



DATE: 16 September 2025
MY REF: RW/CCouncil
PLEASE ASK FOR: Mrs. R. Whitelaw
DIRECT DIALING: (0116) 305 6098
E-MAIL: rosemary.whitelaw@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, 24 SEPTEMBER 2025 at 2.00 p.m. for the transaction of the business set out in the agenda below.

Yours faithfully



Chief Executive

AGENDA

1. Chairman's Announcements.
2. To confirm the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 2 July 2025. (Pages 5 - 32)
3. To confirm the minutes of the Extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 30 July 2025. (Pages 33 - 36)
4. To receive declarations by members of interests in respect of items on this agenda.
5. To answer questions asked under Standing Order 7(1)(2) and (5).
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 Constitution Committee

(a) Revision of the Constitution.

(Pages 37 - 44)

8. To consider the following notices of motion:

(a) Protecting Rural Communities from the Impact of Reckless Tax Reform - Mrs D. Taylor CC

“1. This Council notes:

- a) That 6,365 agriculture, forestry, and fishing businesses have closed in the past year—more than in any year since quarterly records began in 2017 (ONS).
- b) That the majority of these closures occurred in the first half of the year, following the Chancellor’s October 2024 announcement to slash inheritance tax relief for family farms.
- c) That only 3,190 new businesses were created in the sector during the same period, leaving a net loss of 3,175—evidence of the fastest contraction on record.

2. This Council believes:

- a) That the Chancellor’s decision to reduce inheritance tax relief has dealt a devastating blow to generational farming families, many of whom now face impossible financial choices.
- b) That this policy was implemented without adequate consultation or impact assessment and has disproportionately harmed rural communities.
- c) That the Government must be held accountable for the consequences of its actions and take immediate steps to reverse the damage.

3. This Council resolves to:

- a) Condemn the Chancellor’s decision to reduce inheritance tax relief for family farms and call for its urgent reversal;
- b) Demand that the Government introduce emergency support for rural businesses affected by the policy, including transitional relief and access to financial advice;
- c) Request a full impact assessment on rural business

viability, to be shared with local authorities and farming unions;

- d) Stand in solidarity with farming families and rural workers and commit to championing their interests at every level of government.”

(b) Protecting Homes from Flooding in the Planning and Infrastructure Bill - Mrs N. Bottomley CC

“1. This Council notes that:

- a) The Government’s current Planning and Infrastructure Bill makes provision for housing development and infrastructure investment but does not go far enough in ensuring that new and existing homes are adequately protected from the increasing risk of flooding.
- b) Climate change is increasing the frequency and severity of flooding events across the UK, placing thousands of households at risk of damage, disruption, and loss.
- c) Local planning authorities are currently restricted in their ability to ensure developments are flood-resilient. For example:
- d) Planning law largely limits councils to considering the management of surface water within the site boundary, with limited powers to require or enforce measures for water once it leaves the site.
- e) Councils cannot always insist on the use of sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) or require developers to demonstrate the long-term adequacy of drainage and outflow arrangements into wider catchments.
- f) Once a development is built, responsibility for managing downstream or cumulative flood risk typically falls to local authorities or agencies, without dedicated funding from central government.

2. This Council believes that:

- a) Flood prevention and resilience must be a central part of all planning and infrastructure decisions, not an afterthought.
- b) Developers must be held accountable not only for water management on-site, but also for the impact their developments have on neighbouring land and communities downstream.
- c) Local authorities should be empowered and properly

resourced to require the highest standards of flood resilience in all new developments, and to invest in infrastructure that protects existing communities.

- d) Without stronger measures, the Planning and Infrastructure Bill risks locking in avoidable future costs, damages, and risks for residents and taxpayers.

3. This Council therefore resolves to:

- a) Write to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, and the relevant local MPs, calling for the Planning and Infrastructure Bill to be amended to:
 - i. Strengthen requirements on developers to use robust, sustainable drainage solutions that demonstrate effectiveness both on-site and downstream;
 - ii. Give councils clear powers to refuse or condition developments where surface water and flood risk management plans are inadequate beyond the site boundary;
 - iii. Provide long-term, ring-fenced funding for councils to invest in flood prevention and resilience measures, including off-site infrastructure;
- b) Work with neighbouring councils, the Local Government Association, and relevant agencies to lobby for stronger national policy on flooding and planning, taking an accumulative view of the risks.

