the savings being considered to meet the current financial gap of £38m in 2026/27. The Leader confirmed there was no intention to cut services. He agreed the financial challenges faced by the Council were considerable but commented that this had been the position for some years and suggested that a new approach was now needed. The Leader confirmed that the planned efficiency review, the procurement for which was underway, would be critical in guiding the Council's approach through the next phase of the MTFS.
- (ii) Members asked the Leader for specific examples of savings already being worked upon pending the outcome of the review. Serious concerns were expressed about the limited time available before the draft budget was due to be presented to the Cabinet in December ready for public consultation. The Leader stated that it would not be appropriate to give examples at this time as he did not want to jeopardise the ongoing procurement process or what the appointed consultants might ultimately propose. The Leader assured members that the outcome of the efficiency review would feed into the budget

process and that members would be made aware of proposals and be able to comment at that time.

- (iii) Members noted that the savings under development listed in Appendix D were not yet sufficiently detailed to include within the MTFS but they had traditionally been included within reports to provide members with early visibility of areas being considered and work being undertaken by officers. The Director confirmed that some might be included for the next budget and others would feature in future years.
- (iv) In response to further questions, the Director clarified that the consultants appointed would be instructed to take a mixed approach and identify new savings but also accelerate and/or grow existing initiatives. The review was not expected to be complete before savings could be included in the MTFS. Some could be identified quickly and incorporated into the MTFS early on, whilst others might be more complex and therefore take more time to deliver. Members were also assured that the procurement had been prepared to ensure that whilst the initial review to identify savings would be undertaken at a cost, come the implementation phase, payment of the consultants' fees would be dependent on the delivery of the savings identified. Members requested that a copy of the tender documents be shared with members of the Commission for information.
- (v) Members noted that the tender documents made clear the expectation that savings identified would meet the current financial gap in the MTFS. The Director explained that whilst proposals would be put forward by the consultants these would also be considered by officers to ensure a local view and service impacts could be taken into account and presented to the Leader and his Cabinet for consideration.
- (vi) In light of the report now presented, members asked the Leader if he still planned to deliver on his election promise to cut council tax. Several members challenged, that whilst they would all prefer to cut council tax for their residents, this was currently unrealistic and unfeasible. They emphasised that the Council had no other sources of income it could raise to mitigate against the financial gap to be addressed and that a reduction in council tax would only increase the level of savings to be delivered. The Leader reiterated that he and his Group were committed to low taxes and reducing costs for the public but emphasised that the outcome of the efficiency review would be essential in considering how this might be achieved. It was acknowledged that efficiencies would need to offset any council tax reductions.
- (vii) It was noted that a council tax increase had been assumed within the current budget of 2.99%. The Director confirmed that a 1% council tax increase equated to £4m. Members further reiterated concerns

that a council tax freeze could equate to an additional £12m in savings having to be identified which would increase year on year over the period of the MTFS.

- (viii) The Director, as the Council's Section 151 Officer, confirmed in response to further questions raised, that it was too early in the process to comment on the deliverability of a council tax freeze or reduction. In addition to the outcome of the review, the Government's budget would not be received until November and the local government finance settlement expected in December. As a result, the draft budget presented to Cabinet in December might include a range of options for public consultation regarding council tax levels. The Director advised that council tax levels would be considered in the usual way which was at the end of the budget process when all other factors had been considered.
- (ix) Some Members reaffirmed their concerns that the Cabinet would be able to bring forward a fully costed and worked up budget by February 2026 that could not only deliver the savings necessary to bridge the funding gap, but also potentially deliver a council tax freeze or cuts, even with external support. The Leader suggested that as the new Leader, new strategic plans would be developed to tackle the budget and whilst this would take time, detail would be shared with members as progress was made.
- (x) It was emphasised that the Council's low funded position remained a critical factor in the financial challenges it now faced and members questioned what the Leader had done since his appointment in May to continue to address fair funding with Government. The Leader confirmed that he had written to MPs on this issue but that, as yet, no response had been received. He emphasised that despite work done previously to change the local government funding formula, no real progress had been made and so this could not be relied upon. The Leader stated that the Council's budget had to be addressed locally, and bringing in external expertise to assist was the best approach. Members requested that a copy of the Leader's letter to MPs be shared with all members of the Commission for information.
- (xi) In response to questions regarding Reform's DOGE unit, the Leader confirmed that it had been invited to the County Council. However, he felt the appointment of an external consultant would still be the best approach to address the particularly high level of savings the County Council was required to deliver. The Leader reiterated his view that the appointment of external consultants would be the best way forward despite the costs this would incur. Some Members questioned what the costs would be, but it was noted that these would be determined through the competitive tender process.
- (xii) The High Needs Block deficit continued to rise at unprecedented levels. The Director confirmed that growth had been estimated at 7%

based on previous growth trends. However, this was now forecasted to rise by 22% above budget estimates based on current trends. It was noted that the recent increase was being seen nationally and likely as a result of proposed national reforms being proposed by the Government. Following the announcement of proposed systemic changes the Children and Family Services Department, like others across the country, had seen an increase in the number of applications received from schools and parents seeking additional support.

