

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 24 SEPTEMBER
2014**

PRESENT

Mr. G. A. Boulter CC (in the Chair)

Mr. I. E. G. Bentley CC, Mr. D. C. Bill MBE CC, Mr. R. Blunt CC, Mr. S. L. Bray CC, Mrs. R. Camamile CC, Mr. M. H. Charlesworth CC, Mr. J. G. Coxon CC, Mrs. J. A. Dickinson CC, Dr. T. Eynon CC, Dr. R. K. A. Feltham CC, Mrs. J. Fox CC, Mr. S. J. Galton CC, Mr. D. A. Gamble CC, Mr. S. J. Hampson CC, Mr. G. A. Hart CC, Dr. S. Hill CC, Mr. Dave Houseman MBE, CC, Mr. Max Hunt CC, Mr. D. Jennings CC, Mr. J. Kaufman CC, Mr. A. M. Kershaw CC, Ms. K. J. Knaggs CC, Mr. P. G. Lewis CC, Mr. W. Liquorish JP CC, Mrs. H. E. Loydall CC, Mr. K. W. P. Lynch CC, Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC, Ms. Betty Newton CC, Mr. J. P. O'Shea CC, Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC, Mr. P. C. Osborne CC, Mr. I. D. Ould CC, Mrs. R. Page CC, Mr. B. L. Pain CC, Mr. A. E. Pearson CC, Mr. T. J. Pendleton CC, Mrs. P. Posnett CC, Mr. J. B. Rhodes CC, Mrs. J. Richards CC, Mr. N. J. Rushton CC, Mr. R. Sharp CC, Mr. S. D. Sheahan CC, Mr. R. J. Shepherd CC, Mr. E. D. Snartt CC, Mr. L. Spence CC, Mr. D. A. Sprason CC, Mr. G. Welsh CC, Mr. E. F. White CC, Miss. H. Worman CC, Mr. M. B. Wyatt CC and Mr. L. E. Yates CC

19. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the tremendous community response to the one hundredth anniversary of the start of the First World War. Most towns and villages had done something to mark the occasion by tree plantings, exhibitions, publications, concerts, services, parades, war memorial restoration and much more.

The commemoration had first been marked with a service at Leicester Cathedral on 3rd August, and followed by the 'Lights Out across Europe Initiative'. The Chairman reported that he had hosted a balloon launch at Stand Easy and that many people had taken the opportunity to leave personal messages at the memorial. From 10.00 p.m. County Hall's lights had been extinguished and just a solitary light had burned in the Members Lounge whilst Stand Easy had been illuminated, with striking effect.

Responses had been heart-warming and humbling, and demonstrated the depth of respect which existed for the past generation who had lost their lives in the war that had been supposed to end all wars.

The Chairman also report that the County Council was working with a range of partners to ensure that this anniversary was marked now and throughout the coming four years.

Visitors

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting all visitors and guests of members and anyone who was viewing the meeting via the webcast.

20. MINUTES.

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

“That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 2nd July 2014, copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed.”

21. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST.

The Chairman invited members who wished to do so to make declarations of interest in respect of items on the agenda for the meeting.

No such declarations were made.

22. QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 7(1)(2) AND (5).

(A) Dr Eynon asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-

“Could the Leader please advise me:-

- (a) How many requests received during the last 5 years for adaptations to the homes of frail, elderly, disabled and other medically unwell people were agreed by the County Council’s occupational therapists and forwarded to North West Leicestershire District Council for action?
- (b) How long did the service users and carers concerned have to wait for the recommended work to be done?”

Mr Houseman replied as follows:-

“(a) The number of service users living in North West Leicestershire with a major adaptation start date recorded by adult social care in each year is as follows:-

2009/10	122
2010/11	118
2011/12	134
2012/13	180
2013/14 *	168

(b) Information from North West Leicestershire District Council shows that the average time (in weeks) taken from referral from adult social care for all Disabled Facilities Grants to completion by the local authority in each year is as follows:-

2010	62.7
2011	54.5
2012	26.7
2013	28.2

2014*

Due to the introduction of a new computer system figures in the answer to question (a) are up to February 2014 only: time for answer (b) not yet finalised.”

(B) Mr Hunt asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-

“The Council agreed last February to spend £1,045,000 this financial year on upgrading the Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Traffic Modelling System (LLITM) and another £306,000 is programmed from next April.

