CABINET - TUESDAY 8 SEPTEMBER 2026

ORDER PAPER

ITEM	DETAILS
	APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE
	None.
1.	**MINUTES** (Pages 5 - 14)
	That the minutes of the meeting held on 21 July 2026 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'S PARTNERSHIP YEARLY REPORT 2025/26** (Pages 15 - 98)
	• *The Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the draft Yearly Report at its meeting on 1 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked "4".*
	Proposed motion
	a) That the comments of the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;
	b) That the draft Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Partnership Yearly Report for 2025-26 be noted.
5.	**DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2025/26** (Pages 99 - 150)
	• *The Adults and Cultural Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the draft Annual Report at its meeting on 7 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked "5".*

Proposed motion

a) That the comments of the Adults and Cultural Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;

b) That the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board Annual Report for 2025-2026 be noted.

6. MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY - BUDGET MONITORING AND STRATEGY REFRESH (Pages 151 - 192)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered a report on the MTFS position at its meeting on 2 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 for the current financial year be noted;

d) That the proposed approach outlined in the report to updating the Medium Term Financial Strategy be approved;

e) That the revised Capital Programme for 2026/27 to 2029/30 as set out in Appendix C to the report be approved.

7. LOCAL GOVERNMENT REORGANISATION - LEGAL CHALLENGE (Pages 193 - 198 and Supplementary Reports pages 1 - 5 and 1 - 12)

Proposed motion

a) That the letter dated 7 September 2026 from the Minister for Local Government, Devolution and Regional Growth confirming that the Government is undertaking a review of the Local Government Reorganisation programme, that the review will include the 14 decisions made in July 2026, and that councils and their partners have been asked to cease work on implementing those decisions until the review has concluded be noted;

b) That the Government's review and the Minister's request that implementation work should cease represent a material change of circumstances since publication of the supplementary report be noted;

c) That consideration of the recommendations contained in the supplementary report relating to the preparation and sending of a letter to the Secretary of State under the Pre-Action Protocol for Judicial Review be deferred;

d) That the proposed pre-action protocol letter should not be sent at this stage, pending receipt of the written confirmation referred to in paragraph (e) below and consideration of further legal advice;

e) That the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer, following consultation with the Chief Executive and the Leader of the Council, be authorised to write to the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government seeking written confirmation that:

   i. the existing decision affecting local government reorganisation in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland will be treated as having no effect; and

   ii. any decision concerning local government reorganisation in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland will be made afresh following completion of the Government's review;

f) That the Ministry's response should be considered in the light of further legal advice and that, if satisfactory confirmation is received on those matters and that advice does not indicate otherwise, there would be no present need to challenge the existing decision; and

g) Agree that, if the Ministry has not provided a response to the urgent queries referred to in paragraph 4 e) above within seven days of the letter being sent, or if any response received does not provide satisfactory confirmation of the position, the Chief Executive, following consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Chief Legal Officer and Monitoring Officer, and having regard to up-to-date legal advice, be authorised to finalise and send a letter to the Secretary of State under the Pre-Action Protocol for Judicial Review on behalf of the Council, noting that this authority does not extend to the commencement of judicial review proceedings, which would require a separate decision under the Council's constitutional arrangements.

8. INVESTING IN LEICESTERSHIRE PROGRAMME ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORT 2025 - 2026 (Pages 199 - 206)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered the IiLP Annual Performance report at its meeting on 2 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked "8".*

<u>Proposed motion</u>

a) That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;

b) That the performance of the Investing in Leicestershire Programme for the period April 2025 to March 2026 as set out in the Annual Report, be noted.

9. CORPORATE ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN 2022-2026 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE AND STRATEGY UPDATE REPORT 2025-2026 (Pages 207 - 218)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered the CAMP Annual Performance report at its meeting on 2 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 Asset Management Plan 2022-2026 Annual Performance and Strategy update report 2025-2026 be noted;

c) That the implementation of the updated Action Plan be supported.

10. CORPORATE COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS ANNUAL REPORT 2025-2026 (Pages 219 - 252)

- *The Scrutiny Commission considered the Complaints and Compliments Annual Performance report at its meeting on 2 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked "10".*

Proposed motion

a) That the comments of the Scrutiny Commission be noted;

b) That the Corporate Complaints and Compliments Annual Report 2025-2026 be noted.

11. LEICESTERSHIRE SCHOOL TERM DATES AUTUMN 2027 TO SUMMER 2032 - OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION (Pages 253 - 284)

Proposed motion

a) That the outcome of the consultation on proposed Leicestershire term dates for the academic years 2027/28 to 2031/32 be noted;

b) That the recommended term date model as set out in paragraphs 47 to 55 of the report (dates given in Appendix A) be approved for implementation.

12. LEICESTERSHIRE SEND REFORM PLAN (Pages 285 - 298)

Proposed motion

a) That the national SEND Reform policy direction and the submission of the Local [Leicestershire] SEND Reform Plan to the DfE be approved in principle;

b) That the delivery approach to the Local SEND Reform Plan - via the Experts at Hand and SEND Sufficiency and Inclusion Bases - be supported;

c) That it be noted that the final SEND Reform Plan will be submitted to the Cabinet later in 2026 for approval.

13. CARERS STRATEGY - OUTCOME OF CONSULTATION AND APPROVAL OF FINAL STRATEGY (Pages 299 - 366)

- *The Adults and Cultural Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered the Carers Strategy at its meeting on 7 September and its comments are attached to this Order Paper, marked "13".*

Proposed motion

a) That the comments of the Adults and Cultural Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee be noted;

b) That the feedback from the consultation exercise be noted;

c) That the Leicestershire Carers Strategy 2026-2030 be approved.

