

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Commission held at County Hall, Glenfield on Wednesday, 7 November 2007.

PRESENT

Dr. M. O'Callaghan CC (in the Chair)

Mr. D. R. Bown CC	Mr. R. Fraser CC
Mr. S. J. Galton CC	Mr. G. A. Hart CC
Mr. D. W. Houseman CC	Mr. P. G. Lewis CC
Mr. S. D. Sheahan CC	Mr. R. J. Shepherd CC
Mr. E. D. Snartt CC	

37. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 5th September 2007 were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

38. Question Time.

Mr Abbott, an elector registered in the County, asked the Chairman the following questions under Standing Order 35:-

1. Have the police been formally consulted concerning the impact on police resources both locally (the proposed site) and county-wide re the new powers the police apparently have?
2. If they were consulted, who was consulted?
3. What action will be taken if Travellers refuse to pay fees for access to the Transit Site? Will the Council require "cash-up-front"?
4. How much will the Travellers be charged for access to the site? Is this per person or per caravan or something else? How has this charge been calculated? How much is expected to be generated through fees in the financial year?
5. Is the long-term aim that the Transit Site becomes self-financing?
6. If an illegal encampment that is larger than the available plots on the Transit Site is "moved on", how will Police/Council determine who gets the Transit Site places? What happens to the others?
7. What action will be taken should Travellers intentionally damage, foul or otherwise disrespect the provided transit site? How does the Council propose that the offenders are identified and prosecuted?
8. What action will the Council/Police take to ensure that the Transit Site does not spread on to adjacent land?

9. Can the Council confirm that a Traveller Site will be capped at the proposed size and not allowed to grow over time?
10. What hours will the site warden work? Will the warden live on-site? What training and support will the warden receive to ensure the Council's duty of care to its employees is fulfilled?
11. What will the warden be paid? Will they receive any enhancements to their salary? (for example anti-social hours).
12. What action will be taken should the warden be abused or otherwise treated disrespectfully?
13. What action would be taken if crime rates in the area of a Traveller Site rise above normal levels
14. Would Neighbourhood Policing staff (both Officers and PCSO's) be expected to go on to the Traveller Site during their normal "beat"? Will they provide a visible and reassuring policing presence to the Travellers?
15. Will the objections of NWLDC be considered when arriving at a decision on the placement of the Traveller Site?
16. Do the views of the local community carry sufficient weight to force a change of heart?
17. Will the planning permission process be an open and transparent one despite the Council effectively being judge and jury?
18. Should covenants be lifted to facilitate the placement of a Transit Site, will the same flexibility be available to local residents wishing to lift/alter covenants on their own property?
19. What impact would a Transit Site at Snibston have on the attraction for visitors to the local St Mary's Church?
20. If, as the FAQ suggests, property values would not be adversely affected by the placement of a Transit Site, will the Council give an undertaking to compensate home/business owners should values take an unexpected tumble?
21. Will the authorities (Council & Police) take steps to tackle both anti-social behaviour and dangerous/nuisance animals with precisely the same effort as seen in the rest of the local community?
22. Will CCTV be installed at the Transit Site?
23. Should damage, theft or dirt be an issue at the Traveller Site, how promptly would the Council act to put things right?

24. Should crime occur that is traced to a resident on the Traveller Site, can the Police enter the site and apprehend the individual(s) without a warrant?
25. Will the records of Travellers entering the site be retained for use in detecting and preventing benefit fraud?
26. If information/data is retained concerning the Travellers, what other uses will the data be put to?
27. What arrangements will be put in place to monitor both crime levels and community tensions in the vicinity? How will this data be used to benefit the "community cohesion" agenda?
28. Does the Council anticipate a growth in calls to the Single Non-Emergency Number (SNEN) for low level nuisance attributable to the Traveller Site?
29. If, as it appears, the local tax payer will end up paying for refuse collection that is not recycled, can the Council confirm that the Travellers will also have to pay refuse charges and be provided with the correct boxes/bags to enable them to recycle?

The Chairman replied as follows:-

Except in relation to the following, the questions identify issues which have been addressed in general terms only at this stage in relation to the application of the criteria laid down by the County Council for the selection of suitable transit sites. These are matters which will need to be considered in far more detail once decisions have been made in relation to grant funding and the development of a specific site when this has been identified.

