



DATE: 15 September 2015  
MY REF: MIS/Council  
PLEASE ASK FOR: Mr. M. I. Seedat  
DIRECT DIALLING: (0116) 305 6037  
E-MAIL: [mo.seedat@leics.gov.uk](mailto:mo.seedat@leics.gov.uk)

Dear Sir/Madam

I summon you to the MEETING of the LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL to be held at COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD on WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2015 at 2.30 p.m. for the transaction of the business set out in the agenda below.

Yours faithfully



**Chief Executive**

### **A G E N D A**

1. Chairman's Announcements.
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 8 July 2015. (Pages 5 - 20)
3. To receive declarations by members of interests in respect of items on this agenda.
4. To answer questions asked under Standing Order 7(1)(2) and (5).

### **To dispose of business from the last meeting.**

5. Report of the Constitution Committee.  
(a) Review of Standing Orders (Meeting Procedure Rules). (Pages 21 - 24)
6. To receive position statements under Standing Order 8.



**To consider reports of the Cabinet, Scrutiny Commission, Scrutiny Committees and other bodies:**

7. Report of the Cabinet.
  - (a) Medium Term Financial Strategy. (Pages 25 - 30)
8. Appointments in accordance with items 11 and 12 of Standing Order 4.
  - (a) Appointment of Church representative to serve on the Local Authority Committee dealing with Education - Report of the Chief Executive. (Pages 31 - 32)
9. To consider the following notice/s of motion:
  - (a) Adult Social Care Costs - Mr. S. J. Galton CC.
    1. That this Council:-
      - a. Notes the cross-party support for the former Coalition Government's policy to cap care costs following the Dilnot Commission, and that the Conservative Party was elected to Government with a clear and unambiguous promise in their manifesto to cap care costs from 2016 onwards.
      - b. Notes with concern the government's announcement to shelve plans for a cap on care costs, which will result in estimated £100m of public money wasted on preparation and continued uncertainty for the future of those who will be needing these care services.
      - c. Supports the LGA's call that any money saved from delaying the care cap reforms should be put into the mainstream adult social care and support system so as to put it on a more sustainable footing.
      - d. Sees little sense in the Government's policy of increasing the allowance threshold for inheritance tax while continuing to run a care system where many elderly people are forced to sell their home to pay for their care.
    2. This Council therefore calls on the Government to prioritise funding for both the adult social care system and the care cap reforms, before raising the allowance thresholds for inheritance tax and higher rate taxpayers.

(b) Syrian Refugees - Mr. R. Sharp CC.

1. That this Council welcomes the Government's Syrian Vulnerable Persons Relocation Scheme and commits to play its full part in accommodating those claiming asylum into Leicestershire.
2. That the County Council will welcome refugees into our communities and provide sanctuary to families fleeing war and violence, recognising that its capacity to assist will inevitably be governed by available resources
3. This Council calls upon the Leader to immediately establish a cross party panel to work with officers to identify how the Council can assist, ensure early and robust plans are put in place and that effective co-ordination with District Councils and other partners is established.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 8 JULY 2015**

**PRESENT**

Mr. E. D. Snartt CC (in the Chair)

Mr. I. E. G. Bentley CC, Mr. R. Blunt CC, Mr. G. A. Boulter 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. P. G. Lewis CC, Mr. W. Liquorish JP CC, Mrs. H. E. Loydall CC, Mr. K. W. P. Lynch CC, Mr. J. Miah CC, Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC, Ms. Betty Newton CC, Mr. L. J. P. O'Shea 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, Mrs. C. M. Radford CC, Mr. J. B. Rhodes CC, Mr. T. J. Richardson CC, Mrs. J. Richards CC, Mr. N. J. Rushton CC, Mr. R. Sharp CC, Mr. R. J. Shepherd 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

**13. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

**Tunisian Attack**

Members joined the Chairman in conveying condolences to the family of Roy and Angela Fisher of Western Park, Leicester, and all other families who had tragically lost loved ones in the attack in Sousse, Tunisia.

The County Council, along with the rest of the country, had observed a minute's silence on Friday, 3 July, in tribute to all those who had lost their lives.

**The County Council's links with HM Armed Forces**

The Chairman was pleased to report that he had been able to accept a number of invitations on behalf of the County Council to events which sought to maintain and develop the County Council's strong relationship with Her Majesty's Armed Forces. Within the County they had included:

- the Defence Animal Centre's Open Day in Melton Mowbray;
- The Royal Tigers Regimental Association annual Tigers Sunday service and parade; and
- the Welbeck Defence College's Annual Inspection which this year had been performed by His Royal Highness The Duke of Edinburgh.

These events demonstrated the importance that the Armed Forces place on civic and community engagement.

As co-host of the Armed Forces Day Service and Parade held in Leicester the previous Saturday, the Chairman had been pleased to be able to reciprocate these invitations. The service and parade this year was the largest to date with representatives of the Armed Forces, veterans and cadets numbering 600. The parade through the City had been a true spectacle. This had been a chance to show appreciation for the special service the Armed Forces gave to the country and, with thousands of people lining the parade route, the demonstration of public support had been tremendous.

### **Children in Care**

The Chairman reported that Mr Ould had asked him to mention a wonderful opportunity which had been afforded to two young people who were members of the Children in Care Council which the County Council ran.

Luke and Nishat were two of ten young people across the UK who had been invited to London to discuss their own experiences of being in care with the Children's Commissioner and MPs and they would also be meeting the Secretary of State for Education.