14. ACTION TAKEN BY THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE TO APPROVE THE PROCUREMENT OF CONTRACTS IN RELATION TO EXTRA CARE SERVICES (Pages 367 - 370)

Proposed motion

That the action taken by the Chief Executive following consultation with the Leader of the Council to approve the procurement of contracts relating to Extra Care Services be noted.

15. DRUG AND ALCOHOL TREATMENT AND RECOVERY SERVICE RE-PROCUREMENT (Pages 371 - 386)

Proposed motion

a) That the use of the direct award process C for the procurement of the drug and alcohol treatment and recovery service, in line with funding requirements of the Public Health Grant and national guidance be approved;

b) The Director of Public Health, Communities, Law and Governance be authorised to enter into any contractual arrangements necessary to bring into effect the new substance use contract with effect no later than 1 April 2028.

16. RESPONSE TO THE NORTH WEST LEICESTERSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION (Pages 387 - 424)

- *With the agreement of the Chairman, Mr. J. Boam CC, member for the Whitwick division, will speak on this item.*

Proposed motion

a) That the proposed timetable for the progression of the North West Leicestershire District Council (NWLDC) Local Plan be noted;

b) The County Council's formal response to NWLDC's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation, set out in paragraphs 35 to 69 and the Appendix to the report be approved, noting in particular that the County Council:

i) Recognises the significant challenges and pressures that Plan Making Authorities, such as NWLDC, are facing.

ii) Does not raise any fundamental issue with the Plan's spatial strategy, subject to continued delivery of committed infrastructure, a suitable future delivery and contributions strategy, and consideration of viability implications over the plan period being set out with necessary modifications to plan policies.

iii) Will work with NWLDC to ensure that the Local Plan clearly demonstrates a response to the transport evidence produced, and that it will proactively consider and embed Community Infrastructure Levy within the Local Plan to build on the existing approach with the District;

c) That the Director of Growth, Environment and Transport, following consultation with the relevant Cabinet Lead Members, be authorised to make amendments to the detailed Regulation 19 response, noting that:

i) Amendments will take into account officer views of the published Whole Plan Viability Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan;

ii) The formal response (comprising the Cabinet report and updated Appendix) will be submitted to NWLDC ahead of the consultation period closing on 11 September 2026.

17. RESPONSE TO THE HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION (Pages 425 - 464)

- *Comments have been received from the Ulverscroft Residents Group which are attached to this Order Paper, marked "17".*
- *With the agreement of the Chairman, Mrs D. Taylor CC will speak on this item.*

<u>Proposed motion</u>

a) That the proposed timetable for the progression of the Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council (H&BBC) Local Plan be noted;

b) That the County Council's formal response to H&BBC's Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation, set out in paragraphs 46 to 79 and the Appendix to the report be approved, noting in particular that the County Council:

i) Recognises the significant challenges and pressures that Plan Making Authorities, such as H&BBC, are facing.

ii) Does not raise any fundamental issue with the Plan's spatial strategy, subject to a suitable delivery and contributions strategy, and consideration of viability implications over the plan period being set out with necessary modifications to plan policies.

iii) Will work with H&BBC to ensure that the Local Plan clearly demonstrates a response to the transport evidence produced, and that it will proactively consider and embed Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) within the Local Plan and seek to bring forward a CIL charging schedule at pace alongside the adoption of the Local Plan.

c) The Director of Growth, Environment and Transport, following consultation with the relevant Cabinet Lead Members, be authorised to make amendments to the detailed Regulation 19 response, noting that:

i) Amendments will take into account officer views of the published Whole Plan Viability Assessment and Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

ii) The formal response (comprising the Cabinet report and updated Appendix) will be submitted to H&BBC ahead of the consultation period closing on 21 September 2026.

18. ITEMS REFERRED FROM OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

None.

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

None.

20. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

Proposed motion

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

A511 Growth Corridor - Scheme Update And Business Case Submission.

Officer to contact

Jenny Bailey
Democratic Services
Tel: (0116) 305 2583
Email: jenny.bailey@leics.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

4

Leicestershire County Council

CHILDREN AND FAMILIES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

1 SEPTEMBER 2026

DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING CHILDREN PARTNERSHIP YEARLY REPORT 2025-26

MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report relating to the Draft Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Children Partnership Yearly Report 2025-26. A copy of the report, marked ‘Agenda Item 12’, is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were raised:

(i). The Committee was informed that young scrutineers had been appointed in order to ensure additional independent oversight of independent young scrutineers for both children's and adults' safeguarding arrangements. The Scrutineers reviewed reports from performance groups, case review meetings and statutory audits, attended Board meetings, and provided independent challenge and oversight. The young scrutineers had joined a number of Partnership sub-groups, and were already contributing to safeguarding initiatives, including the development of safeguarding awareness posters. Members noted that the contribution of the young scrutineers would be reflected in future reporting periods, as their appointments had taken place after the period covered by the current report.