Would the Leader please advise:-

- (a) Whether this project is expected to meet its budget and when the work was begun?
- (b) What data and assumptions have been updated since December 2012?
- (c) What further data, assumptions or systems are planned to be updated over the period of the capital project?”

Mr Osborne replied as follows:-

“(a) The project is in progress, within budget and expected to be delivered within its allocated budget during Spring 2016.

The project was started in Autumn 2013, and is already providing the County with a more robust tool to support the appraisal of the transportation impacts of new development and to support the strategic appraisal of future travel demands and traffic growth pressures.

(b) The updated data since 2012 includes:-

- 167,000 driver origin-destination records;
- 10,000,000 bus travel records from Electronic Ticket Machine (ETM) from bus operators in the County supplied free;
- 12,000 bus passenger interview records from bus stop origin-destination surveys;
- 50,000,000 UK-wide rail passenger records from around 2,500 stations in the UK;
- Traffic counts from 700 sites within the County;
- Extension of LLITM network beyond County boundary to include Toton and substantial parts of the Strategic Road Network;

- Signal data updates;
- Expansion of zones from 930 to 1320;
- Planning data.

The assumptions that have been updated since 2012 include:-

- New economic parameters, for example, values of time, vehicle operating costs, fuel prices, fares, GDP, etc to accord with current national values and guidance;
- New national assumption constraints in terms of population, household growth, employment and other constraints to be taken into account for context whilst allowing LLITM the flexibility for local forecast;
- LLITM 2014 is being built to a new and more exacting Department for Transport standard specified in WebTAG2 published in January 2014.

(c) The further data, assumptions or systems that are planned for update over the period of the capital project include:

- Future networks to be defined, checked and signed off;
- 5,500 junction coding, geometric layouts and data to be reviewed; 4,500 already reviewed out of a total of 10,000 as part of the short term maintenance;
- New planning data that is being collated from planning authorities;
- Journey time data from 600-650kms of road to be collected from Global Positioning System (TrafficMaster) and Highways Authority sources for the Strategic Road Network;
- Enhanced freight modelling facility;
- All component software will be upgraded to their latest versions;
- All physical servers which run LLITM have been upgraded to a newer version of Windows; the number of processors and clock speed will also be upgraded.”

Mr Hunt asked the following supplementary question:-

“How does this affect Core Strategies that are currently going through the District Councils?”

Mr Osborne replied as follows:-

“It supports Core Strategies and the ability of those to be passed. As you

know there are three councils who are going to re-present theirs in various timescales and I look forward to those being passed.”

(C) Dr Eynon asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-

“Could the Leader explain how the decision to destroy all copies of the Museum Development East Midlands grant-funded report on alternative models for Museum delivery prepared by Winckworth Sherwood:-

- (a) Complies with Statutory Instrument no. 2095 of the "Openness and Transparency in Local Government Regulations 2014" which makes it an offence for an officer of the Council to intentionally obstruct any person from inspecting those written records and background papers that they have a right to see.
- (b) Complies with the Records Management Society Local Government Retention Guidelines (2003) and with the Council's own Retention Policy and Retention Schedule?"

Mr Blunt replied as follows:-

“(a) The Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014 which came into force on 6th August 2014 provide that a written record must be made of specified decisions taken by officers under delegated authority (either by a specific delegation or under a general delegation) where the effect of the decision is to:-

- grant a permission or licence;
- affect the rights of an individual;
- award a contract or incur expenditure which in either case materially affects the Council’s financial position.

In such cases, a record must be produced containing prescribed information and the record and background papers must be made available for inspection by members of the public. A person who has custody of such a record commits an offence if without reasonable excuse he or she intentionally obstructs a person from inspecting the record or refuses a request to provide a copy.

The report referred to in the question is not a document protected by the Regulations because it is not a written record of an officer decision taken under delegated authority.

- (b) The Retention Guidelines for Local Authorities issued by the Information and Records Management Society are currently under review by the Society. The 2003 Guidelines provide advice on the disposal of ‘common functional and housekeeping records’ as described in the Guidelines. The report referred to is not with the description of classes of documents identified in the Guidelines.