The following are the replies to those questions which can be answered specifically at this stage.

- "1. & 2 The Police Community Safety Bureau is a member of the Joint Officer Working Group on Travellers and has been consulted on the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 Sections 62A-E.
6. Those Travellers with greatest assessed needs will be allocated any available space. A detailed policy on these issues will be developed having regard to the need to ensure that those travellers with greatest assessed needs are dealt with appropriately.
15. All objections will be considered.
16. All views will be considered.
17. The planning process is open and transparent."

Mr Abbott asked the following supplementary questions:-

- a) In relation to questions 4 and 5 could the Chairman advise me of the cost likely to be borne by the County Council if the travellers using the site do not pay the required site charges?
- b) In relation to questions 8 and 9 what arrangements will be put in place to prevent overspill to adjacent areas and will the size of the site be capped?
- c) In relation to question 12, 13, 14 and 24 what consideration has been given to any enforcement action should the site warden be abused and will the Police take action to deal with any law breaking by site residents including, if appropriate, entry onto the site?
- d) In relation to questions 19 and 20 what arrangements will the County Council put in place to compensate people whose properties have been blighted by these proposals?

The Chairman invited the Director of Corporate Resources to reply. The Director then replied as follows:

- a) 'The report to the Cabinet set out the costs likely to be incurred by the County Council. These were estimated at approximately £20,000 per annum. At this stage it was difficult to give a precise figure as more detail work would need to be done when a specific site had been identified.
- b) These issues will be dealt with in detail when a specific site has been identified. Any site identified will be clearly marked and fenced.
- c) The response of the Police to any incidents is a matter for the Chief Constable.
- d) This will depend on any decision taken by the Cabinet on a specific site.'

39. Questions asked by members under Standing Order 7(3) and 7(5).

Mr John Legrys asked the following questions of the Chairman under Standing Order 7(3):-

A. General County Wide Policy

The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 Section 62A-E give the police powers to remove travellers trespassing, providing a suitable pitch was available on a local authority managed site in the same LA area. The Housing Act 2004 Section 225 ten years later required councils to carry out an assessment of need for traveller sites and, if a shortfall was found, to prepare a strategy in respect of the meeting of such needs and to identify land for new sites.

1. What was the result of the assessment for the County of Leicestershire?
2. When was this assessment carried out?
3. How many sites/pitches are needed in total across the County?
4. In which districts are they needed?
5. How many sites/pitches are needed in each of these districts?
6. Is it the intention eventually to have a least one transit site per district?

In 2004 a Joint Officer Working Party of the County Council, all District Councils, Leicester City Council and Rutland was formed to develop proposals for the development of suitable sites. The paper to Cabinet on 16th January 2007, paragraph 13, mentioned that sites have been only been identified by the County Council and the City Council.

7. Where were the County Sites?
8. What has happened to these sites?

The following have been given as criteria for the selection of suitable transit sites

- The areas of greatest concentration of unauthorised encampments
- Traveller routes
- Location of doctors' surgeries and other amenities
- Near to established Traveller sites
- Good but safe access to major roads
- Access to services (water, electricity)
- Sites with as low as possible impact on local communities
- Accessible to most of the relevant District

9. What is the origin of each of these criteria?
10. Are there any other important criteria which have should be included in this list?

B. With respect to a proposed site in the District of NW Leicestershire

1. How many pitches are being sought for the proposed site?
2. How many caravans will this include?
3. What is the total population estimated for this site?
4. How many adults in total will this include?

5. Has there been any estimate of the number of children this will include?
6. Can you list the sites that were initially surveyed for the transit site in NW Leics?
7. Was land in the ownership of British Coal and other large landowners considered?
8. Were British Coal and the NFU approached regarding sites?
9. What factors led the Council's property department to recommend the Lockington/Hemington sites?
10. Why was it decided not to proceed with these sites?
11. Mention was made of feedback from a consultation meeting with North West Leicestershire Parish Councils in March 2007. Can you list who was invited to this meeting?
12. Were invitations sent to the Parish Councils of Ravenstone, Swannington and Coleorton?
13. If so who were they addressed to?