(ii). In response to a question regarding the impact of the Safeguarding Partnership's work and the evidence that interventions had improved outcomes for children, the Director stated that the Safeguarding Partnership operated a comprehensive governance structure designed to hold all partner agencies accountable for their safeguarding responsibilities. Senior oversight was provided through governance arrangements extending from director level representatives across partner organisations to chief executive level. An annual safeguarding plan, informed by local and national evidence, learning from reviews, and identified priorities, provided the framework for Partnership activity. The Partnership also shared learning from local case reviews, rapid reviews, and national safeguarding reviews, including joint learning arrangements across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland. The Director assured the Committee that feedback received from a national review panel following submitted rapid reviews had been positive regarding safeguarding practice within the local area.

(iii). Members were pleased that performance monitoring formed a key element of the governance structure. The Director stated that a dedicated subgroup reviewed safeguarding performance across agencies, identifying areas of concern and seeking improvement where necessary. Where issues could not be resolved, a formal escalation process existed, allowing matters to be raised through the governance structure to chief executive level and equivalent senior leadership positions.

(iv). A question was raised regarding escalation arrangements where concerns arose about the performance of partner agencies. The Director stated that the escalation process applied consistently across all partner organisations. Where necessary, concerns could be escalated through the relevant organisation's management structures, including to Chief Officers such as the Chief Constable, Chief Executive of a local authority, or the equivalent senior leadership within health organisations. The Partnership retained the ability to escalate concerns where it considered a partner agency's response to be insufficient.

(v). In response to a question regarding the principal areas of safeguarding risk and evidence of improvement, the Director stated that significant work had been undertaken relating to child sexual abuse. This included collaboration across Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland with partner agencies, the development of services and local strategies, and extensive auditing to assess the quality and impact of interventions. Members noted that a Joint Targeted Area Inspection undertaken in December 2025 had resulted in positive feedback from inspectors. Further examples included work promoting safe sleeping for babies, supported by public awareness campaigns and workforce training to ensure key messages reached new parents.

(vi). Concern was raised regarding the potential impact of Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) on safeguarding arrangements, particularly the loss of existing district council functions which contributed to safeguarding processes. Clarification was sought regarding planning for future arrangements. The Director assured the Committee that preparations for LGR would ensure that safe and effective services for children and families would be maintained throughout the transition period and beyond. It would essential that service users should experience continuity of service, regardless of organisational changes. Work was being undertaken to ensure that appropriate structures, staffing and responsibilities were in place within future arrangements, and that no gaps or loopholes would emerge as a result of transition. Safeguarding responsibilities would continue to be discharged effectively wherever families came into contact with services.

RESOLVED:

(a). That the draft yearly report assessing the impact of the work undertaken in 2025/26 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 8 September 2026.

5

ADULTS AND CULTURAL SERVICES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

7 SEPTEMBER 2026

DRAFT LEICESTERSHIRE AND RUTLAND SAFEGUARDING ADULTS BOARD ANNUAL REPORT 2025-26

MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report of the Independent Chair of the Leicestershire and Rutland Safeguarding Adults Board (LRSAB) for 2025/26. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 8' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

i. Members discussed the Board's work on equality, diversity and inclusion. Officers explained that safeguarding data indicated disproportionately low levels of alerts and enquiries from some demographic groups. Further work would seek to establish whether all communities were being reached and felt able to raise safeguarding concerns. The Board also considered lessons learnt concerning people with learning disabilities and other groups experiencing poorer outcomes.

ii. The Committee noted the increase in safeguarding alerts. Officers advised that 4,337 alerts had been received during 2025/26 and that the increase reflected outreach, training and improved awareness among partner agencies. The proportion progressing to section 42 enquiries had remained broadly stable and consistent with the national position.

iii. In response to concern about the resources required to manage increased activity, officers confirmed that the Council had increased operational safeguarding capacity through investment associated with the Care Quality Commission improvement programme. Processes had also been revised, including improvements to the provider portal and feedback to referrers.

iv. It was clarified that reserves were being used to support the Safeguarding Adults Board business office rather than the Council's operational safeguarding activity. Contributions from partners had remained unchanged for several years and discussions were taking place about increasing them. The remaining reserves were expected to support the Board for at least a further two years.

v. The Healthwatch representative asked about increases in neglect, self-neglect and domestic abuse. Officers referred to revised self-neglect guidance, associated training and audit work, and advised that all recommendations arising from work on domestic abuse in older adults had been addressed. Increased identification of concerns involving people living in their own homes was considered positive because those individuals could have fewer people able to recognise risk.

vi. Members requested a fuller breakdown of people affected by safeguarding concerns, including disability and primary need. Officers confirmed that relevant information was held within the care management system and undertook to circulate available data after the meeting.

vii. Members emphasised the need for reports to explain clearly what had changed for individuals. Officers reported that desired outcomes had been met in 95.8% of enquiries and that risk had been removed or reduced in over 90% of cases. Of 4,337 alerts, 1,531 had met the statutory threshold for a safeguarding enquiry.

viii. Officers undertook to examine whether information could be provided on repeat alerts and on alerts which had not progressed to a section 42 enquiry. It was explained that non-qualifying contacts could relate to care quality, complaints or circumstances falling outside the statutory safeguarding criteria. An easy-read version of the annual report had also been drafted for publication.

RESOLVED:

That:

a) The draft annual report and the comments made by the Committee be noted.

b) The Director of Adults and Cultural Services be requested to circulate available data providing a fuller breakdown of the people affected by safeguarding concerns.

c) The Director of Adults and Cultural Services be requested to consider whether information could be provided on repeat safeguarding alerts and alerts which did not progress to a section 42 enquiry.