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 2 JULY 2025**

PRESENT

Mr. P. Harrison CC (in the Chair)

Mr. C. Abbott CC, Mr. R. Bailey CC, Dr. J. Bloxham CC, Mr. J. Boam CC, Mr. M. Bools CC, Mrs. N. Bottomley CC, Mr. S. Bradshaw CC, Mr. S. L. Bray CC, Miss. H. Butler CC, Mr. M. H. Charlesworth CC, Mr. G. Cooke CC, Mr. K. Crook CC, Mrs. L. Danks CC, Mr. M. Durrani CC, Mr. M. R. England CC, Mr. H. Fowler CC, Mr. S. J. Galton CC, Mr. D. A. Gamble CC, Ms. B. Gray CC, Mr. D. J. Grimley CC, Mr. A. Hamilton-Gray CC, Mr. D. Harrison CC, Dr. S. Hill CC, Mr. N. Holt CC, Mr. A. Innes CC, Mr. P. King CC, Mrs. K. Knight CC, Mr. B. Lovegrove CC, Mr. J. McDonald CC, Mr. J. Melen CC, Mr. P. Morris CC, Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC, Mr. O. O'Shea JP CC, Mr. J. T. Orson CC, Mr. D. Page CC, Mrs. R. Page CC, Ms. A. Pendlebury CC, Mr J. Poland CC, Mr. V. Richichi CC, Mr. K. Robinson CC, Mr. P. Rudkin CC, Mrs B. Seaton CC, Mr. C. A. Smith CC, Mr. M. Squires CC, Mrs D. Taylor CC, Mr. A. Tilbury CC, Mr. B. Walker CC and Mr. C. Whitford CC

15. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.

Armed Forces Week

Monday 23rd June marked the start of Armed Force week and Elisabeth Lee, who worked in the County Council's Health and Safety section, raised the Armed Forces Day Flag at a ceremony at Stand Easy. Elisabeth was in the RAF and had represented the United Kingdom at the Invictus Games in 2023 and 2025.

On Saturday 28^h June, together with the Lord-Lieutenant and Lord Mayor of Leicester, the Chairman attended the Armed Forces Day in Leicester City. There was a parade through the City Centre, service personnel, veterans, the Seaforth Highlanders and cadets. Following the parade there was an outside 'Drumhead Service' in Jubilee Square. It was a very moving occasion.

County Service

The Chairman would be hosting my County Service at St John the Baptist in Hugglescote in October and all Members would receive an invitation in due course. The Chairman hoped they would be able to join him.

Victory In Japan

On Thursday 14th August there would be a service at Leicester Cathedral to mark Victory in Japan and the ending of the Second World War. The Chairman would be representing the County Council, but all Members would also receive an invitation.

Civic Life

Since the Council meeting in May when the Chairman was elected, he had

attended a number of events representing members and the Council. It was a real pleasure to carry out this role. The Chairman looked forward to continuing to represent members in the coming year. The highlight so far was meeting Her Royal Highness the Princess Royal when she came to Leicestershire on Monday 23rd June.

16. MINUTES.

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

“That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 14 May 2025, copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed.”

17. 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 Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the Notice of Motion on Local Government Reorganisation. The Corporate Governance Committee on 23 June approved a dispensation for all members to allow them to take part in any discussion and vote on any matter relating to the office they hold at the County Council, so all members were able to stay in the room and vote on this matter.

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

(A) Mr Holt asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

“During my election campaign residents brought to my attention increased instances of speeding on the Blaby Road, from the foxhunter island towards Enderby and also Whetstone - with one resident clearly stating “it’s only a matter of time before someone loses their life.” Unfortunately, there have been accidents causing damage to property, and only a few days ago we woke up to the sad news of yet another accident and the tragic loss of life of a young man who was only 20 years old.

Will the new administration commit to reviewing the speed restrictions on this stretch of road in an effort to make roads safer for both drivers and local residents?”

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

“Council Members and officers are sorry to hear of this loss of life and send our condolences to those affected. As the Local Highway Authority (LHA) road safety is a key priority and as the outcomes of road safety incidents such as this are understood through police investigations, any identified actions will be taken with the aim of preventing further incidents in the future.

The LHA investigates reports and concerns from the community of speed related issues. When setting speed limits local authorities are obliged to work to guidance issued by the Department for Transport (DfT) to help give a consistency across the country, this guidance is set out in the DfT’s Circular

01/2013 “Setting Local Speed Limits” and provides guidelines to local authorities for the setting of new speed limits. The guidance explains that when setting speed limits, the Council must take into account various factors such as the history of collisions, the road’s function, existing mean traffic speed, and the road environment including level of road-side development adjoining the carriageway and the likelihood that drivers will adhere to a posted limit through self-compliance as opposed to through physical intervention or enforcement.

The B582 is a single carriageway predominately urban road that runs from Whetstone through Enderby, where the road then becomes rural along Desford Road to the junction with the A47 Hinckley Road. The set speed limit is 30mph from Brockington College/ M1 Bridge to EH Smiths/ NEXT where it then increases to 40mph leading to Desford Road where the speed limit then becomes National.