- (xiii) Growth in High Needs expenditure had been a long-standing issue and growth could fluctuate from year to year making it difficult to forecast. Members noted that a scrutiny workshop had been scheduled in October to provide members with more detail on the Council's Transforming Special Educational Needs in Leicestershire Programme aimed at managing and reducing such demand pressures and related costs.
- (xiv) Whilst an £80m gap in the capital programme had been forecast it was too early to determine if any priority projects might be at risk. It was noted that higher inflation and borrowing costs affected the affordability and planning of capital projects. These would therefore be reviewed and reassessed as part of the overall refresh of the MTFS.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That update on the County Council's short and medium term financial position in light of the current economic climate and changes proposed to the previously agreed 2025-29 capital programme following the latest review be noted;
- (b) That the specific revenue budget monitoring position as at the end of Period 4 (the end of July) be noted;
- (c) That the comments now made by the Scrutiny Commission on the report be presented to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 12 September 2025;
- (d) That the Director of Corporate Resources be requested to circulate:
 - (i) a copy of the procurement documents for the appointment of an external consultant to carry out the planned strategic review;
 - (ii) a copy of the letter sent by the Leader to MPs regarding local government funding reform.

9

**SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 8th SEPTEMBER 2025****MINUTE EXTRACT****Corporate Complaints and Compliments 2024/25**

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources, the purpose of which was to present the Corporate Complaints and Compliments Annual Report, covering the period from 1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025. A copy of the report, marked 'Agenda Item 12', is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (i) Root cause analysis was undertaken in respect of all complaints received and to identify common themes which supported improvements being made to processes and practices both within departments and the Corporate Complaints Service.
- (ii) Whilst closely monitored, response times to complaints could vary considerably. It was noted that all complaints were investigated to identify if there was any fault on the part of the County Council. Depending on the complexity of the matter concerned impacted the speed with which those investigations could be carried out.
- (iii) Work was taking place to refine how complaints and general enquiries were managed to ensure that issues were routed correctly and handled promptly. In particular, to ensure enquires received, which were not necessarily complaints, were redirected quickly to departments for response.
- (iv) Efforts were underway to use artificial intelligence (AI) technology where possible to support in the drafting of responses to similar complainants. Although these would continue to be prepared on an individual, personalised basis, utilising AI did offer some efficiencies to speed up parts of the process.
- (v) Members raised concerns that sometimes departments added to delays by not responding to the Corporate Complaints Service regarding complaints received. It was emphasised that responsibility for complaints ultimately rested with departments and that its timely response was critical and should be escalated when this occurred.

- (vi) Members emphasised the importance of good communication with service users, which if done correctly helped to avoid complaints in the first instance. Communication during the complaints process also helped to ensure complaints did not escalate further. Members agreed that this should continue to be a key area of focus for improvement across all service areas.
- (vii) Members noted the challenges presented by delays in Special Educational Needs assessments and Education and Health Care Plan process wait times which affected the number of complaints received. Members noted work taking place to address these areas within the Children and Family Services Department through the TSIL Programme but expressed concern that this added to the increasing cost pressures faced by the County Council.
- (viii) A member suggested the use of a 'mystery shopper' approach which might be beneficial in identifying areas for improvement within departments where service users are experiencing frustration which can lead to complaints.
- (ix) It was recognised that capturing compliments was equally important to recognise the good work of officers. Whilst the Authority sought to capture these both formally and informally, it was suggested more could be done.

RESOLVED:

That the Corporate Complaints and Compliments Annual Report, covering the period from 1 April 2024 to 31 March 2025, be noted and the comments now made be presented to the Cabinet at its meeting on 12 September 2025 for consideration.