Leicestershire County Council

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 2 SEPTEMBER 2026

MINUTE EXTRACT

Medium Term Financial Strategy Monitoring and Strategy Update

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources which set out the Council's short and medium term financial position in light of the current economic climate. The report detailed the changes to the previously agreed 2026-30 capital programme following the latest review and covered the latest revenue budget monitoring position for 2026/27. A copy of the report and the supplementary report marked 'Agenda Item 9' are filed with these minutes.

The Chairman advised the Committee that Mr Fowler, the Lead Member for Resources, had been invited to attend the meeting for this item and items 10 to 13 but disappointingly was not present.

(i) The Committee noted that the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) approved in February 2026 had forecasted that £15.5 million of reserves would likely be used to deliver a balanced budget come the year end. The current forecast, however, now showed a £4.8 million underspend against service and corporate budgets, which reduced the anticipated call on reserves to approximately £10.5 million.

(ii) A Member expressed concern that Council communications had referred to the delivery of savings but did not make clear that these reflected an underspend and that, despite this, the Council still forecasted a need to use its reserves. The Member suggested such communication was therefore factually incorrect and duplicitous. The Director robustly rejected this suggestion and emphasised that budget monitoring reports were prepared consistently against the approved budget and that the figures provided were factually correct. He further emphasised that the report followed the same format which had always been used and that there had been no change in approach by officers. The report simply provided commentary against the agreed budget in accordance with normal practice.

(iii) The Chair clarified that some Members were concerned this message put out on behalf of the County Council was misleading regarding the

Council's current financial position. The Chair explained that such questions would have been put to the Lead Member had he attended. The Director again firmly rejected the suggestion that the language in the report and any communications arising from this put out by the Council, which would have been based on the report, was in any way 'misleading'. The Chair clarified that concerns did not relate to the Council's press release and were not intended to be directed to officers. The Director further stated that if the concerns related to social media posts, they were not relevant to the meeting and that the Commission's focus should be on the content of the report before them.

(iv) It was noted that although a need to use reserves had similarly been forecast when the 2024/25 and 2025/26 budgets had been set, ultimately this had not been necessary by the year end. The Director advised that it was not yet clear if this would again be the position come the end of the 2026/27 financial year. A significant proportion of the Council's expenditure was demand-led and volatile and the delivery of further underspends could not be predicted with confidence. A cautious approach at this stage was still therefore necessary.

(v) The forecasted high-needs deficit for 2026/27 was £62.2 million. This was an annual, rather than cumulative, forecast based on the first four months of the year. The Director confirmed that the position remained volatile. Members were pleased to note that demand growth had slowed and the placement mix was less costly, but it was recognised that there was no assurance that these trends would continue.

(vi) Government support covering 90% of the accumulated High Needs Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) deficit had been confirmed only to 31 March 2026. The Director advised that support for deficits arising thereafter remained uncertain and might not be clarified until 2028. In the absence of further confirmation, he advised that the MTFS would need to continue to allow for a reserve estimate for new deficits. Members noted that under local government reorganisation, the DSG deficit, together with all other assets and liabilities of each authority, would need to be apportioned between successor authorities in accordance with principles yet to be agreed.

(vii) The Commission welcomed the early repayment of £36 million of external debt since April 2026. The Director explained that early repayment decisions were made by comparing any premium payable with the interest savings over the remaining life of the debt. The debt repaid had attracted interest of approximately 7–8%, making the long-term saving significant.

Members were assured that early debt repayment decisions were only taken where a net saving had been demonstrated. Members requested that further details of the premiums, interest savings, and assumptions supporting the early repayment decisions be circulated to members for information outside the meeting.

(viii) Adult Social Care direct-payment “claw backs” were £0.5m under budget. This related to unused balances held by adult social care service users. Clawbacks were expected following annual reviews carried out. Whist there had been some delay in this process the Director assured Members that the Department was working to bring recovery activity back on track while following required processes to support service users through this process.

(ix) Members expressed concern about the funding required to meet the Council’s statutory duty to provide sufficient school places following a Department for Education change to its grant allocation methodology, which had significantly reduced the Council’s funding. The Director advised that officers were reviewing available and prospective section 106 contributions, other capital receipts, scheme prioritisation and delivery options to avoid or reduce the need for external borrowing. Members noted the potential cost of additional provision at ten schools was still being assessed, with further information expected to be included in the draft MTFS report to be presented to the Cabinet in December and the Commission in January 2027.

(x) Members questioned the potential effect of Local Government Reorganisation on the letting of areas of County Hall. The Director advised that no tenants at County Hall had been served notice to terminate their tenancy and that there was available space to accommodate some degree of reorganisation. Members noted that one tenant had given notice to the Council, creating additional space, however, this was not being actively marketed to new occupiers give the limited period before reorganisation.

(xi) Members questioned the impact of vacancies and the difficulty faced in recruiting staff and whether this gave rise to any significant service delivery risks. The Director advised that whilst recruitment remained challenging in some service areas, the overall position was not materially worse than in recent years. Permanent appointments continued to be made notwithstanding local government reorganisation, as frontline services would transfer to successor authorities. It was suggested that individual scrutiny committees should examine vacancy levels and their impact on service delivery where this was considered material. It was noted for individual service areas this would be considered by the service-related scrutiny committee.

(xii) A Member raised a question regarding the Administration's prospective council tax policy and asked whether the higher increase was under active consideration. Officers undertook to obtain a response from the Lead Member on this point after the meeting. The Commission requested that the response be recorded in the minutes.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the report and comments now made be noted and presented to the Cabinet at its meeting on 8th September for consideration;

(b) That the Director of Corporate Resources be requested to provide further details of the premiums, interest savings, and assumptions supporting the early debt repayment decisions outlined in the report;

(c) That the Lead Member for Resources be asked to confirm the Administration's prospective council tax policy and whether the higher increase was under active consideration; the response to be recorded in the minutes.