Unfortunately, even with posted speed limits and measures in place, motorists will often judge what is an acceptable speed for a road based on the level of development there is adjoining the highway. This is something both the County Council and the police consider when setting and enforcing speed limits respectively. The speed limits in place along the B582 are in line with the speed limit guidance and conducive to the varying road environment and roadside developments along its length.

It should also be noted that in general physical calming features such as speed tables and chicanes, are not measures that are implemented on A and B classification roads due to volume and type of traffic using them and also the principal road network purpose they serve.

Leicestershire County Council as the Local Highways Authority, is responsible for the implementation of speed limits; however, enforcement of speed limits remains a matter for Leicestershire Police to undertake if drivers are not travelling at the posted limit. Residents can raise their concerns direct to the police via <https://www.speedorsafety.com/community>.

A speed survey was undertaken on the B582 between Moores Lane and Conery Lane between 21 June and 28 June 2021, with survey results as follows:

	Mean	85th %
All traffic (Both directions)	29.5 mph	34 mph
Southeast bound traffic	28.6 mph	34 mph
Northwest bound traffic	30.4 mph	35 mph

When assessing if a road would be considered an area of concern, the police would normally advise that the 85th percentile of speed should be above the National Police Chiefs’ Council threshold for prosecution which is 35mph

(speed limit + 10% + 2mph) in a 30mph speed limit. The results of the survey show a reasonable compliance with the 30mph speed limit. The County Council would therefore not look to make any changes to the speed limit along this particular section of road.

At present, there are no plans to introduce measures along the B582 through Whetstone and Enderby, but the Council alongside the police will continue to monitor the situation and look to take any mitigating action should persistent and continual issues arise."

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

"HGV traffic is an ever increasing problem in Enderby village, with drivers using it as a cut through. This has caused the roads to be blocked as drivers attempt to reverse back to the main road, and also significant and repeated damage to vehicles and property as they attempt to navigate the roads that are clearly unsuitable for vehicles of this size. This scenario is likely to only become worse and more frequent as Blaby District Council have recently approved planning permission for a huge Logistics Hub to be built on the outskirts of the village.

Will the new administration commit to reviewing the acceptable access points to the village for vehicles of this size to prevent these unnecessary incidents from occurring and causing misery to residents?"

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

"Seine Lane, Conery Lane, Moores Lane, Chapel Street, High Street, Cross Street and Broad Street have 7.5 tonne environmental weight restrictions in place with illuminated signage present. Therefore, we would expect all Heavy Goods Vehicles to be using the non-weight restricted routes available which are the B582 Blaby Road, Forest Road to access Seine Lane and Hawgrip Garden Centre. Furthermore, "unsuitable for HGV" blue signage has been provided on the junction with High Street and The Cross approaching Chapel Street.

It is evident that on some infrequent occasions drivers are ignoring both the "environmental weight restriction" and "unsuitable for HGV" blue signs and possibly following satellite navigation technology, resulting in these vehicles mistakenly travelling through the village centre. This error leaves no alternative route available to physically turn around or access the B582 Blaby Road, without travelling through the village, which I can fully appreciate is extremely frustrating for residents.

Where environmental weight restrictions are in force in Enderby Village, the County Council would advise that if anyone suspects that a vehicle is travelling along the roads within the restricted area in contravention of this restriction, the police should be contacted as they are currently the only authority in Leicestershire with the necessary powers to take action against such contraventions. Please remember that in a significant proportion of suspected contraventions the HGVs are travelling legally. If they are loading and unloading at a location within a weight restricted zone they can legally take any route into and out of the zone to reach and leave their destination.

It is important to note that enforcement against a driver is a very time-consuming exercise and is not always effective – the police have to witness a suspect vehicle entering a weight restricted area, follow the vehicle until it leaves the area without loading or unloading, and then stop the vehicle in a safe place. Any enforcement action is then taken against the driver, who may never be on that route again, or who may be an overseas driver and therefore difficult to prosecute. It helps to have details of the date, time, direction of travel, vehicle registration mark or company details. Any such instances of this should be reported to the police on the non-emergency 101 telephone number or via the online reporting form at:

<https://www.leics.police.uk/ro/report/rtr/rtr-beta-2.1/report-a-road-traffic-incident/> or <https://www.leicestershire.gov.uk/roads-and-travel/road-maintenance/weight-restriction-monitoring>. It is important to inform residents that all suspected vehicles entering the weight restricted area are reported to Leicestershire Police, to investigate as required.