The purpose of the Council’s Retention Policy is to help the Council

meet its statutory obligations to ensure information is retained for the correct period of time and then disposed of appropriately. It requires information to be assessed and retained according to the following principles:

- *Statutory requirements: information will be retained for only as long as is required by statute.*
- *Ongoing business need: information will be retained for only as long as it is required to run the organisation effectively. Storing information costs money, therefore storing information for longer than is necessary incurs unnecessary costs.*
- *Best practice: information will be retained if best practice indicates this would be of benefit, best practice can be drawn from respected external sources.’ [para 2.1 LCC Retention Policy]*

Managers assess retention requirements against these principles and the retention schedule and reach decisions on retention on a case by case basis.”

(D) Mr Sprason asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-

“The information coming from the Rotherham child abuse and grooming scandal identified the use of taxis as a major risk. Will the Leader inform this Council on:-

- 1) What measures have been taken by Leicestershire County Council to prevent vulnerable young girls from being transported in taxis alone?
- 2) While it is recognised that CRB checks are required of all taxi drivers employed to transport children this alone does not protect vulnerable girls from exploitation and abuse so what additional procedures and safeguards have been considered or put in place?, and
- 3) Will the Leicestershire and Rutland Local Safeguarding Children Board (LSCB) be reviewing its practices following the Rotherham findings?”

Mr Ould replied as follows:-

- “1) Female drivers and escorts are provided by the Council where vulnerability is identified through the risk assessment which is undertaken whenever transport is provided for children and young people. There is recognition that children in care can be more vulnerable and extra training is given to those contractors and their staff who are employed on such work.

The question is specific to vulnerable young girls but I would wish to make clear that the Council also has procedures which apply to vulnerable young men.

- 2) Preventing and protecting children from sexual exploitation is a local LSCB priority and in October 2013 the LSCB Sub Group initiated a

Child Sexual Exploitation awareness raising campaign “spot the signs.” The first phase focused on raising awareness amongst children and parents, and the second phase of the campaign is focusing on businesses including taxi drivers. A package of leaflets and training materials to support this current phase of the campaign has been produced which members of the Licensing Forum and Leicestershire Police have agreed to disseminate. Amongst other things the package contains a leaflet which draws attention to:-

- The responsibilities of premises owners and taxi drivers with regard to ‘protecting children from harm’;
- The signs of child sexual exploitation;
- Six ‘protection steps’ which should be incorporated into a licensed business and used for staff training with the aim of protecting young people and a business;
- Contact details - emergency/support/for more information.

The County Council’s Sustainable Travel Group which deals with transport arrangements for children and young people is diligent at referring any matters where there is a concern about the suitability of a taxi driver or escort to the Local Authority Designated Officer (LADO) in accordance with LSCB procedures.

Additionally, the Sustainable Transport Group has asked the taxi licencing district councils to add to their forum agenda an item to consider the findings of the Rotherham enquiry in respect of taxi operation, and that the LSCB will share the outcomes of the LSCB audit exercise and subsequent action plan.

There is also a national campaign “Say something if you see something” being developed by the National Working Group (NWG) Network which has produced a number of resources for officers to brief hoteliers and taxi companies.

3) Yes.”

Mr Sprason asked the following supplementary question:-

“Can I thank the Lead Member for his comprehensive answer. I am just asking under the last paragraph, under 2, the report and the audit exercise, can all members be circulated with that report please?”

Mr Ould replied as follows:-

“I am happy to say ‘yes’ subject to officer advice.”

(E) Ms Knaggs asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-

“Potholes and defects on the roads and footpaths are a major hazard to users. I have been advised that the County Council inspects every carriageway and footpath at least once a year and that it also welcomes

reports of any defects from members of the public. All potholes/defects identified are recorded and included in a schedule of repairs to be undertaken.

Would the Leader please advise me:-

- (a) Of the time between a pothole or defect being identified and repairs being undertaken?
- (b) Given the significant reductions in the budget for such repairs how does the County Council prioritise repair works and how does it manage the risk of being sued should someone get injured as a result of a failure or delay in undertaking repairs?"

Mr Osborne replied as follows:-

"(a) The County Council has set out in its Highway Maintenance Policy and Strategy a prioritised basis for the repair of all defects in the highway, centred round the severity of the defect. If the defect is considered to be an emergency, it is treated within two hours. If it is urgent, it is classified as a Category 1 defect and repaired within 3 days. All other defects that require a reactive repair are to be treated within 90 days. The recently completed Customer Service Centre/Highways Review identified that the County Council's performance is actually within these timescales, with consideration being given to reducing the 90 day target.