Leicestershire County Council

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 2 SEPTEMBER 2026

MINUTE EXTRACT

Investing in Leicestershire Programme Annual Performance Update 2025/26

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources, the purpose of which was to set out the performance of the County Council's Investing in Leicestershire Programme (IILP) in 2025/26. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 10' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were noted:

(i) The reduction in the value of the Fund was not considered to be a cause for concern. It was explained that this reflected updated market valuations rather than a reduction in the income being generated by the Fund. In particular, the valuation of some office assets, including Embankment House in Nottingham, had reduced due to wider market conditions and lease expiry assumptions, but this did not affect the rental income currently being received from existing tenants

(ii) Members noted that the valuation of the Council's office assets took account of tenants coming to the end of their lease and who may therefore choose to vacate, and the relative merits of selling properties with sitting tenants or with vacant possession.

(iii) The sublet element of office accommodation at County Hall had remained relatively constant and, pending the establishment of shadow authority arrangements for Local Government Reorganisation, the Fund would continue to operate on a business-as-usual basis in respect of this property.

(iv) In response to questions concerning the valuation of farmland, Bosworth Battlefield and other heritage assets, it was explained that specialist valuation methods were used employing external valuers. It was also noted that different categories of heritage asset including parkland, were valued in different ways.

(v) The allocation of IiLP assets between successor authorities following Local Government Reorganisation remained uncertain and would ultimately be a political decision to be negotiated and determined by the two shadow authorities once established. Different approaches, including allocation by geography, could be considered. The Director advised he would recommend that the rural estate remained intact as currently held by the County Council as dividing it could affect the overall sustainability and therefore benefit to the rural parts of Leicestershire. Regarding timing, it was noted that settlement of land assets and other comparable issues in Northamptonshire which had been reorganised some time ago had only recently reached a conclusion and therefore locally this could take a considerable period to resolve.

(vi) Members questioned the difference between the target and actual asset allocations. It was noted that the target had been established in early 2024 following advice from the Council's external advisors, Hymans Robertson. Subsequent increases in the directly held property portfolio, together with the recent return of £7 million from diversifiers, had moved the Fund further from the target. The next review of the Fund would be carried out imminently and this would inform the future direction of the Fund and targets set.

(vii) It was questioned if investments in pooled property assets could truly be considered 'diversifiers' given they were still invested in property. It was noted that a focus on property had been the original aim of the Fund but that for these types of investment, this was no longer considered appropriate. Therefore, monies recently returned from pooled property investments had not been reinvested in property and the plan remained to reduce the Fund's property exposure.

(viii) Whilst there had been a reduction in debt, £631,000 remained. It was noted that this was below target and spread across all asset classes. The Director undertook to provide a breakdown of the total debt across each asset class and to circulate this to members after the meeting.

(ix) Regarding the Lutterworth East Strategic Development scheme, it was explained that due to the scale and complex nature of the scheme, its viability is reviewed periodically against prevailing market conditions and changes made to the scheme as necessary. For example, land originally allocated for offices currently had lower value than historically owing to limited demand and alternative uses could therefore be considered. It was emphasised that this did not necessarily mean reducing the scope of the scheme. Discussions were ongoing with Homes England and the process of reassessment, replanning and taking action to improve delivery would continue throughout the development.

(x) Members requested that future reporting on key performance indicators set out in the appended IILP Performance Report make clearer whether targets were being achieved, for example through appropriate RAG rating.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the report be noted and comments now made be noted and presented to the Cabinet at it its meeting in September for consideration;

(b) That the Director be requested to provide a breakdown of the £631,000 debt across all asset classes and that this be circulated to members of the Commission;

(c) That future reports on key performance indicators be made clearer as to whether targets were being achieved, for example through appropriate RAG rating.

This page is intentionally left blank

Leicestershire County Council

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 2 SEPTEMBER 2026

MINUTE EXTRACT

Corporate Asset Management Plan Annual Performance Report 2025/26

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources, the purpose of which was to present the Commission's consideration the Corporate Complaints and Compliments Annual Report, covering the period from 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 11' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion the following points were made:

(i) Members expressed concern that performance had declined with 52% of indicators being achieved in 25/26 compared to 67% the previous year. It was acknowledged that performance had been mixed, but that the indicators covered a very broad portfolio, including normal property projects and improvements to energy performance projects and building schemes, some of which depended on factors outside the Council's control. Delivery was also sometimes dependent on services first defining their strategies before the property implications could be progressed resulting in the rephasing of projects which could also affect individual indicators being achieved. Members requested that future reports distinguish between indicators so that it could be more clearly identified where delivery had genuinely fallen short of targets expected.

(ii) The cost of identified maintenance liabilities had increased by approximately £3 million. It was questioned if this was fully funded within the MTFS and when it could be expected these works would be carried out. Members noted that £1.8m of this related to priority one works which would be carried out within 12 months and so were fully funded. The remainder would be reviewed and programmed as necessary. The Director explained that the estimate of maintenance liabilities represented a snapshot in time and was regularly reassessed before works commenced, as assets could remain serviceable for longer than anticipated or alternative interventions might become appropriate.