C. With respect to the current consideration of the three sites in NW Leicestershire

1. Were any soundings taken before these 3 sites were selected? If so what?
2. Have surveys (soil tests etc) been made of any of the proposed sites? If so, where and when?
3. Is the property dept working on other sites in NW Leics?
4. Why wasn't Scrutiny consulted on the non site specific bid?

D. With respect to the consultation process

1. Who is being consulted on these three sites (list organisations please)?
2. Are the police, doctors, schools, PCT being included?
3. Will revenue and capital funding be available, via section 106 agreements and otherwise to support the local infrastructure in coping with the additional population (schools, doctor surgeries etc)?
4. Was the existing traveller community in NW Leicestershire consulted?

5. Will they be consulted?
6. What methods were used to publicise the consultation?
7. What is the normal period of consultation used by the County Council?
8. Why have five weeks been chosen for this consultation?
9. Why have no reasons been given for the short period of consultation? What reasons are there?
10. Is the Citizen's Panel involved in the consultation process, if so why?
11. If so, what weighting will be given to their result?
12. Is it recognised that their response may be skewed given that the majority are unlikely to be remotely affected by the outcome?

E. For Site 1: Land to the north of Ashby Road, Sinope.

1. How many unauthorised encampments have there been in recent years in this area?
2. Which existing traveller routes are close to this site, how close are they?
3. Which doctor's surgery will serve the population of this site? What population does it currently serve?
4. Which school will serve the population of this site? How many pupils does it currently have? Up to how many additional pupils could it be expected to take?
5. What other amenities of importance are close to this site?
6. What other established Traveller sites are in the immediate vicinity?
7. Is the access to the local major roads considered good and safe?
8. How busy are these major roads?
9. What is their accident record in the area of the site?
10. What comments have you received from Highways Development Control on the site?
11. How suitable is the entrance access to the site?
12. What access to services (water, sewerage and electricity) does the site have?

13. How accessible is the site to most of the relevant District?
14. What is the size and location of the immediate community?
15. What is the ratio of the proposed population to that of the existing immediate community?
16. Is this considered to have a low impact on the local community?
17. What impact does the Council think the site will have on the settled community?
18. What impact will the site have on local community cohesion?
19. Is the Council's property department doing any work on identifying other sites in NW Leicestershire?
20. If so, where?
21. If so, why?

F. For Site 2: The former Slaughterhouse, Ashby Road Sinope

1. How many unauthorised encampments have there been in recent years in this area?
2. Which existing traveller routes are close to this site, how close are they?
3. Which doctor's surgery will serve the population of this site? What population does it currently serve?
4. Which school will serve the population of this site? How many pupils does it currently have? Up to how many additional pupils could it be expected to take?
5. What other amenities of importance are close to this site?
6. What other established Traveller sites are in the immediate vicinity?
7. Is the access to the local major roads considered good and safe?
8. How busy are these major roads?
9. What is their accident record in the area of the site?
10. What comments have you received from Highways Development Control on the site?
11. How suitable is the entrance access to the site?

12. What access to services (water, sewerage and electricity) does the site have?
13. How accessible is the site to most of the relevant District?
14. What is the size and location of the immediate community?
15. What is the ratio of the proposed population to that of the existing immediate community?
16. Is this considered to have a low impact on the local community?
17. What impact does the Council think the site will have on the settled community?
18. What impact will the site have on local community cohesion?
19. Is the Council's property department doing any work on identifying other sites in NW Leicestershire?
20. If so, where?
21. If so, why?

G. For Site 3: Land at rear of former Snibston Junior School

1. How many unauthorised encampments have there been in recent years in this area?
2. Which existing traveller routes are close to this site, how close are they?
3. Which doctor's surgery will serve the population of this site? What population does it currently serve?
4. Which school will serve the population of this site? How many pupils does it currently have? Up to how many additional pupils could it be expected to take?
5. What other amenities of importance are close to this site?
6. What other established Traveller sites are in the immediate vicinity?
7. Is the access to the local major roads considered good and safe?
8. How busy are these major roads?
9. What is their accident record in the area of the site?
10. What comments have you received from Highways Development Control on the site?

11. How suitable is the entrance access to the site?
12. What access to services (water, sewerage and electricity) does the site have?
13. How accessible is the site to most of the relevant District?
14. What is the size and location of the immediate community?
15. What is the ratio of the proposed population to that of the existing immediate community?
16. Is this considered to have a low impact on the local community?
17. What impact does the Council think the site will have on the settled community?
18. What impact will the site have on local community cohesion?
19. Is the Council's property department doing any work on identifying other sites in NW Leicestershire?
20. If so, where?
21. If so, why?