The Chairman, Mr Ould and members agreed this was a deserved reward for the way in which young people in care organised themselves so they could influence national as well as local policy making.

### **Battle of Bosworth Anniversary re-enactment**

The Chairman reminded members that each year the County Council staged a special weekend of re-enactment at Bosworth Battlefield. With the return to Bosworth of the mortal remains of King Richard III in March ahead of his reinterment in Leicester Cathedral still fresh in the memory, it was anticipated that there would be a high level of interest from the public.

This year the re-enactment weekend coincided exactly with the anniversary of the battle held on 22<sup>nd</sup> August, and so this year the event would incorporate the traditional Laying of the Roses ceremony, which the Chairman said he would be delighted to host.

Members were encouraged to purchase tickets for this exciting family friendly event arranged and hosted by the dedicated team at the Bosworth Battlefield Heritage Centre and Country Park.

### **Visitors**

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

## **14. MINUTES.**

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

"That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 20 May 2015, copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed."

## **15. 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.

All members declared a personal interest in the report of the Constitution Committee concerning the Electoral Review.

Dr Eynon declared a personal interest in the question she had asked of the Leader under item 4, as she was a salaried GP.

## **16. QUESTIONS ASKED UNDER STANDING ORDER 7(1)(2) AND (5).**

### **(A) Mr Bray asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-**

“Could the Leader please tell me if the County Council are exploring or advocating any changes to waste collection arrangements? If so could you outline what these changes are?”

### **Mr Pain replied as follows:-**

“Waste collection is the responsibility of District Councils and each authority makes its own decisions in relation to the waste collection services it provides.

The Leicestershire Waste Partnership, which consists of the 7 District Councils as well as the County Council, is working with consultants to explore the options for providing a county-wide food waste collection service to achieve both improved performance and realise budgetary savings. A number of high level options have been modelled by the consultants but there is no commitment by any of the partner authorities to implement the modelled options at this time. It will remain a concern if the district councils are not able to realise savings opportunities which are clearly available from waste collection.”

### **Mr Bray asked the following supplementary question:-**

“Thank you for the response to question one. In the second paragraph, is one of the options being considered a move to three weekly collection?”

### **Mr Pain replied as follows:-**

“I couldn’t possibly answer as we are not responsible for collection of waste at the County Council.”

### **(B) Mr Bray asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-**

“The Hinckley Times (25<sup>th</sup> June) reported that the County Council is proposing to sell off £28 million of its land and property assets as part of the Corporate Asset Management Plan. Could the Leader confirm if any of these assets are in Hinckley and Bosworth, and if so could he provide me with a list

of what they are?”

**Mr Pain replied as follows:-**

“It would be a pity if Mr Bray relied on the local newspaper for his understanding of the County Council’s intentions when he had the opportunity to read the wealth of information contained within the 50 plus pages of the Plan and accompanying documents which went through Scrutiny and Cabinet last month. Any disposals will be progressed through the Council’s approval processes. Sites can be commercially sensitive but members will be advised if a proposal is likely to affect their division.”

**Mr Bray asked the following supplementary question:-**

“Can the Lead Member point out to me which page actually lists the assets and if it isn’t in the document, could he supply me with one?”

**Mr Pain replied as follows:-**

“As stated in the response, the Corporate Asset Management Plan consists of over 50 pages of information and the proposals are split under the relevant departments of the authority. I am sure there will be certain assets that pertain to the Hinckley and Bosworth area, and so under the sensitive issues procedure we will notify the relevant members accordingly as and when decisions are taken to dispose of relevant assets.”

**(C) Mr Bray asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-**

“In the past I have raised concerns about the need for a pedestrian crossing in Mount Road near to Hurst Road, this will be needed more than ever with the imminent opening of a new leisure centre in the town centre. Would the Leader please ask officers to once again consider this request?”

**Mr Osborne replied as follows:-**

“Members will be aware that the Hinckley area was identified as a focus for investment with a view to stimulating economic growth, minimising congestion and reducing carbon emissions. A four phase programme of work in the Hinckley area (the Hinckley Area Project) aims to improve the transport network in and around Hinckley to support these objectives.

The first three phases of the project, which includes the construction of cycle, walking, bus and safety measures, are now well underway. Phase 4 of the project will focus on Hinckley Town Centre and involve a review of the major junctions and strategic signing network in the town and joining up with the cycle and walking network currently being constructed. Once proposals have been developed they will be subject to a future funding bid to the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership.

Mount Road and Hurst Road are within the area of focus for this fourth phase of the project and the request for a crossing in this location will be considered as part of this work.”



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

"The patient is the only person who attends all appointments across health and social care systems, yet Leicestershire's health and social care IT systems still lack patient-centred inter-operability to promote self-care.

What opportunities exist for this Council to adopt a patient/client portal that is not organisation or supplier-specific and how could this be pursued?"

**Mr Houseman replied as follows:-**

"The Council is working closely with the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland health and social care community to ensure greater sharing of data between care professionals and with patients through the Better Care Together Programme.

The procurement of new IT systems in health and social care adhere to national interoperability standards that allow systems to be connected. Work is ongoing to allow the NHS number to be the primary identifier across all health and social care organisations to allow records and information to be more easily shared.