(iii) In response to a request for greater visibility of the underlying property maintenance programme, the Director explained that the Property Operations Team maintained a planned preventative maintenance programme. Items expected in years one and two were more certain than those in years three to five, and the programme was continually updated through inspections and liaison with the Strategic Property Team, including consideration of proposed disposals where the cost of maintaining a property might exceed its value. Members asked that the schedule of planned maintenance works be shared with members of the Commission. The Director undertook to provide this after the meeting.

(iv) Members highlighted the relevance of maintenance liabilities to Local Government Reorganisation, as significant future expenditure could affect decisions by successor authorities about which assets to retain. The Director agreed that an asset's maintenance burden would form part of the assessment of whether it represented a genuine asset or a liability and noted that anticipated consolidation of the property estate could justify deferring some works.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the report be noted;

(b) That future reports distinguish between key performance indicators so that Members could clearly identified where delivery had genuinely fallen short of targets expected;

(c) That the current schedule of planned maintenance works be shared with members of the Commission.

Leicestershire County Council

SCRUTINY COMMISSION – 2 SEPTEMBER 2026

MINUTE EXTRACT

CORPORATE COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIMENTS ANNUAL REPORT 2025-2026

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 2025 to 31 March 2026. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 12' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion the following points were made:

(i) Of the 118 enquiries received by the Local Government and Social Care Ombudsman, 27 had proceeded to investigation and 25 of those had been upheld. The remaining enquiries had not warranted a full investigation because, for example, they were premature in their submission, outside the Ombudsman's jurisdiction or the Ombudsman had decided simply an investigation was not warranted. An upheld complaint was one where fault had been found. A Member suggested that future reports should explain more clearly why cases had not been progressed and make clear that such complaints had nevertheless been considered and reached an outcome.

(ii) Members discussed the increasing use of artificial intelligence to prepare complaints and how this made dealing with them more time consuming and complex placing an additional burden on officer resources. Whilst caution was advised against using artificial intelligence to respond to complaints, particularly where legal issues were involved, options were being considered to assist with triage and streamline the complaints process.

(iii) It was recognised that artificial intelligence could help some residents articulate concerns which they might otherwise have difficulty expressing, and services would need to adapt to this.

(iv) Concern was expressed at the reduction in performance against the Stage 2 response-time target, from 61% to 31%. The Director explained that this reflected the volume and increasing complexity of complaints and the resources available within the team. Where a response could not be issued within 10 working days, Members were assured that complainants were still contacted during that period and given an expected response date to help manage expectations and provide reassurance.

(v) Members noted that 299 Stage 1 complaints related to Special Educational Needs and Disabilities services and expressed concern about the number of these complaints that escalated to Stage 2 and resulted in the payment of compensation, rather than being addressed early on. Members requested that further information be shared with the Commission to examine the learning arising from those complaints and the action being taken to improve the service.

(vi) Members welcomed the recording of compliments, including the positive feedback received. It was noted that compliments represented approximately 15% of the combined total of complaints and compliments. It was agreed that the use of a QR code to make it easier for service users to submit feedback was helpful.

(vii) Members requested that abbreviations be avoided or explained in future reports and that charts and graphs be fully labelled.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the Corporate Complaints and Compliments Annual Report, covering the period from 1 April 2025 to 31 March 2026 be noted;

(b) That future reports explain why complaints referred to the Ombudsman were not progressed to investigation, to make clear that those cases had reached an outcome, and that abbreviations be avoided or explained and tables and graphs fully labelled;

(c) That further information be provided on the learning arising from complaints relating to Special Educational Needs and Disabilities services being escalated to stage 2 and resulting in compensation payments being made and what improvements were being made in the services to address these earlier on in the complaints process.

13

Leicestershire County Council

ADULTS AND CULTURAL SERVICES OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

7 SEPTEMBER 2026

LEICESTERSHIRE CARERS STRATEGY 2026-2030

MINUTE EXTRACT

The Committee considered a report of the Director of Adults and Cultural Services presenting the outcome of consultation on the Leicestershire Carers Strategy 2026 to 2030. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 13' is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion, the following points were made:

i. Members were advised that more than 160 people had responded to the formal consultation, in addition to approximately 300 people engaged during development of the draft strategy. Respondents broadly supported the priorities. Key issues included respite provision, loneliness and isolation, crisis support, support for working carers, and improved communication between adults' and children's services for young carers and parent carers.

ii. A Leicestershire Carers Strategy Group would oversee delivery, with representation from Council services and health partners. Recruitment of a dedicated carers lead was under way and the commissioned carers support service was due to be reprocured. A progress update and developed action plan were proposed for submission to the Committee in approximately six months.

iii. Members strongly welcomed the strategy and emphasised the importance of carers being listened to, recognised and valued. The Healthwatch representative welcomed the reflection of carers' views and sought assurance that the health sector would make corresponding commitments. Officers confirmed that health partners had contributed to the strategy and would participate in governance, but accepted that additional NHS commitments should be included in the action plan.

iv. Members requested that the economic value of unpaid carers in Leicestershire be identified, alongside qualitative evidence of the difference made by support. Officers undertook to provide an indicative figure.

v. The difficulty of reaching rural and isolated carers was discussed. Officers advised that the strategy and the proposed grant scheme included commitments to improve engagement and information in harder-to-reach communities. Members suggested greater use of parish councils, community organisations, charity shops and other local networks.

vi. Officers undertook to work with parish councils and local communities as part of implementation. The importance of accessible information, advice and signposting in varied formats and locations was emphasised, including a concise item which carers could retain or display.

vii. It was confirmed that the extension of the existing commissioned carers support contract to 31 March 2028 had been an officer decision made within the extension provisions of the contract.