H. Following the Decision

1. Does the Council accept that the areas around these sites will in effect suffer from planning blight for future years even if the sites are rejected?
2. What will the Council do in this case to alleviate this concern?
3. Will the Council give a guarantee that, if a site is ruled out as unsuitable in this exercise, then it will rule out the site from all other future consideration and oppose further applications?

I. Enforcement

The Chief Inspector of Police has said that he will still only take into account 'operational issues' and not necessarily move travellers on. What assurances have been made with regard to enforcement?

The Chairman replied as follows:-

A. General County Wide Policy

"1 -6 All these questions are dealt with alongside other matters in the 132 page Report entitled "Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Gypsies' and Travellers' Accommodation Needs Assessment (2006-2016)" prepared for the County Council, Leicester City Council, Rutland Council and the seven district councils by the

Centre for Regional Studies at the University of Birmingham published in April 2007. The report is available on the County Council website and formed part of the consultation on the three sites which ended on 2 November, 2007.

7. This information cannot be made public. The County Solicitor has already indicated in response to a Freedom of Information request that this information is exempt under Section 36 of the Freedom of Information Act 2000, and that the public interest in withholding the information outweighs the public interest of disclosing it. The exemption applies because disclosure of the information on the sites previously considered for travellers' camps would prejudice the effective conduct of public affairs as it is conceivable that one or more of the sites identified might be pursued sometime in the future.
8. No further action has been taken in relation to these sites pending consideration of the three sites identified in the report to the Cabinet on 2 November, 2007.
9. The criteria were prepared on the basis of guidance issued by the Gypsy and Traveller Unit within the Department for Communities and Local Government.
10. Following a meeting with Parish Councils in March 2007 one additional criterion was added relating to "the impact on local communities".

B. With respect to a proposed site in the District of NW Leicestershire

1. 12 to 15.
2. 24 to 30.
- 3,4,5 A detailed estimate has not been undertaken but experience shows that the population is likely to fluctuate.
6. The only sites which have been surveyed are the 3 sites referred to in the report to the meeting of the Cabinet on 2 October, 2007.
7. No.
8. No.
9. The sites closely met the specified criteria.
10. In the light of representations from Lockington cum Hemington Parish Council and expressions of concern from local people, the Cabinet decided that no further action be taken to proceed with a bid to locate a transit site for travellers at either Hemington or Lockington.

- 11.)
- 12.) Please see Appendix attached at the end of these minutes.
- 13.)

C. With respect to the current consideration of the three sites in NW Leicestershire

1. Discussions took place at officer level within the County Council.
2. Some limited, non intrusive, surveys have been undertaken on one site at Sinope and the site at Snibston.
3. Not at present.
4. On 2 October, 2007 the Cabinet agreed in principle that a non-site specific application be made to the East Midlands Regional Assembly for a grant to develop a transit site. The report to that meeting identified the need for this matter to be brought to the attention of the Scrutiny Commission at its meeting on 7 November, 2007.

D. With respect to the consultation process

1. The following organisations were consulted:-

North West Leicestershire District Council
Parish Councils in North West Leicestershire.
Leicestershire Constabulary.
Department for Communities and Local Government.
Leicestershire Fire and Rescue Service.
Children and Young People's Service and Health Travellers Liaison Teams.
Travellers' organisations.
2. These are all covered through consultation with those bodies referred to in the reply to Question D1.
3. No.
4. Yes.
5. See 4 above.
6. The principal methods of publicising the consultation were via the local media, including local newspapers and radio stations, letters to 150 identified houses, displays in public libraries and County Hall and on the County Council's website.
7. 12 weeks wherever possible.
8. & 9. Given the deadlines imposed by the bidding process and that the matter did not affect the whole County area, a five week period was set for the process.

10. Yes, it is involved. The Citizen's Panel is a useful resource and is invited to respond to most consultations.
11. Members of the Panel are required to provide their postcode so that the analysis of results can reflect responses received from different geographical areas.
12. Yes and the response will be analysed on the basis set out in 11 above.