A number of other initiatives are also taking place, including –

- Patients in Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland have access to a summary of their care records, and further work is taking place nationally and locally to allow patients access to their full GP health records. This will be available at most GP practices by April 2016.
- University Hospitals of Leicester is working on a patient portal to provide access to information on relevant services. They will work with other partners to ensure that feeds from other services can be included.
- A health and wellbeing hub is being developed to provide information and advice on local services, especially in relation to prevention and support. This will be available to professionals in the autumn and then the public early in 2016.
- Work is also underway to develop a 'whole system' view of health and social care data to support evidence based decision making.
- A successful application has been made to the NHS Test Beds Programme for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland to be a test bed site for using data to improve patient care."

**Dr Eynon asked the following supplementary question:-**

"Could I thank the Lead Member for the very informative set of answers. I was wondering if the Lead Member is aware of a patient/client portal known as "Patients Know Best" which is one of seventeen NHS Innovation Accelerator schemes aimed at breaking down barriers to information sharing. Does the Lead Member agree with me that any solution for health and social care integration that leaves the patient, who should be at the heart of the system, unable to see or share their own information is unacceptable?"

**Mr Houseman replied as follows:-**

“Thank you Dr Eynon. I must say that I found the question and so-called supplementary convoluted and confusing. I am not sure whether it was a supplementary question, a statement or just something you wanted to talk about whilst we were all here at the County Council today. I do share your concerns, will seek further advice and will talk to you about these outside the meeting if you wish.”

**(E) Mr Charlesworth asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-**

- “1. Did Mr Orson disclose any of the contents of the Police and Crime Commissioner’s letter dated the 24<sup>th</sup> June to anyone prior to the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel on the 25<sup>th</sup>?
2. When did the Leader become aware of/or see the Police and Crime Commissioner’s letter of the 24<sup>th</sup>?
3. Did the Chief Executive of Leicestershire County Council see or become aware of the Police and Crime Commissioner’s letter of the 24<sup>th</sup> prior to the meeting of the Police and Crime Panel on the 25<sup>th</sup>?
4. Did the Leader contact the Police and Crime Commissioner on the 24<sup>th</sup> June and ask him to “take a different course of action?”

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:-**

“I am sorry that the Police and Crime Commissioner decided to challenge publicly Mr Orson’s integrity and I am also sorry that Mr Charlesworth is asking such questions now since they serve no purpose. We need to move on and I see the Commissioner has said on his website this morning that he hopes to be back at work next week. That, of course, is a totally different position from what he reported to the Panel that he was “compelled to take a period of extended absence due to incapacitating ill-health”. What the Panel did not know when they met was that the Commissioner had tweeted an hour before the meeting that he hoped to be back in a couple of weeks, but a circular letter last week from the Chief Executive of the Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner confirmed that the Commissioner was on extended sick leave. Clearly there appears to have been some confusion, but not of the Panel’s or the County Council’s making.

All I, Mr Orson and the County Council as Secretariat to the Police and Crime Panel have tried to do is to help Sir Clive Loader. It had been known for some time that he had a serious back problem. Whilst we wish him well and hope he is not returning to work too soon, that should not detract from the wholly unacceptable situation whereby an unelected official can simply take over the role of the Police and Crime Commissioner when he is incapacitated. Mr Orson and the Panel were absolutely right to take up the matter with the Government. I am pleased that the Home Secretary has said to Mr Orson in her response that the Panel should be commended for giving the matter serious consideration.”

**Mr Charlesworth asked the following supplementary question:-**

“Would the Leader confirm or deny that Mr Orson leaked the letter?”

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:-**

“Of course Mr Orson did not leak the letter. I don’t think there was anything to leak. As far as I know there was a lot more in the public domain than was at first perceived.”

## **17. POSITION STATEMENTS UNDER STANDING ORDER 8.**

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

- Combined Authority;
- Leicester and Leicestershire Economic Partnership;
- Midland Mainline Electrification;
- Great Central Railway;
- Police and Crime Commissioner;
- Local Government Association Conference.

The Lead Member for Environment and Transport presented a position statement on the following matters:-

- North West Leicester Transport Project;
- A511 Growth Corridor.

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

## **18. REPORT OF THE CABINET.**

### **(a) Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2015-16.**

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

“That the Youth Justice Strategic Plan 2015/16, attached as Appendix 2 to this report, be approved.”

## **19. REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION.**

### **(a) Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2014-15.**

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

“That the information contained in the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2014/15, attached as Appendix 1 to this report, on its activities, be noted.”

**20. JOINT REPORT OF THE EMPLOYMENT COMMITTEE AND CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.**

**(a) Proposed Amendment to the Officer Employment Procedure Rules.**

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

“That the revised Officer Employment Procedure Rules attached as Appendix 1 to this report, be approved.”

**21. 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 Appendix 1 to this report, other than those which relate to Standing Orders (the Meeting Procedure Rules), be approved;

Motion 2 – Procedural Motion in accordance with Standing Order 37

- (b) That the changes to Standing Orders (The Meeting Procedure Rules), as set out in Appendix 1 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.)

**(b) Electoral Review of Leicestershire County Council.**

It was moved by Dr Feltham and seconded by Mr Hart:-

“That the proposed County Council submission on new electoral divisions be approved.”

The motion was put and carried, 36 members voting for the motion and 2 members voting against.