Notwithstanding this, the County Council did propose a one-way with no access from the B582 on Conery Lane and Moores Lane in Enderby, to physically stop these movements and mitigate the concerns raised. After undertaking a consultation with residents of Moores Lane, Conery Lane and Chapel Street, the feedback and general consensus was that residents did not support the introduction of the proposed one-way as outlined in the petition response provided in November 2023. The County Council's view, as previously stated is that whilst additional signage provided on the network would help to increase awareness to HGV drivers, it would not categorically prevent drivers mistakenly travelling along High Street from the B582, and the only measure to absolutely prevent the reported concerns would be to physically stop all vehicular access from the B582 onto High Street, Moores Lane and Conery Lane.

The County Council will again engage with Hawgrip Garden Centre, to ensure that their suppliers and any new haulage firms and drivers use the non-weight restricted B582 Desford Road and Forest Road to access Seine Lane. Whilst all businesses, including Hawgrip, have been extremely supportive and continue to be proactive concerning the matter, unfortunately it is not possible to ensure that this message is received by every haulage driver as they frequently change. Positive "All HGV's no access through village centre" signage is also present on Seine Lane directly opposite the access to Hawgrip Garden Centre, with further signage present on Thurlaston Lane and Forest Road.

Permanent "unsuitable for HGV" blue signage has been installed on High Street/ The Cross, Moores Lane and Conery Lane, junctions with the B582 Blaby Road. County Council officers are satisfied that both the 7.5 tonne weight restriction (except for loading), along with the "unsuitable for HGV" signage present on High Street, Moores Lane and Conery Lane, is consistent and visible to road users travelling along the B582.

Following the recent concerns raised and to try and increase awareness further to drivers, the County Council is currently looking at additional signage on High Street and the junction with the B582, advising all HGVs to use the B582 when travelling to Hawgrip Garden Centre."

(C) Mr Holt asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

“There have been continuous reports to myself and our district councillor of dangerous and irresponsible parking by drivers in Enderby, with cars often parked on double yellow lines, blocking access points to roads and left in a manner that makes it dangerous for pedestrians crossing the road.

I understand the previous administration completed research and resident surveys to understand this problem and explore possible solutions but nothing was ever changed - suggesting the current model is acceptable. Will the new administration commit to making this information and raw data available to me for review?”

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

“In terms of previous work, a detailed village wide review was undertaken to explore a range of issues raised with the Local Highway Authority. This included a Microsim (traffic simulation model) review to explore the impacts of implementing a one-way system in the village of Enderby, which was undertaken in December 2017. The review concluded that a one-way system would not make a material difference in traffic flows, nor would it reduce congestion, particularly at peak times. The one-way system proposal was therefore not progressed any further.

Residents’ parking was also considered as part of the village wide review with a view to alleviating reported congestion issues. A proposed residents’ parking scheme on roads within the village was consulted upon at that time but was ultimately rejected by residents with the majority not supporting such a permit scheme. This scheme was therefore not progressed any further.

However, a number of measures have been introduced since, namely:

- Conery Lane and Moores Lane, High Street - “unsuitable for HGVs” signage introduced in 2019/2020.
- Townsend Road – one-way system introduced in 2019.
- Double Yellow Lines - parking restrictions introduced on Kipling Drive/ Stewart Avenue/ West Street/ Shortridge Lane/ King Street and Townsend Road in 2018/19.
- Mill Lane – School 20mph zone and School Keep Clear Project introduced in 2018.
- Townsend Road – parking restrictions introduced on the junction with George Street in November 2020.
- Mill Lane – additional double yellow lines introduced in 2024.
- Rawson Street and Cornwall Street – additional double yellow lines introduced in 2023/2024 to aid Blaby District Council and residents with waste collection services.

With reference to additional parking restrictions, most de-restricted parking within Enderby village is utilised for the significant number of residents with no or limited off-road private parking available. Any additional parking restrictions introduced would leave these residents with no parking available near to their properties which would also create displacement of the required parking.

The County Council only has the power to deal with the issue of parking where there are waiting restrictions present, or when a vehicle is blocking all or part of a dropped kerb that is intended for use by pedestrians to cross a road. The County Council expects all residents and visitors to be considerate of where they park their vehicles to ensure that highway users and residents are not inconvenienced, and park in accordance with the Highway Code; however, it is appreciated that this is not always the case.

It does remain an offence under the Road Traffic Act 1988 for any person in charge of a vehicle to cause or permit that vehicle to stand on a road/footway in such a manner that is considered to be dangerous, or that which causes an obstruction to the safe and effective use of the highway. Any such instances should be reported to the police on the non-emergency number 101 or email at the following address
<https://www.leics.police.uk/ro/report/rti/rti-b/report-a-road-traffic-incident/>.

The Microsim review is appended to the Order Paper for information.

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

“It has been brought to my attention that the access road to Abbey Road in Enderby is dangerous at the entry and exits points because each end of this narrow access road allows both entry and exit. This is often creating a ‘near-miss’ accident and is only a matter of time before there is an accident involving another car, cyclist or pedestrian and someone is injured, or worse.