RESOLVED:

That:

a) The consultation results and the comments made by the Committee be noted.

b) The Director of Adults and Cultural Services be requested to strengthen NHS commitments within the Strategy action plan.

c) The Director of Adults and Cultural Services be requested to provide an indicative assessment of the economic value of unpaid carers in Leicestershire.

d) The Director of Adults and Cultural Services be requested to work with parish councils, community organisations and other local networks to improve the reach of information and support for carers.

e) A progress update and further developed action plan be submitted to the Committee in approximately six months.

CABINET - 8 SEPTEMBER 2026

AGENDA ITEM 17 - RESPONSE TO THE HINCKLEY AND BOSWORTH BOROUGH COUNCIL REGULATION 19 LOCAL PLAN CONSULTATION.

COMMENTS FROM THE ULVERSCROFT RESIDENTS GROUP

Briefing for Leicestershire County Council Meeting 8 September:

Response to Hinckley & Bosworth Regulation 19 Local Plan
MARK004 / M1 J22 – cumulative transport and infrastructure implications for Markfield

I am writing as the **lead representative for the Ulverscroft Residents Group**. We have been examining the evidence supporting the proposed Local Plan, particularly **Policy PS17 / MARK004 at Cliffe Hill Farm, M1 Junction 22**, and the cumulative infrastructure implications of the wider growth proposed around Markfield.

We recognise that responsibility for selecting Local Plan allocations rests with HBBC and that LCC must reach its own professional conclusions. We are asking LCC to consider whether the evidence sufficiently demonstrates **why MARK004 is justified, what additional pressure it places on the transport network, and whether the infrastructure required to accommodate MARK004 alongside wider growth is both deliverable and sufficient.**

This is particularly important because Markfield sits immediately alongside the Charnwood boundary. **The infrastructure affected by development does not stop at the HBBC boundary**, and LCC has a unique strategic role in considering those cumulative effects.

1. Why is MARK004 needed?

We do not dispute the identified Leicester and Leicestershire need for strategic logistics floorspace, nor that proximity to M1 Junction 22 gives MARK004 a genuine strategic freight-location advantage.

However, HBBC's evidence identifies a residual strategic B8 requirement of approximately **515,301 sqm**, while the proposed allocations provide substantially more. Our review indicates that the other three strategic B8 allocations can collectively meet the identified quantitative requirement without MARK004.

MARK004 is therefore **not numerically indispensable**. That does not automatically mean it should not be allocated, but it does mean that numerical need alone cannot justify its selection.

The important question is:

What strategic benefit is obtained by allocating MARK004 which justifies the additional transport, environmental and infrastructure consequences arising from its selection?

HBBC has assessed reasonable alternative sites. Our concern is whether the final evidence sufficiently demonstrates why MARK004 forms part of the **most appropriate strategic B8 portfolio**, rather than a portfolio without it.

2. What additional transport impact does MARK004 create?

The July 2026 Forecasting Report includes a Stage 1a **"Without Local Plan"** scenario. However, MARK004 is already included in this baseline because of its live planning history.

Its traffic has therefore **not been omitted**, but the published scenario comparison does not provide a straightforward **"without MARK004 / with MARK004"** assessment showing what selecting MARK004 itself adds to the network.

For a major logistics allocation at M1 Junction 22, we would ask LCC:

Where has the incremental transport consequence of selecting MARK004 been demonstrated, and how did that assessment inform its selection, mitigation and infrastructure requirements?

The live planning application reinforces why this matters. It requires a dedicated A50 entry, separate Whitwick Road egress and associated highway works, and has required continuing consideration by LCC Highways and National Highways. This does not demonstrate that the development cannot be accommodated, but it illustrates the **scale of its highway dependency**.

3. The cumulative picture is wider than MARK004

MARK004 cannot sensibly be considered in isolation.

Alongside it, the Regulation 19 Plan proposes approximately **400 homes through MARK001, MARK002 and MARK003** around Markfield. There are also existing housing and employment commitments, together with development in adjoining Charnwood using the same network.

The modelling itself illustrates the difficulty: MARK001 and MARK004 are already included in Stage 1a because of their planning history, while MARK002 and MARK003 are subsequently introduced as Local Plan allocations. A simple comparison between scenarios therefore does not provide a straightforward before-and-after picture of **all the growth affecting Markfield**.

Residents experience one road network, not separate HBBC and Charnwood networks.

We would therefore ask LCC to consider whether planned allocations, existing commitments and relevant cross-boundary development have been adequately considered together against the capacity of the **A50/A511/J22 corridor**.

4. What happens after the planned interventions?

This cumulative picture makes the results of HBBC's final transport modelling particularly important.

The Forecasting Report identifies **residual cumulative impacts in 2045** at junctions directly affecting Markfield:

Junction	Residual cumulative impact
A511 Field Head Roundabout	**PM peak**
A511 Flying Horse Roundabout	**AM and PM peaks**
M1 Junction 22	**AM peak – including Cliffe Lane and M1 northbound on-slip**

These are not simply existing problems before mitigation. The Forecasting Report expressly identifies them as **residual cumulative impacts after the future intervention scenarios have been modelled**.

The A511 Growth Corridor is central to the infrastructure response. HBBC's Infrastructure Capacity Study states that the scheme is **"due to commence construction in winter 2026"**, but the evidence we have reviewed does not establish when the relevant Field Head and Flying Horse improvements will be **completed and operational relative to the development growth which relies upon them**.