**22. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICE/S OF MOTION:**

**(a) Midland Mainline - Mr. Max Hunt CC**

It was moved by Mr Hunt, and seconded by Dr Feltham, and carried unanimously:-

“1. That this Council:-

- (a) Notes with deep concern the Secretary of State for Transport's statement to the House of Commons on 25 June when he announced that the electrification of the Midland Mainline between Bedford and Sheffield project be 'paused';
- (b) Expresses disappointment that any delay will undoubtedly affect the local economy across Leicestershire;
- (c) Is pleased that the Secretary of State confirmed that Network Rail's project to straighten the line and improve disabled access at Market Harborough station is not affected and will go ahead and therefore asks the Department for Transport for confirmation that the project is fully funded and will therefore progress without any delay;
- (d) Asks the Secretary of State to begin an urgent review of Network Rail's planning of the Midland Mainline electrification project so it can be quickly resumed to meet the original 2020 completion date.

2. This Council therefore resolves to work with other East Midlands transport authorities, members of parliament and council leaders representing communities across Leicester and Leicestershire to campaign for the reinstatement of the Midland Mainline electrification project.”

**(b) Grass Cutting - Mr. S. L. Bray CC**

It was moved by Mr Bray, and seconded by Mr Lynch:-

“This Council notes the increasing amount of public concern over the poor state of grass verges across the County and therefore calls on the Cabinet to review the decision to reduce the frequency of the grass cutting service.”

On the motion being put and before the vote was taken, five members rose asking that a named vote be recorded.

The vote was recorded as follows:-

For the motion

Mr Boulter, Mr Bray, Mr Charlesworth, Dr Eynon, Mrs Fox, Mr Galton, Mr Gamble, Dr Hill, Mr Hunt, Mr Kaufman, Mrs Loydall, Mr Lynch, Mr Miah, Mr Mullaney, Ms Newton, Mr Sharp, Mr Spence, Mr Sprason, Mr Welsh, Mr Wyatt, Mr Yates.

Against the motion

Mr Bentley, Mr Blunt, Mrs Camamile, Mr Coxon, Mrs Dickinson, Dr Feltham, Mr Hampson, Mr Hart, Mr Houseman, Mr Jennings, Mr Lewis, Mr Liquorish, Mr Osborne, Mr O'Shea, Mr Ould, Mrs Page, Mr Pain, Mr Pearson, Mr Pendleton, Mrs Posnett, Mrs Radford, Mr Rhodes, Mrs Richards, Mr

Richardson, Mr Rushton, Mr Shepherd, Mr Snartt, Mr White.

The motion was put and not carried, 21 members voting for the motion and 28 against.

2.30 pm – 5.30 pm  
08 July 2015

CHAIRMAN

## **COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING – 8<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2015**

### **LEADER'S POSITION STATEMENT**

#### **Combined Authority**

A fortnight ago myself, the City Mayor and the seven district council leaders announced proposals to create a combined authority for Leicester and Leicestershire to further improve how we collaborate and deliver on key issues, including economic growth, skills, transport and planning.

I am delighted that we have put together a strong initial proposal which has been submitted to Greg Clark, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, for his consideration and which responds positively and speedily to the new Government's devolution agenda.

There is strong local support for the proposal, from the LLEP as well as from the local authority leaders, and this is especially pleasing as it demonstrates that we have in place an effective coalition of the willing. I was able to convey this message to Greg Clark when I met him at the LGA Conference last week, to which I will also refer later.

The establishment of a Combined Authority will provide robust governance across the functional economic area, which will enable us to make key decisions in support of economic growth and job creation. Having such governance in place is also a prerequisite for the devolution of funding and powers from Whitehall to local areas.

Our proposals include:

- The preparation of a long term strategic growth plan (looking to 2050) which will identify future growth locations and corridors and set a single consistent framework for future local plans and economic and infrastructure investment plans. This will give us the platform our area needs to plan for the area's long term economic prosperity and give investors and developers confidence that we are serious about growth. Alongside this we will also look to prepare a joint strategic asset management plan which will seek to maximise the contribution existing land and assets in the public sector can make to economic growth;
- Preparation of a joint strategic transport plan with clear investment priorities and supported by long term transport funding commitments from the Government;
- The devolution of funding and commissioning of skills programmes to the local area, with the LLEP taking on the role of commissioning body on behalf of the Combined Authority; and
- Enhanced funding and finance powers through the establishment of new Enterprise Zones, including at Loughborough University Science and Enterprise Parks and the East Midlands Enterprise Gateway.

Setting up a combined authority will help accelerate the growth of the local economy and create more jobs for local people. Available evidence suggests that when decisions about the economy are made locally, rather than in Whitehall, it is much

more likely that their impact will be maximised, overcoming local barriers to growth and supporting local priorities.

Further work is underway to support development of the final proposal, which will be subject to consultation and then submitted to the Secretary of State later in the year, with a view to a Combined Authority being set up by the end of 2015.

### **LLEP**

I am delighted that Blake Pain has joined the LLEP Board alongside David Slater as a representative of the district councils and also welcome the re-appointment of Nick Pulley as Board Chairman and the appointment to the Board of two new private sector members, Andy Reed and John Hill.

As more funding is channelled through, or influenced by, Local Enterprise Partnerships it is increasingly important that the Council works closely with the LLEP to ensure key schemes and initiatives in the county receive necessary funding.

We will particularly seek to maximise funding from the Local Growth Fund to support delivery of key capital infrastructure to support growth, and from the European Structural and Investment Funds in relation to employment and skills, and business support programmes. In addition our success in securing LEADER status for East Leicestershire will bring benefits to many rural businesses and communities.