Will the new administration commit to reviewing this access road and consider making it a one way to ensure the safety of all road users - including those using the cycle lane users and pedestrians?”

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

“This service road has been present since the Abbey Road and Warren Road housing development was constructed including the B4114 dual carriageway. The service road layout has been constructed and junctions built to encourage road users to access the service road at the first junction approaching Abbey Road and exit on the south end of the service road to join the B4114 towards Narborough.

There are no records of any previous enquires concerning any difficulties being experienced on the service road/ junctions or any personal injury accidents recorded by Leicestershire Police in the last five years. This indicates that most road users are accessing and exiting the service road as would be expected. Whilst there may be some road users who are not familiar with the layout accessing and exiting the service road at both junctions, there are give-way road markings present, and manoeuvring should be at reduced speeds as would be the case at any junction on the highway.

This section of the B4114 Leicester Road has many private driveways along it with a number of other junctions along its length. There will therefore be vehicles entering and exiting private driveways at various points requiring

approaching drivers to slow down to allow these manoeuvres to safely take place. The Abbey Road service road junctions are no different to this.

If there is any evidence that can be shared with the Council that highlights these issues being reported, the Council will investigate further.

Whilst there are currently no plans or evidenced justification to introduce a one-way system on the service road, please be assured that the concerns raised have been recorded, and the Council will consider this, and any other appropriate actions should evidence come to light highlighting a realised road safety issue in line with its criteria.”

(E) Mr Smith asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

- “1. Following Reform UK’s recent electoral success and comments by Lee Anderson MP calling for an end to home working for council staff across the East Midlands, can the Administration clarify its position on flexible and remote working arrangements at Leicestershire County Council?
2. Does the leadership intend to make any changes, or does it continue to support the current approach based on service delivery, efficiency, and staff wellbeing?”

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

“I understand that the Smarter Working Policy, which defines the different working arrangements for Council employees, was approved by the Employment Committee in 2015. Although it has been adapted since, particularly during Covid, it would be appropriate to review the policy ten years on.

I have asked for that to be undertaken by the Employment Committee and for their recommendations to be forwarded to the full Council. I would expect the recommendations to recognise the need for consultation with the trade unions and staff as part of the review.”

Mr. Smith asked the following supplementary question:

“Whilst I welcome the review, it's clear that speculation about ending flexible or remote working is already unsettling staff, particularly with high-profile comments from figures like Lee Anderson MP gaining traction in the media. We risk losing experienced and skilled employees if uncertainty is allowed to drift on. For clarity and to give the staff the reassurance that they deserve, can the Leader confirm whether he is, in principle, in favour of the flexible working policy at Leicestershire County Council?”

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

“I'm in principle in favour of flexibility but we are going to look at this in much greater depth to understand exactly what the requirement is. This policy is over 10 years now, so I feel positively going into this, we'll review it openly, and we'll see where we go from there.”

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

“At the Scrutiny Commission meeting on 9th June, the Leader told the Commission “We don’t think we’ll have a visit from the DOGE.” He went on to tell members:

“We have to have a proper thought-out scheme with a reliable partner who is able to accomplish that {the audit} for us and not just come in and bang a big drum and save a few million here and there. We have a specific problem; we’ve got to try and concentrate our thoughts on how we can deal with it correctly and professionally.”

It is reasonable to infer from those comments that the Leader does not therefore view the Reform UK DOGE Audit Team as a reliable partner and that, based on his comments, he wouldn’t see the use of that team as dealing with the audit correctly or professionally. That the Leader holds that view is further confirmed when Mr Harrison answered a question from Mrs Taylor regarding the cost of external auditors stating:

“Inevitably there will be a cost. Outside sources of the style and standard and professionalism needed, there would be a cost.”

Following the Scrutiny Commission meeting, Leicestershire Live reported that Reform UK had told them that party bosses “expected” all of the councils it controlled to “welcome” the audit team in.

Given the Leader’s very clear view on the Reform UK DOGE team, can he again confirm that the DOGE team will not be coming to audit Leicestershire County Council?”

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

“Thank you for your question. The new Reform UK Administration inherited a financial mess from our predecessor administrations and their national parties in government. Their failure over 24 years whilst in control has necessitated this Administration to take immediate action to reduce the current Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) gap of £90m by 2028/29. We also need to know the impact on the MTFS of the Government’s Spending Review (announced on 11 June) and a report will be brought to the next meeting of Cabinet by the Director of Corporate Resources, highlighting the Spending Review’s impact and implications for the County Council’s finances and services. It will also address as far as possible the implications of the Government’s review of local government funding announced on 20th June.