More detail can be found on the County Council website on the webpage related to the Highway Maintenance Policy and Strategy.

(b) The process for prioritising repairs will not change, irrespective of any overall budget reductions. Furthermore, the Council must continue to meet its statutory obligation to keep the highway safe so the funding for defect repairs will always need to be found. The current prioritisation process and a robust approach taken by the Insurance Team ensures that the total value paid out for highway claims against the County Council is one of the lowest in the country."

Ms Knaggs asked the following supplementary question:-

"Thank you Mr Osborne, I won't say for a comprehensive response. My supplementary question is in regard to part (b) of your response which is "the Council must continue to meet its statutory obligation to keep the highways safe so that funding for defect repairs will always need to be found", so my question is where will the funding for the defect repairs be found and could Mr Osborne please state where he thinks that the money will come from?"

Mr Osborne replied as follows:-

"It comes out of the budget and it is a matter of prioritising allocations and if we have to take money from one part of the budget to supplement another where it is required then we will do so and report to Council when it comes to the budget of how that distribution has been done."

(F) Mr Mullaney asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-

- “(a) There is much concern about possible library closures in the County including many in Hinckley and Bosworth. Libraries may be in danger of closure if no volunteers are found to run them. Does the Leader have a contingency plan if volunteers can't be found to keep the libraries open?”
- (b) Leicestershire County Council received a £781,402 grant from the Big Lottery Fund towards the opening costs of the Newbold Verdon Library. Can the Leader reveal how much it will liable to have to pay back the Big Lottery Fund if the County Council closes the Library and the effect this will have on the net savings?”

Mr Blunt replied as follows:-

- “(a) I am disappointed in the rather negative tone of the question. I would like to suggest that a more positive use of Mr Mullaney's time would be to encourage people in his electoral division to consider the opportunities now open to community groups with support from the County Council. I note also that the question makes no recognition of the financial situation. It is important that all concerned recognise that since, whilst we would all like to see an outcome which keeps all libraries open, that may not be possible. It is instructive to look across the border to Warwickshire where several communities have embraced the opportunity to run their libraries, but not every library has been kept open. However, it is evident that people are prepared to travel further distances to use a library, which in itself must be a good thing.

As I am sure Mr Mullaney is aware, Cabinet last week approved further work being done on the various suggestions raised during the consultation on the future of libraries and a report will be considered in November.

- (b) Any repayment of grant, whether in full or part, will be subject to discussions with the Big Lottery Fund. No detailed discussions have yet taken place as, of course, no decision has yet been made on the future of the library.”

Mr Mullaney asked the following supplementary question:-

“If the amount of money the County Council has to pay back to the Big Lottery Fund is greater than the savings that would be made from closing Newbold Verdon Library, do you agree that it makes sense that we should guarantee to keep open the excellent community facility that is Newbold Verdon Library?”

Mr Blunt replied as follows:-

“The Conservative Group are pledged towards saving the libraries that are out there now. We will deal with that. You have seen the consultation last

week, you have seen the efforts that we are making and the efforts of Scrutiny in the process and we are looking all the time to improve and refine our offer so each and every community gets a chance to run their library in the future, and we will not deal with any of these other matters until we have given every member of the community the chance to run their own library.”

(G) Mr Mullaney asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-

“Can the Leader provide me with the Council procedures that cover circumstances when a carer is unable to attend a scheduled visit? What measures does the Council take to ensure that people are not charged if no visit is made?”

Mr Houseman replied as follows:-

“Service providers submit information electronically using their own or the Council’s system for times of actual care delivered. Absence notifications are submitted electronically on a weekly basis as required by the Council. This assists with prompt payment and enables the Department to monitor where services have not been delivered, and ensure that appropriate action is taken.

Once in receipt of the information that care has not been provided, the Adults and Communities Department will make adjustment to the charges paid by the service user accordingly.”

(H) Mr Sheahan asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-

“Could the Leader inform the Council of all Section 38 agreements which were signed prior to 2011, but where roads have not yet been adopted, listed by the year the agreement was signed, address and County Division and whether or not there is a certificate of provisional completion in respect of each?”