This creates two distinct questions for LCC:

Timing – when will the relevant improvements actually be operational relative to MARK004 and the wider planned and committed growth?

Sufficiency – if residual cumulative impacts remain after intervention, what further mitigation, phasing or development controls will be required?

5. Flood risk and infrastructure deliverability

LCC also has an important role as **Lead Local Flood Authority**.

The MARK004 planning application has required substantial further drainage work. Subsequent investigation indicates substantial theoretical capacity in the **900 mm Whitwick**

Road culvert, but our review has not identified an equivalent assessment of the **complete downstream Priory Lane ditch/open-watercourse system**, while defects requiring remedial works have been identified elsewhere in the existing drainage network.

We recognise that the latest LLFA position is more positive and that detailed drainage design belongs primarily within the planning application process.

The strategic question is therefore:

Is LCC satisfied that MARK004, alongside wider cumulative growth affecting the same catchments, has a credible drainage and flood-risk delivery pathway which will not increase flood risk elsewhere?

6. Can the development relied upon actually deliver Policy PS17?

HBBC itself creates a question about the effectiveness of the allocation.

Paragraph 6.346 describes PS17/MARK004 as being **"supplemented by a live planning application, ref 25/00931/FUL"**, with the supporting text identifying access, mitigation, buffers, green infrastructure and comprehensive master planning among the matters necessary for development.

Yet paragraph 6.353 states that applications already submitted **"should not be required to retrospectively comply with requirements set out in this Policy and Plan as a whole."**

This tension is sharpened by the August 2026 NPPF. Its new national decision-making policies apply to the live application, while the transitional arrangements mean this legacy Local Plan continues under the December 2024 plan-making framework. The application relied upon to support MARK004's deliverability may therefore be determined under a different national decision-making framework without being required retrospectively to comply with PS17.

The effectiveness question is:

If the live application is relied upon as evidence that MARK004 is deliverable, how has HBBC established that the development capable of being permitted will secure the outcomes upon which the effectiveness of PS17 depends?

7. What we are asking LCC to consider

Before LCC finalises its Regulation 19 response, we would be grateful if it could consider five questions:

1. **Justification:** Given that MARK004 is not numerically indispensable, has HBBC sufficiently demonstrated why its selection is justified when weighed against its additional transport and infrastructure consequences?

2. **MARK004's transport impact:** Where is the incremental highway consequence of selecting MARK004 demonstrated, given that its traffic is already included within the Stage 1a **"Without Local Plan"** baseline?
3. **Cumulative growth:** Have MARK001–004, existing commitments and relevant development in adjoining Charnwood been sufficiently considered together against the **single transport network serving Markfield and J22**?
4. **Timing and sufficiency:** Is LCC satisfied that cumulative growth can be accommodated when residual impacts remain at **Field Head, Flying Horse and M1 J22 after intervention**; when will the relevant improvements be operational; and what further measures are required if those interventions are insufficient?
5. **Flooding and deliverability:** Is LCC satisfied that MARK004 has a credible infrastructure and drainage delivery pathway without increasing flood risk elsewhere and, given HBBC's reliance on the live application, that the development capable of being permitted can secure the outcomes required by PS17?

We appreciate that LCC must reach its own professional conclusions and that responsibility for selecting allocations rests with HBBC.

Our request is simply that, before LCC responds to the Regulation 19 Plan, it considers not only whether MARK004 and the wider growth have been included somewhere within the evidence base, but whether the evidence demonstrates **why MARK004 is justified, what it adds to the network, and whether the infrastructure relied upon will be delivered in time and will be sufficient.**

I would be very grateful if you could ensure these matters are brought to the attention of the relevant LCC members and officers.

Kind regards,

Helen Oliver
Ulverscroft Residents Group

Supporting Evidence – Key Primary Sources

MARK004 / M1 Junction 22 – Ulverscroft Residents Group

Key primary sources supporting the accompanying briefing. References are provided to enable the principal evidence to be readily checked.

Briefing issue	Primary source
Strategic B8 need / MARK004	**HBBC Employment Land Provision Topic Paper (July 2026)** and **Regulation 19 Local Plan** – strategic B8 requirement, supply and proposed allocation portfolio.
Transport modelling / cumulative growth	**HBBC Local Plan Modelling – Forecasting Report (July 2026)** – Stage 1a/1b scenario construction and treatment of MARK001–004.
Residual transport impacts	**HBBC Local Plan Modelling – Forecasting Report (July 2026), para 6.4.14, pp.76–77** – residual cumulative impacts at **Field Head (PM), Flying Horse (AM & PM) and M1 J22/Cliffe Lane/northbound on-slip (AM)**.
A511 / infrastructure delivery	**HBBC Infrastructure Capacity Study Phase 3 (5 August 2026), p.18** – A511 Growth Corridor/Field Head scheme, funding and stated winter 2026 construction commencement.
MARK004 highways and drainage	**Planning application 25/00931/FUL** – Transport Assessment/Addenda; Road Safety Audits; LCC and National Highways responses; Flood Risk/Drainage Strategy; LCC LLFA responses; Burrows Graham response (30 July 2026).
PS17 / live application / national policy	**HBBC Regulation 19 Local Plan, paras 6.346 and 6.353–6.355** – relationship between PS17 and live application 25/00931/FUL. **National Planning Policy Framework (17 August 2026), Annex A** – decision-making policies and transitional arrangements for legacy plan-making.