### **Midland Mainline Electrification**

Later on the agenda we will be debating a motion regarding the 'pause' in the electrification of the Midland Mainline but I wanted to take this opportunity to say a few words on the matter.

The electrification of the mainline is not only critical to economic growth in Leicester and Leicestershire, it would support growth for the whole area from Northamptonshire to Sheffield. It would get the journey time from Leicester to London down to under an hour. This would boost more inward investment and growth. A modern electrified route with upto date rolling stock is an essential part of delivering a modern, fit for purpose transport network for the city, county and region.

I was therefore dismayed at the announcement that work on electrifying the Midland Mainline was to be 'paused'. Over the years Ministers have consistently highlighted the importance of infrastructure investment and only recently the Chancellor talked in positive terms when he launched the 'Midlands Engine for Growth' concept. Such a concept will struggle to gain public and more importantly business credibility if the Government cannot deliver on its existing investment commitments. I have, therefore, along with the city and other county council leaders across the East Midlands, written to Patrick McLoughlin expressing our concerns.

### **Great Central Railway**

As I advised the Council at its last meeting, the Heritage Lottery Fund has earmarked funding of £9.5million for the development of a new Railway Museum to sit alongside the Leicester North terminus of the Great Central Railway (GCR). £500,000 of this earmarked fund has been released to help the GCR to work with



partners to progress the plans and apply for the full grant later this year. GCR has invited the County Council to join its Project Board to help develop the bid and I was pleased to accept this invitation personally.

The plan is for a new build glass frontage museum which will provide a clear view of trains arriving at the Station. The Museum will house collections of locomotives together with personal histories and smaller objects which will help interpret the railway's role in everyday life. Exhibits will be drawn from the prestigious National Rail Collection in York and the Director of the National Rail Museum has stated that he is keen to work in synergy with the GCR events programme to provide greater opportunities for learning and tourism.

Work on the Museum will create a short term increase in construction jobs but more importantly it is estimated that, when completed, the Railway and Museum will be worth some £39million to the local economy as well as providing education and training facilities. Whilst a significant part of this will be in the City, members should note that the majority of the Great Central Railway line runs in the Charnwood area and there will be opportunities offered to communities and businesses in those areas.

Work is also currently underway to connect the Great Central Line to the main rail network. When this is completed it will further enhance the opportunities for tourism to the area.

### **Police and Crime Commissioner**

As I have commented in the answer to Mr Charlesworth's question, the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) has put out a statement this morning to say that he hopes to return to work next week. The PCC has previously said that he has been suffering from severe back pain for several months. It is good to know that the medical treatment he has been receiving appears to have been successful and I wish him well in his return to work and hope that he is able to manage his discomfort.

I am particularly concerned that the PCC should have challenged Joe Orson's integrity and that of County Council officers. They have my full support and confidence. It is also unfortunate that the Police and Crime Panel was not made aware of the inconsistency between Sir Clive's letter to the Panel saying that he was incapacitated and would be away for an extended period, and his tweet earlier on the same day saying that he hoped to be back in a couple of weeks. If the Panel had been made more aware, it seems probable that they would have at least asked the question as to whether it was necessary to appoint an Acting PCC.

On the matter of an Acting PCC, I remain of the view that the PCC would be well advised to appoint a Deputy and also that the legislation as currently framed is a nonsense. It simply cannot be right that the powers of a PCC can pass more or less automatically to an unelected official.

### **LGA Conference**

All tiers of Leicestershire councils were well represented at this year's Local Government Association's national conference held in Harrogate.

The Chairmanship switched back to the Conservatives, after one year under the stewardship of Labour's Cllr David Sparks, after the strong district council election results on May 7<sup>th</sup>. I understand that Conservatives will retain the Chairmanship at least for the next two years. My congratulations go to Cllr Gary Porter, of South Holland District Council, who was elected as the new LGA Chairman, and to Cllr David Hodge, leader of Surrey County Council, as the new LGA Conservative Group Leader.

Together, they will make a strong team and bring considerable experience, working alongside the new Communities Secretary Greg Clark MP, who has promised to "be a good friend to local government". I know he will be a man of his word. I had several ad-hoc conversations with the Secretary of State at the LGA Conference, particularly on fairer funding and our Combined Authority bid. I noticed that he listened intently, took copious notes and asked pertinent questions of us and what we expected from him and the Government. He seems to be the kind of man we can do business with. I very much look forward to forging a special relationship with the new Secretary of State and expect him to be true to his word when dealing with Leicestershire.

**COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING – 8<sup>th</sup> JULY 2015**  
**POSITION STATEMENT BY THE LEAD MEMBER FOR**  
**ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT**

**North West Leicester Transport Project**

As members will have seen on their way into County Hall, work has started on the first stage of a multi-million pound project to improve the road links into the City from the north west part of Leicester.

The major part of the work is along the A50 from the A46 Western Bypass into the City. On the County side this will mean works between the A563 Outer ring road and the A46 bypass. I would like to take this opportunity to apologise in advance for the inevitable disruption and delay the work will cause but it is essential that this work is done now.

The north west of Leicester plays an important role in generating wealth and jobs as well as providing access routes into the City. This area contains a number of places that attract visitors (customers, residents and employees) such as the Glenfield Hospital, Beaumont Leys Shopping Centre and the surrounding industrial estate, the National Space Centre and the Great Central Railway Station near Birstall. It also provides an important role in facilitating the orbital movements – northeast between the A6 and A47 and southwest between the A50 and the A426.