E. For Site 1: Land to the north of Ashby Road, Sinope.

1. In 2006 there were 32 unauthorised encampments in North West Leicestershire.
2. The A511, M42, A42, A50 and M1.
3. There are doctor's surgeries within 2 to 3 miles of the site. Further information on the population served by those surgeries has not been obtained but the Health Travellers' Service have been consulted on the matter.
- 4,5 7 to 18 These questions identify issues which have been addressed in general terms in relation to the application of the criteria. However, they will need to be considered in more detail once decisions have been made in relation to grant funding and the development of the specific site still to be determined.
6. There are two sites adjacent to this site.
19. to 21. Not at present.

F. For Site 2: The former Slaughterhouse, Ashby Road Sinope

Please see the replies to Section E above.

G. For Site 3: Land at rear of former Snibston Junior School

Please see the replies to Section E above in respect of all except the following:-

6. There are no traveller's sites in the immediate vicinity.

H. Following the Decision

1. No.
2. Not Applicable.
3. The County Council has not addressed this issue.

I. Enforcement

This is a matter entirely for the Police.

Mr Legrys asked the following supplementary questions of the Chairman:

- a) Are officers aware of an e-mail from the Chief Constable which implies that, even if a travellers site were to be established, it would not necessarily result in additional police resources being deployed in the area?
- b) With regard to the answer to question A 7, will the Authority release the information not available under Freedom of Information to local elected members on the basis of 'need to know'?

The Chairman invited Mr Page CC the Cabinet Lead member to reply. Mr Page then replied 'Yes' to both questions.

40. Urgent Items.

The Chairman advised the Commission that he had agreed to consider the following issue as a matter of urgent business:

- Leicestershire Anti Social Behaviour Strategy

41. Declarations of interest.

The following members declared personal non prejudicial interest as members of District Councils in relation to any issues arising from the consideration of the reports on the Sustainable Community Strategy and Local Area Agreement and Leicestershire Anti Social Behaviour Strategy

- Messrs Galton, Snartt, Hart, Legrys and Shepherd.

42. Declarations of the Party Whip in accordance with Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16.

There were no declarations of the party whip.

43. Presentation of Petitions.

The Chief Executive reported that no petitions had been received under Standing Order 36.

44. Transit and Stopping Place Provision for Gypsies and other Travellers.

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources concerning the decision to submit a non-site specific application to the East Midlands Regional Assembly (EMRA) for a grant to develop a transit site for Gypsies and other Travellers and to consult on three possible sites. A copy of the report, marked 'E', is filed with these minutes.

Mr John Legrys attended the meeting as a local member. He acknowledged the need for the Council to find a suitable site but expressed concerns about the suitability of the proposed sites. He also expressed concern about the consultation process which he considered to have been somewhat limited as it had not included some parish councils and Travellers groups who were affected by the proposals.

In response to questions, the Director of Corporate Resources advised the Commission as follows:

- (i) the original non-site specific bid had not succeeded. The Council had been advised of the decision by GOEM in June 2007. The announcement of a second round of funding had been made at a late stage. The deadline for the current round was 30th November 2007 and the Cabinet would be considering the outcome of the consultation on 23rd November. The outcome of the bid would be known by April 2008. This tight timetable was one of the main reasons for a shorter than normal consultation period.
- (ii) Since 2004, the County Council had been in discussion with district councils with a view to identifying possible transit sites. To date not one site had been identified by the district councils. It was acknowledged that further work needed to be undertaken at district council level.
- (iii) The criteria for selection of sites were based on Government guidance and a further issue had been included relating to the "impact on local communities".
- (iv) Discussions had recently commenced with British Coal about potential sites but to date no response had been received.
- (v) The Cabinet had, following representations, decided not to proceed with the proposed site at Lockington and Hemington.
- (vi) A considerable number of well-argued responses had been received as a consequence of the consultation exercise.

In the ensuing discussions the following comments were made by members:

- there was a clear need to identify appropriate transit sites if illegal encampments were to be dealt with;
- district councils needed to be urged to identify appropriate sites in preparing their local development frameworks;
- the issue of the effect on local properties resulting from the identification of possible transit sites needed to be considered;
- the lessons learnt from the current consultation process needed to be noted and incorporated in any future consultations.

RESOLVED:

That the information now provided be noted and the views now expressed be drawn to the attention of the Cabinet.