Mr Poland, however, is incorrect in his understanding of my view of DOGE. At the Scrutiny Commission I was referring to DOGE visiting those councils who have a Reform UK majority control, starting with Kent. It has since become clear that DOGE has offered to assist councils with a Reform UK minority administration and I recently said to the Opposition Group Leaders

that I have invited DOGE here for an initial discussion, although the commissioning of a review would be a matter for decision by the Cabinet, a key decision. At the same meeting, the Director of Law and Governance explained the requirements around data protection and the limitations on data sharing which would apply.

At its meeting later in July, the Cabinet will consider what sort of efficiency review it wishes to commission. Rooting out inefficiency and waste was a key platform of our election mandate in May and is something the public clearly supports. We will not shy away from taking tough decisions needed to put this Council on a firmer financial footing.

Mr Poland may also be interested to know that other County Councils under Reform UK control, such as Nottinghamshire, Derbyshire and Lancashire, have taken the initiative to commission work on their own efficiency reviews, without waiting to be visited by the DOGE team."

Mr. Poland asked the following supplementary question:

"In the answer the Leader talks about failure from the previous administration but Leicestershire was benchmarked third out of 32 upper tier authorities for overall performance in 2024, second for Adult Social Care, second for Highways and Transport, with the Children and Families Department rated outstanding by Ofsted just one year ago. Does the Leader really believe that represents failure?"

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

"We're committed to a review. We have been all the way along. I suggested a review of efficiency throughout the campaign in various events, whether it was with the media or at public gatherings. All my colleagues support it as I do."

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

"At the Melton Borough Full Council meeting on March 27th the Portfolio Holder for Governance, Environment, and Regulatory Services stated that £34.7 million had been secured through S106 contributions for education across the Borough over the past decade. However, records indicate that only £8.7 million has actually been collected by Leicestershire County Council.

Given this significant discrepancy, will the Leader acknowledge that District Councils must take greater responsibility in ensuring that S106 funds from developers are properly collected and allocated, so that Leicestershire County Council can deliver the essential services our communities depend on?"

Mr Fowler replied as follows:

"It is important to be clear about the distinction between secured and

collected contributions, and the sensitivity around how they are reported.

A secured contribution means that there is a completed legal agreement in place to ensure that, should the development go ahead, the developer is legally obliged to pay the relevant contributions. Legal agreements that have not yet been completed and are still under negotiation are not included in any reports on secured contributions.

Collected means that the relevant contributions have been paid to the County Council.

Leicestershire County Council's records show that, over the ten years period from April 2015 to March 2025, a total of £18.7m had been secured for Education (including Early Years, and SEND) in Melton borough.

Over the same ten years period, £8.7m has been collected for education in Melton borough.

I am aware of 3 agreements in the Melton borough that are still under negotiation with relevant parties. These agreements, if completed as expected, will secure a further £17.7m in contributions for Education, and the land for a new primary school.

The £18.7m already secured for Education, when added to the £17.7m in negotiations, exceeds the £34.7m figure Mr Orson refers to in the question. At any given time, there will always be a gap between contributions secured and contributions collected. Legal agreements are entered into at the point of planning permission being granted, and the Planning Obligations Team records the contributions secured once all relevant parties have legally completed the agreement.

However, the legal triggers for payment of contributions are, typically, at the commencement of development and then at key points of progression, such as the first dwelling to be occupied. The time lag between planning permission being granted (and the amount secured being recorded), and the legal triggers being reached, will account for much of the gap between contributions secured and contributions collected at any given point in time.

Other factors to bear in mind are that some developments, for whatever reason, may not ultimately go ahead despite planning permission being in place, whilst others can run into viability problems during construction. Such factors also mean that the contributions secured figure, at any given point in time, will always differ from the contributions collected figure.

Turning to the substantive point of the question, I am aware of the positive working relationships between the County Councils Planning Obligations Team and the Development Management and Planning Policy Teams at the district councils.

I expect this relationship to continue to be positive and that the district councils will work closely with the County Council on the sharing of information and intelligence about the implementation and progress of approved developments, including situations where permissions with

agreements lapse or are superseded, to ensure that developer contributions are being monitored and collected as efficiently as possible, and to ensure that information about secured contributions is up-to-date.

More importantly, district councils should be doing everything within their planning powers to ensure that they are approving viable developments that are capable of making their full contribution to essential community services. Officers are aware of several instances where applicants have sought to reduce S106 contributions on the basis of site viability. This is a concern for the Council particularly in respect of education provision and highways and transport infrastructure, given the absence of adequate developer contributions gives rise to substantial financial risks for the County Council in the performing of its statutory duties. Other contributions such as those that support recycling and household waste sites and community facilities are also often reduced, leading to the risk of shortfalls in the future in these service areas.

Melton Borough Council introduced a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to inform prioritisation of developer contributions if viability issues occur and this prioritises highways and education contributions in order to manage the larger financial risks. In line with the Council's statutory duties to provide school places for children living in the new development the Council cannot accept reduced education contributions as part of viability negotiations.