This Scheme, which is run jointly by the City and County Councils will improve the main junctions with wider lanes and better signalling. It will also provide much improved facilities for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users thereby encouraging a modal shift to other forms of transport. When the work is completed we will see amongst other things:

- Benefits for businesses as a result of better journey times and reliability for employees and delivery vehicles;
- Reduced congestion at the key junctions with better traffic flows into and out of the City as well on the ring road;
- Reduction in carbon emissions from greater take-up of walking, cycling and public transport.

As I said earlier this is a joint City/County scheme. The total investment for this scheme is £19million of which £16million is coming from central government following a successful bid to the Single Local Growth Fund (SLGF). The remaining £3million is to be met by the City and County Councils.

The Leader in his position statement has talked about the Combined Authority bid and the benefits this will bring to Leicester and Leicestershire through joint working and co-operation. This scheme is a prime example of the County, City and the Local Enterprise Partnership working together for the benefit of the area. The £16million bid to Government was only successful as we were able to demonstrate joint working at a political level but also that we had the support of the business community through the LEP.

## **A511 Growth Corridor**

M1 junction 22 and A42 junction 13 are important points of access to the Strategic Road Network, providing access to existing businesses in North West Leicestershire (which is home to a number of major logistics businesses).

The Coalville and Ashby areas have plans for the delivery of major growth, including over 5,000 dwellings and further employment sites. However modelling undertaken to develop the North West Leicestershire Core Strategy and in connection with planning applications has shown that the scale of the development proposed would have a severe impact on the highway network without specific targeted interventions. Highways England has previously imposed holding directions on planning applications and the local highway authority has also expressed concerns about the impact of growth on the efficient and safe operation of these junctions.

The County Council therefore decided to submit a bid to the LLEP for funding under the Single Local Growth Fund (SLGF) for this project which will remove this uncertainty, deliver benefits much earlier than would otherwise be the case and enable the prompt and efficient delivery of significant growth.

The bid was successful and funding was awarded for the A511 Corridor project as part of Growth Deal 1 in July 2014. The funding is split over two years, 2015/16 and 2016/17 with improvements to M1 J22 this year and A42 J13 next.

The additional funding needed from the County Council for the junction improvements is included in the LTP Implementation Plan approved by Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015 and the project also forms part of the Enabling Growth Plan similarly approved by Cabinet on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2015. There is also funding available from S106 monies linked to a development in Ashby.

The project will be delivered in two phases. Improvements to the M1 J22 will start in October this year and the improvements to the A42 J13 in spring 2016. Given the works on the M1 to build the New Lubbesthorpe Bridge and the roundabout improvements on the A50 at the County/City boundary, I have emphasised to officers that it is vital that these works are coordinated to minimise disruption and close liaison between the projects and with Leicestershire Police will be maintained throughout.

## **REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE**

### **A. REVIEW OF STANDING ORDERS (MEETING PROCEDURE RULES)**

#### **Introduction**

1. This report concerns proposed changes to the Council's Standing Orders (Meeting Procedure Rules), a procedural motion on the proposals having been moved and seconded at the last meeting of the Council to meet the requirements of Standing Order 37.

#### **Background**

2. At the last meeting of the Council approval was given to recommendations set out in a report of the Constitution Committee on various changes to the Council's Constitution. The report included proposed changes to Standing Orders (Meeting Procedure Rules).
3. Any motion to add, vary or revoke Standing Orders must, having been proposed and seconded, stand adjourned without discussion to the next ordinary meeting of the Council. Accordingly, at the last meeting of the Council such a motion was duly moved and seconded.
4. Appendix A to this report sets out the proposed changes to Standing Orders being recommended by the Constitution Committee, accompanied by an explanation as to why each change is considered to be necessary.

**(A motion to the following effect, moved by Mr Rushton and seconded by Mr Rhodes, stands adjourned from last meeting:**

**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.)**

**N J Rushton  
Chairman**

#### **Background Paper**

Report of the Constitution Committee to the County Council on 8<sup>th</sup> July on the Review and Revision of the Constitution.

This page is intentionally left blank

**APPENDIX A**

**PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE**  
**CONSTITUTION OF LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**SEPTEMBER 2015**

<b><u>ITEM</u></b>	<b><u>PROPOSED AMENDMENT</u></b>	<b><u>EXPLANATION</u></b>
<b><u>PART 4 A</u></b>  <b><u>MEETING</u></b> <b><u>PROCEDURE</u></b> <b><u>RULES</u></b>	<b>Standing Order 18</b>  Amend to read as follows:-  ‘A member shall direct his or her speech to the question under discussion (i.e. it shall be directly relevant to the matter under discussion) or to a point of order or a point of personal explanation or information for the meeting, shall not impute motives or use offensive expressions to or about any other member and shall act in accordance with the role of a County Councillor as set out in Article 2.03 of the Constitution.’	<p>To clarify the role of a County Councillor.</p> <p>The amendments confirm that, whilst the overriding duty of County Councillors in their representative role is to the whole community, they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them.</p> <p>They should act in the capacity to which they were elected to the Council and should not speak on behalf of any other local authority.</p> <p>The amendment also clarifies that any speech must be directly relevant to the matter under discussion.</p>