45. Combined Performance Report - Quarter 2 - 2007/08.

The Commission considered a joint report of the Chief Executive and Director of Corporate Resources concerning issues on both the revenue budget and key performance indicators where performance is below target. A copy of the report, marked 'A', is filed with these minutes.

In response to questions, the Commission was advised as follows:-

- The Customer Services Centre for Highways, Transportation and Waste would be going live at the end of November. This would be Phase 1 and the intention is to roll out the programme over time to other County Council services starting with Community Services.
- The Equality Standards target was particularly challenging and the Equalities Board would be considering a plan setting out what actions were needed to achieve the standard.
- An action plan had been developed to address issues arising from the MORI analysis of the public satisfaction survey and this would be brought to the next meeting of the Commission.

The Director of Corporate Resources advised the Commission that the Local Government Finance Settlement would be announced on 6th December. Given the complexity of the likely changes it might be difficult to produce an analysis of the effect of the settlement in the usual time.

RESOLVED:

- a) That the good progress being made in relation to the targets and commitments be noted and that the officers be commended on the new format of reporting financial and performance data;
- b) That the report be drawn to the attention of the Chairmen and Spokesmen of all Scrutiny Committees inviting them to raise issues as appropriate with the relevant Chief Officers.

46. Second Review of the 2007/08 Capital Programme.

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Corporate Resources concerning the second review of the 2007/08 Capital Programme. A copy of the report, marked 'B', is filed with these minutes.

In response to questions, the Director of Corporate Resources advised some of that the contribution to the Loughborough Sports Park could be made in the next financial year. The project was being managed by Loughborough University.

RESOLVED:

That the current position on the projected spend, estimated at 97% on the capital programme, be noted and welcomed.

47. Development of Sustainable Community Strategy and the LAA - Key Performance Indicators.

The Commission considered the reports of the Chief Executive which set out:

- i) how the 'This is Leicestershire' evidence base related to the work of the Commission and contributed to the development of outcomes for inclusion in the Leicestershire Sustainable Community Strategy and Local Area Agreement;
- ii) key performance information in the context of changes to the local government performance framework together with the early views of the Government Office for the East Midlands (GOEM) as to the key priorities for Leicestershire.

Copies of the reports, marked 'C' and 'D' respectively, are filed with these minutes.

The Commission also considered a supplementary report of the Chief Executive setting out the views of the Scrutiny Committees on the Sustainable Community Strategy, a copy which is also filed with these minutes.

In the ensuing discussion members endorsed the comments made by the scrutiny committees and, in particular, the comment of the Children and Young People's Service Scrutiny Committee that priority should be given to the development of facilities for children and young people. Members were of the view that this would not only allow for a number of the key concerns emerging at Community Forum meetings to be addressed but would also help deliver some of the key targets likely to be included in the LAA. In addition members asked that:

- i) consideration be given to strengthening the role of Community Forums by delegating funding to these bodies so that they could address the identified needs of their area;
- ii) the Strategy should not focus solely on areas and people deemed to be deprived but that it also should seek to address issues of social inclusion and cohesion across the County;
- iii) consideration should be given to the mapping of the needs of social groups across the County which might highlight non geographic deprivation.

RESOLVED:

That the comments now made, together with those of the Scrutiny Committees, be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration.

48. Anti Social Behaviour Strategy.

The Commission considered this matter, the Chairman having decided it was of an urgent nature, in view of the need to obtain approval of the Anti Social Behaviour Strategy so that the County Council and its partners could begin to implement the Action Plan arising from the Strategy as soon as possible.

The Commission considered a report of the Chief Executive setting out the draft Anti Social Behaviour Strategy and seeking the comments of the Scrutiny Commission thereon. A copy of the report is filed with these minutes.

In response to questions, members were advised as follows:

- i) the Leader of the Council was in discussion with the Chief Constable and others on the possibility of funding the roll out of 101 telephone line to all areas of the County. These discussions had not addressed the recent speculation that the Home Office might withdraw funding for the scheme;
- ii) discussions on a common methodology for identifying and recording anti social behaviour were nearing completion and the revised recording arrangements would be in place soon.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet be advised that the Commission welcomes and supports the draft Anti Social Behaviour Strategy.