10



**HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORT OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY
COMMITTEE – 4 SEPTEMBER 2025**

**OUTCOME OF THE 18 – MONTH MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL
STRATEGY STREET LIGHTING DIMMING TRIAL**

MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Environment and Transport the purpose of which was to advise the Committee of the outcome of the 18-month street lighting dimming trial and to seek its views on shaping the future street lighting service, prior to presenting a report to the Cabinet on 12 September 2025. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 9' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

- (a) Members welcomed the work undertaken and the outcome of the pilot. Members agreed that this had been an innovative approach taken by the County Council, noting it was the first authority to trial this level of street light dimming. Members were also pleased to note the level of savings it had delivered which could now be factored into the MTFS year on year.
- (b) The Committee supported the proposal to permanently dim street lights within this trial to 30% between the hours of 8pm and 7am across the County, on the basis there would be continued monitoring of road collisions and crime. Whilst the pilot had not raised any definitive issues and it was noted the reduced lighting levels had largely gone unnoticed, Members agreed this should continue to be monitored, with the opportunity to increase lighting in specific areas if and were deemed necessary for safety or crime related reasons.
- (c) It was noted that as part of the public consultation undertaken prior to the pilot, many respondents raised concerns and these had been monitored as part of the pilot scheme.
- (d) It was highlighted that the areas across the County that were under the 'part night lighting regime' (switching off street lights from midnight to 5.30am) would stay the same and that regime would not be affected by the proposal outlined in the report. Members were informed that not all local authorities operated a Central Management System used by the Council to control street lighting which had been fundamental in being able to take this approach.

The Lead Member for Highways and Transport welcomed the report and Members comments on the success of the dimming trial. He said as a result of the outcome of

the pilot he would recommend to Cabinet that this be made a permanent feature and thanked officers for the work undertaken.

RESOLVED:

That the outcome of the 18-month street lighting dimming trial be noted and welcomed and that the comments now made by the Committee be presented to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 12 September 2025.

11

CABINET - 12 SEPTEMBER 2025**COMMENTS FROM MRS. ANN PENDLEBURY CC IN RELATION TO
AGENDA ITEM 11****A5 Concept Link**11th September 2025

Dear Member

I am writing to you as Cabinet Member in regards to agenda item 11 of the scheduled Cabinet meeting for Friday 12th September 2025, the A5 Concept Link

While I completely agree the Dodwells Island junction is already struggling with traffic jams and long delays and is likely to get worse given the significant increase in housing targets by this government and the imminent Warwickshire approved Padge Hall Farm development, a solution is desperately needed to resolve this issue however I believe there needs to be significant mitigation measures. My concerns are as follows:

1. The road that this will cross into, Roston Drive, is a wide road with no form of mitigation to slow traffic, for which both myself and the previous County Councillor have consistently asked that action takes place on reports of speeding.
2. It has a number of older adults living along this stretch with nearby shops, there is no crossing in place. This road will become the main entrance to Hinckley by traffic users coming south down the A5.
3. There are schools on nearby streets both North and South of Roston Drive and we are encouraging children to walk/cycle to school through the Active Travel Campaigns. This road has no cycle routes, again there is no crossing and this would effectively be an extension to the Concept Link/Normandy Way without any of the safeguards and let's remember there have been several accidents including fatalities within the last twelve months on Normandy Way.
4. Roston Drive ends at a park, there is a 90degree left hand turn into Outlands Drive which I believe will result in a significant increase in road accidents especially in poor weather so again mitigation would be needed.
5. From Outlands Drive your options to access the town centre are Westray Drive or Lismore Drive, these are residential streets which are narrow with cars parked along most days at most times of day. Westray Drive (represented by Mr Bray CC) has a very popular park (Hollycroft Park) along one side. You would then turn into

Hollycroft which has traffic lights and generally is already backed up most mornings. Mr Bray confirms there has in the past been speeding concerns raised in this area – though the speed reduction measures installed have divided residents.

6. If alternatively, you chose to access the town through Outlands Drive, I have footage of two accidents along this hill/slope during cold weather and again this is a popular school route.
7. Roston Drive used to have signage restricting heavy goods vehicles. While I know this signage is no longer in place, we would again have HGVs using this road and hitting all the pinch points described above alongside all the housing estates into the night.
8. There are a number of side roads off Roston Drive which have already had issues with speeding including Broddick Road and Glenbarr Drive, this will get worse.
9. The improvements to the A5 were approved by the local authority over 20 years ago and have still not materialised and yet National Highways have approved development despite the given increase in traffic and the previously planned mitigation.
10. Normandy Way needs speed reduction measures. County Councillor Mullaney and I would both ask for this to be a priority.

Thank you

Cllr Ann Pendlebury

County Councillor for Hollycroft