

Minutes of a meeting of the Scrutiny Commission held at County Hall, Glenfield on Wednesday, 10 April 2019.

PRESENT

Mr. S. J. Galton CC (in the Chair)

Mr. P. Bedford CC
Mr. D. C. Bill MBE CC
Mr. G. A. Boulter CC
Dr. T. Eynon CC
Dr. R. K. A. Feltham CC

Mr. J. Morgan CC
Mrs. R. Page CC
Mr. A. E. Pearson CC
Mr. T. J. Richardson CC
Mrs. J. Richards CC

104. Minutes.

The minutes of the meeting held on 6 March were taken as read, confirmed and signed.

105. Question Time.

The Chief Executive reported that no questions had been received under Standing Order 35.

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

The Chief Executive reported that no questions had been received under Standing Order 7(3) and 7(5).

107. Urgent Items.

There were no urgent items for consideration.

108. Declarations of interest.

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

All members who were also members of a district council declared a personal interest in the report on Place Marketing, Strategic Tourism and Inward Investment (minute 111 refers).

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

There were no declarations of the party whip.

110. Presentation of Petitions under Standing Order 36.

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

111. Place Marketing, Strategic Tourism and Inward Investment.

The Commission considered a report of the Chief Executive providing an update on recent developments in relation to the jointly funded City and County Council Place Marketing Service which incorporated place marketing, strategic tourism and inward investment activities. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 8' is filed with these minutes.

The Commission also received a presentation from the Director of the Place Marketing Service on progress to date and future plans. A copy of the slides forming the presentation is filed with these minutes.

Arising from discussion and questions the following points were raised:-

- (i) The Commission expressed disappointment that the presentation did not make reference to targets and outcomes and did not provide quantifiable evidence of what the Place Marketing Service had achieved. Members were advised that the Inward Investment Team had already supported and was continuing to support a number of businesses that were interested in either moving to the area or looking to expand. A Tourism Growth Plan and a Business Tourism Strategy were being developed with partners across the private and public sector and would be the subject of a future report to the Scrutiny Commission. These would include performance measures. Performance was also measured using STEAM data, a tourism economic impact modelling process.
- (ii) It was confirmed that, following a review a few years ago, neither the County Council nor Leicester City Council funded Leicestershire Promotions, although it continued to have a relationship with some district councils. Visit Britain recognised both Leicestershire Promotions and the Place Marketing Service as Destination Marketing Organisations but also recognised the split between the tactical work of Leicestershire Promotions and the strategic work of the Place Marketing Service. The two organisations complemented rather than competed with each other.
- (iii) In response to a concern that the Place Marketing Service had not met its original savings target, the Commission was advised that substantial savings had been made when compared to the level of funding that Leicestershire Promotions used to receive. The savings target had been revisited to enable the new organisation to be strengthened and to work effectively. Work to generate income was ongoing, for example through the membership model.
- (iv) Some concern was expressed regarding the declining footfall in town centres. The challenge was acknowledged; town centres needed to be distinctive in order to attract visitors. District Councils were able to bid for funding from the Future High Street Fund to support Leicestershire's Market Towns, six bids had submitted and the County Council had provided letters of support for all bids.
- (v) Concern was expressed regarding the impact that robotics had on local employment. The Commission was advised that work was currently being undertaken by the LLEP and its partners through the development of the Local Industrial Strategy to strengthen key sectors to support growth. A Skills Advisory Panel would also be created to develop a Skills and Employment Strategy for Leicester and Leicestershire, designed to match future demand to skills. There was

also a Skills and Employment Strategy for HS2; the County Council had volunteered to lead work on the inspiring young people theme.