49. Exclusion of the Public.

It was moved by the Chairman, seconded and carried:-

That under Section 100 A 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 the paragraphs of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A of the Act specified below and, in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information:-

<u>Item</u>	<u>Paragraph Number</u>
Oracle E Business Suite Implementation and Consultancy Support	3 and 10

50. Oracle E Business Suite Implementation and Consultancy Support.

The Commission considered a report of the Chief Executive concerning the decision of the Cabinet to approve the extension of the County Council's use of Oracle e-Business Suite and the preferred method of procurement for future consultancy support. The decision of the Cabinet had been 'called – in' on the basis that it involved significant expenditure, unassessed risk and the centralisation of functions and corporate practice. A copy of the report, marked 'F', is filed with these minutes. The report was not for publication by virtue of paragraphs 3 and 10 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A of the Local Government Act 1972.

The Commission also considered the following supplementary papers:

- Staff transactions Business Case
- Business Case for Procurement.

Copies of these supplementary papers, marked 1 and 2 respectively, are also filed with these minutes. These reports were also not for publication by virtue of paragraphs 3 and 10 of Part 1 of Schedule 12 A of the Local Government Act 1972.

In response to questions, the Director of Corporate Resources replied as follows:

- the total cost of the system would be approximately £5.1 million with a potential annual saving of £2.1 million. In addition, there would be the additional benefit of better quality information to inform service delivery;
- the e-Business Suite was a modular system, the first phase costing £2.5 million. It was therefore possible to stop further investment if deemed appropriate;
- Oracle was a well established system and the County Council had looked at its implementation in other authorities and learnt lessons;
- the detailed business cases on shared services and e-procurement had not been considered in detail by the Cabinet. The all party member Corporate Change Management Board had considered and endorsed the overall programme.

RESOLVED:

That the decision of the Cabinet be noted and that no further action be taken.

10.00 am - 12.00 pm
07 November 2007

CHAIRMAN

APPENDIX

Distribution List Name: Travellers meeting in North West Leicestershire

Members:

Appleby Magna	parishcouncil@applebymagna.org.uk
Ashby Town Council	colin.gay@btconnect.com
Auzra Flynn, NW Leics DC	auzra.flynn@nwleicestershire.gov.uk
Belton	belton.clerk@ntlworld.com
Bob Scott, Leics Constabulary	robert.scott@leicestershire.pnn. police.uk
Breedon on the Hill	jo.allen2107@virgin.net
Brian Roberts	bdroberts@leics.gov.uk
Castle Donington	clerk@cdpc.org.uk
Charley	bri-val.duncombe@ntlworld.com
Christiane Athey	CAthey@leics.gov.uk
Christine Fisher, NW Leics. DC	christine.fisher@nwleicestershire. gov.uk
Coleorton	sara_cowin@hotmail.com
Dr. R. K. A. Feltham	KFeltham@leics.gov.uk
Ellistown & Battleflat	ellistownparish@yahoo.co.uk
Heather ?	stewart@stewartshepherd. wanadoo.co.uk
Ibstock	ibstockparishcouncil@fsmail.net
Isley cum Langley	smiliesam@aol.com
Kegworth	lesleypendleton@aol.com
Long Whatton	longwhatdisepc@hotmail.com
Measham	dawn@meashamparish.co.uk
Mr. C. A. Stanley	CStanley@leics.gov.uk
Mr. J. G. Coxon	JCoxon@leics.gov.uk
Mr. J. K. C. Legrys	JKCLegrys@leics.gov.uk
Mr. N. J. Rushton	NRushton@leics.gov.uk
Mr. P. A. Hyde	PHyde@leics.gov.uk
Mr. S. D. Sheahan	SSheahan@leics.gov.uk
Mrs. L. A. S. Pendleton	LPendleton@leics.gov.uk
Oakthorpe & Donisthorpe	oakdonpc@hotmail.com
Packington	clerk@packingtonpc.org.uk
Ravenstone with Snibston	parishclerk@ravenstonewith snibstonparishcouncil.org.uk
Snarestone	rdhassall@fsmail.net
Steve Siddons	SSiddons@leics.gov.uk
Stretton en le Field	jazfeeney@aol.com
Swannington	bri-val.duncombe@ntlworld.com

10.00 am - 12.00 pm
07 November 2007

CHAIRMAN