It is important that the Borough Council in its role as planning authority does everything within its powers to require that development coming forward funds the necessary infrastructure to ensure that new development is sustainable and its residents can access the services they need."

Mr Orson asked the following supplementary question:

"I have no doubt the Lead Member is aware that Melton Borough Council approved 368 homes and waived Section 106 monies amounting to £1.8 million that would have supported vital infrastructure: £844,000 for the Melton Mowbray Distributor Road (MMDR), £900,000 for education and £48,000 for health services, not to mention the absence of contributions to libraries and other services. While viability assessments were accepted, the scale of the shortfall is significant. Has the Administration made formal representation to Melton Borough Council about this?"

Mr Fowler replied as follows:

"With regard to Melton Borough Council, as outlined in the answer already provided, there are a number of factors which affect whether the contributions are up to date or not. Naturally, the trigger points will change based on legal requirements, things such as the first occupant of the dwellings. But, we are in a working relationship with the district councils. Yes, they do need to make sure they're fulfilling their obligations and holding the developers to account, that much I agree on, but we do have a working relationship with them and we are currently in talks with them, especially with regards to the changes and variations in a lot of the major developments that have come from the circular road around Melton Mowbray."

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

“I’d like to highlight the excellent work carried out by Nigel Palmer in securing over 1,000 petition signatures calling for improved safety at the Bull in the Oak Junction, near Market Bosworth. I would request that Leicestershire County Council Highways Department gives full consideration to the proposals made and responds with speed.”

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

“The County Council is in receipt of this petition and through an evidence-based appraisal will consider the justification for installing traffic signals at the Bull in the Oak junction.

In addition, the Council will need to assess the feasibility of installing traffic signals at this junction, which will involve the undertaking of a data collection exercise to gain up to date information on traffic flows and counts at the location. This along with accident and speed data is essential in considering the petition and will enable the junction’s current performance and capacity to be assessed. Following the data collection, a simulation replicating conditions of traffic signals will be carried out to understand if it would be feasible to introduce signals by assessing any congestion impacts on current traffic flow as well as considering future demand and growth.

The data collection exercise along with the full assessment will take time to complete. It is anticipated that the Council will be in a position to fully respond to this petition during September 2025.

Please be assured our investigations will consider all aspects of the concerns raised, including a review of signage in and around the crossroads, and any other potential improvements which could be considered necessary.”

(I) Mrs Taylor asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

- “1. Could the Leader please advise how his private meeting with Sir Peter Soulsby regarding Local Government Reorganisation (LGR) went? Was any agreement reached?
2. What is the Leader’s view on the way forward for the County Council regarding LGR?
3. The Leader advised the Scrutiny Commission on Monday 9th June that he was working in collaboration with the Districts/Boroughs and Rutland Councils. Two hours after the Leader said that, their North, City, South proposals went out for public consultation, why?
4. When will the Leader be publishing a public consultation from the County Council so residents can input their views?”

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

- “1. I have met Sir Peter on several occasions since I became Leader and we are working constructively on what is best for the County and the City together.
2. As above: what is best for the County and the City together.
3. That is a question for the Leaders of the district councils and Rutland. They did not inform me of their intention, nor I understand did they inform Sir Peter.
4. It will be important to consider the Government’s guidelines on consultation before any decisions are taken.”

Mrs Taylor asked the following supplementary question:

“When is the Leader actually going to make a decision on local government reorganisation? Obviously, we're hearing about lots of meetings going on, but we're now in July. We're heading into the summer recess and we're still no further forward than we were two months ago. We're losing time and we really need to be going out and consulting with our residents to get their view about how they feel about what's best for local government reorganisation in Leicestershire. Can the leader please confirm when we'll be going out for consultation? We all know it's important, but we need to get this done and dusted by November to give officers time to write our business case. When will you make a decision?”

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

“I think you realise from my response initially, we are in discussions with the Mayor. There are other people we have spoken to in the past, but this is critical. This is going to affect Leicestershire for probably the next 50 years. We've got to get this right. It's so critical that we get it right. I understand your concerns on pace and that's fine. I accept that. But we've just got to be able to get this right. You know, from what I've said, I believe that Leicestershire is important, and we believe a Combined Authority is appropriate. Having tried to seek information and not get information from anywhere else, we've had no option. I've had to take an executive view that we need to talk to who's appropriate. They're there. They're willing to talk. So, we've had two meetings, and we'll continue those meetings, and we've established a proper professional rapport. We will then have to move on with how we're going to resolve any of the difficulties. We've said we are keen to talk and find, with best effort, answers, but it might not be at the pace you're expecting, but you've been through this. You know what's it like, but this time we've been told it has to be right. Now, we've done things in the past and got “No”. So, this time I want to make sure when we submit, and if it's with the City, that we've got two potential organisations of note and ability to be able to be recognised by the Government. It is absolutely critical how we do this, and obviously you know the discussions with land and all sorts, because previously the Conservative Group took a view that we'll go forward where we were going to give land in the past. I'm open-minded what we do. It's critical. But what I'm concerned about, if we sit back and actually did nothing,