<p><b><u>PART 4 A –</u></b></p> <p><b><u>MEETING</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PROCEDURE</u></b></p> <p><b><u>RULES</u></b></p> <p><b>Standing Order 22</b></p>	<p>Amend to read as follows:-</p> <p><b>Standing Order 22 (A) - <i>Points of Order</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A member may rise on a point of order and shall be entitled to be heard forthwith. A point of order shall relate only to an alleged breach of a Standing Order or statutory provision and the member shall specify the Standing Order or statutory provision and the way in which he or she considers it has been broken.</li> <li>2. The ruling of the Chairman on a point of order shall not be open to discussion.</li> </ol> <p><b><i>Standing Order 22 (B) - Points of Personal Explanation or Information for the meeting</i></b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A member may rise on a point of personal explanation or point for information for the Council and shall be heard forthwith.</li> <li>2. A point of personal explanation shall be confined to some material part of the former speech by him or her which may have been misunderstood in the present debate.</li> <li>3. A point of information for the meeting shall be confined to correcting a speaker developing their argument on incorrect facts or figures so as to avoid misleading the meeting.</li> <li>4. The ruling of the Chairman on a point of personal explanation or point of information for the Council shall not be open for discussion.</li> </ol>	<p>Provision added to enable a member to raise a point of information so as to correct a speaker from developing their argument on incorrect facts</p>
--	---	--



## REPORT OF THE CABINET

### A: MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY UPDATE

#### **Introduction**

1. The purpose of this report is to advise the Council of the worsening financial position and the approach to updating the current Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS).

#### **Background**

2. The current MTFS for 2015/16 to 2018/19 was approved by the County Council in February 2015. Over the autumn and winter the MTFS will be updated. All scrutiny committees and the Scrutiny Commission will have an opportunity to consider the outcome of the update in January and early February 2016. The Cabinet will consider the outcome of scrutiny and other deliberations before it makes a recommendation to the County Council in February.

#### **Position in the Medium Term**

3. Over the last four years there have been significant reductions in the Government's funding of local government. Reductions have been higher than in other parts of the public sector which in part reflects the fact that local government, unlike health, overseas development and education, has not been protected.
4. The County Council remains one of the lowest funded and lowest spending authorities in the country and it is from this low base that further savings need to be made. Settlement Funding (Revenue Support Grant and Business Rates) per head is 21% /£46 below the average for other county councils. If the Council was funded at the same rate as the average county council it would be £31m better off. If Council Tax is also included, the County Council's funding is 14% /£72 per head below the average for other county councils. If the Council was funded at the same rate as the average county council (including Council Tax) it would be £48m better off.

#### **Summer Budget**

5. The Summer budget announced by the Government on 8 July had two key implications for the County Council;
  - The introduction of a new minimum/National Living Wage
  - Confirmation that local authorities will remain an unprotected part of the public sector.

#### **National Living Wage**

6. The introduction of a new minimum wage in the summer budget will have a significant impact on the County Council over the medium term. The National

Living Wage will increase by 11% from £6.50 per hour to £7.20 from April 2016. Thereafter it will increase to 60% of the national median wage by 2020.

7. It is not straightforward to forecast the impact on the Council's budget due to a number of uncertainties and unknowns. Based on certain assumptions the overall impact on the MTFS is an increase in costs of £7m in 2016/17 rising to £23m in 2020/21. Whilst this estimate needs to be treated with caution it does indicate the scale of the challenge.
8. This increase is not yet factored into the MTFS. The Government has not stated whether under the New Burdens Agreement the impact on local government will be offset by additional resources. At this stage the assumption is that if additional resources are made available they will be limited and there will be a major impact on the MTFS.
9. The new minimum wage will affect Dedicated Schools Grant funded services (paragraphs 19 - 21 below refer).

### **Local Government Funding**

10. The Government confirmed that Local Authorities will remain an unprotected part of the public sector, thus signalling that spending reductions will continue broadly at the same rate for the next four years as experienced over the last four. The Chancellor did take the opportunity to smooth the reduction in spending, but at the same time increased the time for the national deficit to be eliminated from three to four years. This means that spending reductions will be required for at least the next four years.

### **Early Intervention and Prevention**

11. The Council has supported a number of early intervention initiatives which aim to reduce future demand (and costs) on local services through initiatives that seek to address the underlying causes that give rise to the need to access services. Examples include Supporting Leicestershire Families, Children's Centres, Public Health and the Adult Social Care Strategy. The Council is keen to continue this policy and is reviewing its approach to prevention and early intervention. The proposed Government cuts to the Public Health Grant along with a worsening financial position will mean that these services will come under increasing pressure.

### **Summary**

12. The introduction of the Living Wage, continuing reductions in Government funding and the pressures within the Children and Family Services placement budget mean that the County Council faces an extremely tight financial position. A position that could be further impacted by any unfunded costs arising from the need to accommodate refugees following the recent government announcement.
13. This will mean that the saving requirement of £87m within the current MTFS will need to increase significantly. This will have profound implications for services delivered by the County Council. It raises questions around

affordability of non-statutory services, the level of funding that can realistically be spent on statutory services and future council tax increases. Given the Council's funding position it is likely that it will find itself having to make these increasingly tough choices sooner rather than later. In the short term existing savings may need to be brought forward from future years to balance the 2016/17 budget.

14. In recent years the Leader and Deputy Leader have met with Leicestershire MPs in the Autumn to inform them of the Council's financial position and low funding level. Given the acute financial pressure being experienced by the County Council it is considered that this should be repeated as soon as possible. The modelling of further reductions in spending has already been submitted by non-protected Government Departments to the Chancellor.