Mr Osborne replied as follows:-

“The information requested is held in various electronic filing systems (not databases) which will take some time to interrogate and provide in the requested format. To extract a comprehensive list of this information for the whole county is a significant task. However, specific queries or issues on a specific development site, or specific road, could be extracted manually, relatively quickly.

Details of Section 38 agreements signed prior to 2011 are as follows:

Year Signed	Active Agreements	Under Provisional
1994	1	
1999	1	
2001	1	1
2002	1	
2003	2	2
2004	2	2
2005	2	1
2006	9	6
2007	7	2
2008	7	2
2009	7	
2010	15	7

The approval and adoption of developer works to construct roads and infrastructure that are intended to become public maintainable highway is predominantly a developer led process. Those roads and footpaths that remain under agreement to adopt are still considered public highway but are maintained at the expense of the developer. The Highway Authority holds a bond against each site under a Section 38 agreement equal to the figure likely to be required to bring the works up to a suitable standard for full adoption by the authority in the event the developer ceases - for whatever reason - to maintain the highway. If it becomes evident (either through inspection or from resident complaints) that the developer is not managing and maintaining the roads to a suitable standard, the Highway Authority will seek to progress full adoption either in co-operation with the developer or, failing this, by calling on the bond to complete the works on the developer's behalf.

Whilst the preference would be to ensure that Section 38 agreements do not remain un-adopted for several years, current service priorities of the authority (including the need to support economic growth) suggest that the focus of our current resources should be on the appraisal and approval of new Section 38 schemes."

Mr Sheahan asked the following supplementary question:-

"Mr Osborne, it is a bit of a pity we couldn't have had the details of where all these roads that have not been adopted actually are so that members of the respected divisions could look into that. My supplementary question is do you not think a more proactive approach, either in the past given that some of these go back twenty years, or even now, would resolve these and stop them dragging for so long and I think the same goes for other developer led agreements such as Section 238 agreements. Could we not do more to chase these up and get things sorted out?"

Mr Osborne replied as follows:-

"If there were better ways we would be doing them. I am quite satisfied the manner in which we conduct it is exemplary."

23. POSITION STATEMENTS UNDER STANDING ORDER 8.

The Leader presented a position statement on the following matters:-

- Leicester City Football Club;
- The UK Constitution Boundary Review;
- East Leicestershire LEADER Bid;
- Re-interment of King Richard III;
- Green Plaque Awards;
- Environment and Transport Customer Service Centre;
- Lead Member for Children and Family Services.

The Lead Member for Children and Family Services presented a position statement on the following matters:-

- Safeguarding;
- Examination Results;
- School Funding;
- Achievements of the Children and Families Service.

The Cabinet Lead Member for Health presented a position statement on the new NHS review of Congenital Heart Services.

A copy of the position statements is filed with these minutes.

24. REPORT OF THE CABINET:-

(a) Medium Term Financial Strategy Update.

It was moved by Mr Rhodes, seconded by Mr Rushton:-

- “(a) That the significant financial challenge faced by the County Council and the impact on services, which is unfolding and becomes acute in 2016/17 and thereafter, be noted;
- (b) That the approach outlined in the report to updating the Medium Term Financial Strategy be agreed;
- (c) That local MPs be informed of the Council’s financial position and asked for their views given the impact on their constituents;
- (d) That the response to the technical consultation on the 2015/16 Local Government Finance Settlement, as set out in Appendix C (pages 34-36 of the Council booklet), be approved;
- (e) That the position on the Business Rate Pool, as set out in paragraph 28 in Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.”

An amendment was moved by Mr Sharp and seconded by Mr Hunt:-

“That the motion be amended to read as follows:-

'That this Council:-

- (a) Notes the significant financial challenge faced by the County Council and the impact on services which is unfolding and becomes acute in 2016/17 and thereafter;
- (b) Deplores the approach adopted by the Conservative Administration which has failed to effectively engage opposition parties, the public or key stakeholders in decision making, such that many proposed cuts are viewed as politically motivated and simply ignore the social consequences;
- (c) Calls upon the Administration to enter into early and meaningful discussions with the main Opposition Groups and the third sector in particular to ensure that the challenges now facing the Council can be addressed in a considered way and have proper regard to the consequences of decisions taken;
- (d) Informs local MPs of the Council's financial position and asks for their views given the impact on their constituents;
- (e) Calls upon the Administration to commence a comprehensive public awareness campaign, on the financial challenge facing this authority using existing media channels;
- (f) Approves the response to the technical consultation on the 2015/16 Local Government Finance Settlement as set out in Appendix C to this report;
- (g) Notes the position on the Business Rate Pool as set out in paragraph 28."