- (vi) The map of business investment sites in Leicestershire had been prepared for MIPIM, the International Real Estate Industry Exhibition, which the Place Marketing Service had attended with a delegation of 25 businesses from Leicester and Leicestershire to showcase the opportunities and support available. The map only included the larger sites; there was also a list of smaller sites which the website and development of a toolkit would bring to the fore. All sites were also included in an online searchable database.
- (vii) It was noted that MIPIM had led to a number of follow up meetings. It would be important to ensure that these contacts led to successful outcomes.
- (viii) It was confirmed that Leicester and Leicestershire were seen as attractive areas for businesses to invest in due to the central, well connected location, slightly lower than average costs and a more plentiful labour supply than other areas. The work the Place Marketing Service was undertaking with the Leicester and Leicestershire Employment Hub also gave employers confidence in their ability to recruit staff.
- (ix) Whilst the Business Improvement District (BID) Boards in Leicestershire were not represented on the Strategic Marketing Group, the Place Marketing Service worked well with district councils on inward investment and strategic tourism. The County Council's Economic Growth Team also worked closely with market towns and their BIDs, including through providing support to the elected members who served on BID Boards, as required.
- (x) The Leicestershire Rural Partnership had a key role in championing the broader rural economic offer including rural sectors such as tourism. Work across the Midlands, led by the West Midlands Growth Company, was also being undertaken funded through Visit Britain's 'Discover England' programme. The National Forest was leading on the cycling offer which would be promoted in Europe. .
- (xi) It was acknowledged that greater communication to members of the work that was being undertaken was needed. Consideration should also be given to how local communities could be kept informed.

RESOLVED:

That a further report be submitted to the Commission in a year's time, providing an update on progress and including detailed performance data, particularly related to investment in the county area.

112. Draft Youth Justice Strategic Plan.

The Commission considered a report of the Director of Children and Family Services which provided details of the draft Youth Justice Plan for 2019/20. A copy of the report marked 'Agenda Item 9' is filed with these minutes.

The Chairman welcomed the Cabinet Lead Member for Children, Families and Community Safety, Mr I D Ould CC to the meeting for this item. Mr Ould suggested that the performance information contained within the report should provide reassurance to

members that the service was effective. He also welcomed the approach to Child Sexual Exploitation in Leicestershire, which was led by the Police.

Arising from discussion and questions the following points were raised:-

- (i) The Commission indicated its support for the Youth Offending Service and welcomed the good outcomes that it achieved. However, the challenges faced by the service were also recognised. With regard to Serious Organised Crime, that the key issue for the Youth Offending Service was young people in certain areas carrying knives to feel safe. This was not widespread but was significant enough to be problematic. A strong strategy to identify the young people involved was already in place. Future developments included working with partners on a prevention strategy.
- (ii) It was important to provide support for young people released from custody and to ensure that they were in suitable accommodation. The Commission was advised that the court would determine the use of custody, with background information provided by the Youth Offending Service. The intensive support offer for vulnerable young people who were not placed in or were released from custody included up to 25 hours a week from one of the Integrated Rehabilitation and Intensive Support (IRIS) workers. Warden control could also be available, depending on the accommodation.
- (iii) It was noted that the Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) service was only available to adults and suggested that this caused a gap in service provision. However, the Commission was assured that a Children's Psychiatric Nurse and a Clinical Psychologist now worked with the Youth Offending Service. In addition, the County Council was working with Clinical Commissioning Groups to have trained staff in place to provide a wellbeing service for children and young people who did not meet the CAMHS threshold. The Lead Member advised that he was comforted by these developments, which would give support to the most vulnerable.
- (iv) The County Council had a statutory responsibility to ensure that children and young people had access to meaningful education or training. This included those who had been excluded from school. Conversations regarding inclusion were taking place with education providers; these included exploring why exclusions happened and providing challenge.
- (v) The Youth Offending Service was aware of the connection between drugs and crime. It was important to recognise that young people involved in these types of crimes were being exploited, hence the Police focus had shifted to Serious Organised Crime. The Youth Offending Service aimed to prevent young people from getting into such environments in the first place, including through challenging school exclusions. The strong police and partnership approach was welcomed and it was suggested that Community Safety Partnerships could become more involved in promoting community cohesion.
- (vi) It was noted that the format of the report was prescribed by the Youth Justice Board, although it was expected that it would be revised later in the year. Officers undertook to suggest that the revised format should include some flexibility around the assessment of risk. Officers also agreed to include case studies in the covering report in future years.

RESOLVED:

(a) That the Youth Justice Plan 2019/20 be supported;

(b) That the comments now made be submitted to the Cabinet for consideration at its meeting on 25 June.

113. Date of next meeting.

It was noted that the next meeting of the Commission would be held on 12 June 2019 at 10.30am.

10.30 am - 12.40 pm
10 April 2019

CHAIRMAN