### **Planning Framework**

15. The next two key Government announcements will be;
  - The Spending Review on 25<sup>th</sup> November. This will give an indication of the scale of the challenge faced by local government.
  - The Local Government Finance Settlement. Although no date for this has been given it is expected to be announced in late December.
16. The MTFS will be reviewed during the autumn and informed by these announcements.
17. The broad MTFS timetable is:
  - September to October – Refresh growth and savings including consideration by Lead Members
  - November – Spending Review analysis
  - Late December – Local Government Finance Settlement
  - January/February – Cabinet, Scrutiny and County Council.

### **Transformation Programme**

18. In May 2014 the Cabinet agreed the County Council's Strategic Plan and Transformation Programme to support the MTFS. The latter sets out how the Council will transform services and the way in which the Authority operates and is a key element to the successful delivery of the MTFS. It has continued to develop with the (officer) Transformation Delivery Board now adopting a broader monitoring role to include other high-risk MTFS savings. This approach enables all key Departmental savings and transformation activity to be seen in one place. There is a clear focus on:
  - Delivery of existing savings.
  - Identifying and delivery of new savings including a 'Digital Council', 'Commercialise Traded Services' and joint support services.
  - Transitioning part of the programme into business as usual.

### **Dedicated Schools Grant**

19. The County Council receives Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) which provides for delegated school budgets and other education services that are managed within the Council such as early years and special educational needs. Financial pressure is being encountered across the area covered by the Grant, which consists of three blocks. Whilst 2015/16 saw funding increased for the Schools Block, the remaining two block settlements have remained at the level of historic spend:

- a) Schools Block – This block funds delegated school budgets and some other budget areas. This element of DSG is under pressure as a result of an increase in the number of pupils, largely as a result of new housing. It is expected that this will create a revenue shortfall in 2019/20.
- b) High Needs Block – This element of the grant has remained at the level of historic spend. Increasing numbers and cost of pupils with special educational needs together with increased responsibilities for local authorities, such as provision for post-16 students, are resulting in a projected overspend of £1.5m. This is currently being supported by the DSG earmarked fund. The Department for Education (DfE) is considering a formulaic approach to the delivery of this element of DSG and Leicestershire was one of a number of authorities participating in the research to inform the future allocation methodology for the grant. It is uncertain when any changes will be delivered.

Future models for services funded from the High Needs Block are being considered within the Transformation Programme and options to reduce the cost of placements, including development of additional local provision, are being investigated.

- c) Early Years Block – This block funds the free entitlement to early years education for disadvantaged 2 year olds and the early years offer for 3 and 4 year olds. This element of the grant is currently insufficient to meet provider and service costs and, as with High Needs, is being supported from the DSG earmarked fund (£0.7m). The MTFS also assumes a saving resulting from moving all service costs to DSG. There are expected to be significant pressures from changes likely to be introduced within the Childcare Bill currently progressing through Parliament.

The service has identified savings options which will allow savings to be delivered in 2016/17; further savings options will be considered at such point the impact of the Childcare Bill/Act is known.

20. All DSG spend will be affected by the introduction of the National Living Wage. A significant financial impact, approximately £7m, will be felt in the childcare market where there are claims nationally that local authority rates fail to meet current costs. The impact of the National Living Wage for other services funded from High Needs is estimated to be approximately £4m.

21. Whilst delegated school budgets have been increased in 2015/16 as a result of increased Government funding, many schools are reporting financial pressures especially in the secondary sector where pupil numbers are falling as a result of age range changes and a reduction in funding for post 16 is causing significant financial concerns. It is estimated that the impact of the National Living Wage is equivalent to a further average 2.2% budget pressure estimated to be approximately £8m.

**(Motion to be moved:-**

**That the update on the MTFS as set out in the report of the Cabinet, be noted.)**

**N. Rushton  
Chairman**

### **Background Papers**

Report to County Council -18 February 2015 – Medium Term Financial Strategy  
2015/16 to 2018/19

<http://ow.ly/RDYfR>

Report to Cabinet – 6 May 2014 – County Council Strategic Plan and Transformation  
Programme

<http://ow.ly/RDYnE>

Summer Budget 2015

<https://www.gov.uk/government/topical-events/budget-july-2015>

This page is intentionally left blank

**COUNTY COUNCIL MEETING – 23 SEPTEMBER 2015****REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE****A. APPOINTMENT OF CHURCH REPRESENTATIVES TO  
SERVE ON THE LOCAL AUTHORITY COMMITTEES DEALING  
WITH EDUCATION**

The Local Government Act 2000 requires local education authorities which maintain Roman Catholic Schools to include at least one representative of the Church on any relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee or Subcommittee. Similar provision is included for Church of England Schools that are maintained.

The appointment of a Church of England representative was made at the meeting of the Council on 26 March 2015.

The nomination for the Roman Catholic Church must be made by the Bishop of the appropriate Diocese and the following nomination has been received from the Nottingham Diocese to serve on the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

Roman Catholic Church – Mr Gerard Hirst

**(Motion to be moved:**

**That Gerard Hirst be appointed as Roman Catholic representative on the Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committee (or other appropriate scrutiny committee dealing with Education) for the period ending with the County Council elections in 2017).**

J Sinnott

September 2015

This page is intentionally left blank