The amendment was put and not carried, 22 members voting for the amendment and 29 against.

The original motion was put and carried, 30 members voting for the motion and 21 against.

25. REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE:

(a) Review and Revision of the Constitution.

It was moved by Mr Rushton, seconded by Mr Rhodes, and carried:-

Motion 1

- “(a) That the proposed changes to the Constitution, as set out in Appendices A and B to this report, other than those which relate to Standing Orders (the Meeting Procedure Rules), be approved;
- (b) That the list of meetings determined for the purposes of Standing Order

34(2) be amended to read as follows:-

*“Adoption Panel;
Appointment Committee (Chief Officer);
Approval of Premises Panel (Civil Marriages);
Children’s Social Care Panel;
Children in Care Panel;
Child Protection Panel;
Complaints Panel (School Curriculum and Religious Education);
Disputes Panel;
Fostering Panel;
Guardianship Panel;
Member Conduct Panel;
Member Reference Panel on Quality and Safeguarding in Registered Care;
Representations Panel (Independent providers of adult social care);
Secure Accommodation Review Panel.”*

Motion 2 – Procedural Motion in accordance with Standing Order 37

“That the changes to Standing Orders (the Meeting Procedure Rules), as set out in Appendix A to the report of the Constitution Committee, be approved.”

(NOTE Standing Order 37 requires that this procedural motion, having been moved and seconded, stands adjourned until the next ordinary meeting of the Council.)

26. NOTICES OF MOTION.

(a) School Place Planning and School Improvement - Mr. S. J. Galton

Mr Galton, with the consent of the seconder of the motion, sought and obtained the consent of the Council to move the following altered motion:-

It was moved by Mr Galton, seconded by Mr Ould, and carried:-

“That this Council:-

- (a) Congratulates Nicky Morgan MP for her appointment as Secretary of State for Education and looks forward to working together in partnership to ensure that Leicestershire children receive the highest standards in education;
- (b) Believes that Local Authorities can contribute further to this partnership, particularly in areas such as School Place Planning and School Improvement, were their powers extended in the relevant areas.
- (c) Therefore calls on all parties drawing up manifestos for the May General Election to give the following points consideration:-

- (i) Give Local Authorities oversight of Age Range and Catchment Area changes, enabling them to ensure such changes to local schools are made in consideration of impacts to the wider area including home to school transport;
- (ii) Reduce restrictions on Local Authorities when establishing new schools in their area, providing them with the freedom to make decisions that are right for their area;
- (iii) Allow Local Authorities to challenge the establishment of free schools in areas where there are good schools with surplus places, so that resources can be focused in areas of need;
- (iv) Abolish the unelected regional school commissioners and hand all middle tier responsibilities to Local Authorities that are democratically accountable to their residents.”

(b) Committee System - Mr. L. Yates

It was moved by Mr Yates, and seconded by Mr Sprason:-

“(a) That this Council notes that:

- i) the Localism Act 2011 permits councils to change from one form of governance to another, including a return to a non-cabinet committee system;
- ii) committees are the most democratic form of decision making and enable all councillors to be involved; and
- iii) other councils have reverted to a committee system which has ensured both democracy and accountability for all councillors and therefore all electors.

(b) This Council believes that:

- i) due to the leader/cabinet system too many elected members of all parties have been insufficiently involved in the decision making process; and
- ii) due to the current cabinet system ordinary councillors of all parties have been denied the right to a public vote on many important decisions, and that this is fundamentally undemocratic.

(c) This Council therefore urges the Council to change to a committee system at the earliest opportunity and requests the Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer to submit a report to the Constitution Committee explaining, in detail, how the committee system could be re-introduced at Leicestershire County Council with a view to a recommendation being made to Full Council by the Constitution Committee at the earliest opportunity.”

The motion was not carried, 2 members voting for the motion and 44 members against.

2.30 pm – 5.50 pm
24 September 2014

CHAIRMAN