the City would have a fantastic case to be able to say it needs land. What I'm trying to say to you is, we will do it right because we want to be in charge of this, not leave it to some civil servant to say, "Oh, no, we won't want this, want that." So, it's important that the case we bring to the Government is going to be a case that we've got a good chance of winning. It's absolutely critical. I apologise if the pace isn't to your liking, but I've also promised to talk to people and let them know on the journey where we're going with this. I can't be any fairer than that. I'm trying to be helpful, but I cannot rush it. And that's what I'm being invited to do is to rush it. I will do it correctly. I will get it spot on that people can then look at it and say, "Yes, we like that. That's a great idea."

(J) Mrs Taylor asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"In Reform UK's local political leaflets for the May 2025 elections and at Reform UK's national launch of the elections in Birmingham, Reform UK informed Leicestershire residents how much Leicestershire County Council's Chief Executive was paid, stating that his salary was an extortionate amount and should not be allowed. Can I ask:

1. Is the Leader happy with the current Chief Executive's salary?
2. What does the Leader believe is a reasonable starting salary for the new Chief Executive and will the Leader commit to not recruiting a new Chief Executive on more than that figure?
3. If the Leader is unhappy with the current Chief Executive's salary, will he introduce a salary cap for the new Chief Executive as part of their contract to ensure inflation and other contractual pay increases do not push their salary beyond a certain level even if they give decades of service to this county as the current Chief Executive has?"

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

"Thank you for your question. In response to the first paragraph of your question, political literature was produced by the Reform UK Party's central office, over which local candidates had little control. After the election, I took the opportunity to personally apologise to the Chief Executive, who has provided many years' dedicated service to the communities of Leicestershire. I'm very happy with the current Chief Executive's performance and that of his staff, supporting the transition to a new Reform UK Administration following the County Council elections in May. I am also grateful to the Chief Executive agreeing to postpone his retirement until November this year.

No decisions have yet been made regarding the recruitment of a new Chief Executive and Head of Paid Service, but I have said to Mrs Taylor and the other Group Leaders that with the possibility of new structures of the local government in the short term, I am inclined towards an interim appointment. The appointment process is set out in the Constitution of the County Council, part 4H Officer Employment Procedure Rules. It is also worthwhile to note that Member involvement will be on a cross-party basis, with a politically balanced Chief Officer Recruitment panel making a recommendation to the

full Council for approval.

Regarding salary levels, caps and contractual arrangements, those details will need to be agreed during the recruitment process, with regard to the nationally set Chief Executive salary scales.”

Mrs Taylor asked the following supplementary question:

“In the first paragraph of your response, you advised that it was political literature produced by the Reform UK Party central office over which local candidates had little control, but your own campaign Facebook page was pushing this political literature about the salary that the Chief Executive of this Council thoroughly deserves. So maybe you should also apologise to the residents of Leicestershire, as well as your apology which I think was very welcomed by the Chief Executive.

Just going to the appointment of an interim Chief Executive, that will cost this Council a huge amount of money to get an interim Chief Executive in. So, will the Leader reconsider that decision and move with haste towards the recruitment process for a new permanent Chief Executive for this Council?”

Mr Harrison replied as follows:

“We are aware that the Chief Executive has kindly extended his retirement until November, which I asked him about. I did apologise to the Chief Executive because lots of literature goes out. I was unaware and I thought, “well I've never campaigned like that before.” I did apologise and he accepted that apology.

With reference to going forward, it is critical, and we've got to think where we're moving and, if we are moving into other organisations, how we're going to change and shape what is happening in local government. Maybe something of a more temporary basis, rather than actually going out to the market straight away. I think that's going to be the best way forward for us. An interim temporary Chief Executive might be far better and with less costs involved. It would probably be the way we go forward.”

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

“Residents living in the Ashby Road area of Hinckley are extremely concerned about safety issues on the road. There's a concern about excessive speeding on the road and the risk of accidents on the road. This has been heightened by a tragic accident involving a motorcyclist on the road on 13th June 2025.

Could County Council Highways please look urgently at this situation. Can a thorough assessment please be taken of the risks of accidents on Ashby Road and an assessment taken of what road safety measures are needed on the road to reduce the risks of accidents. The problems on this road are also heightened by it being linked to Normandy Way which has also had a number of accidents including tragically fatal accidents and ongoing

problems with speeding which need to be addressed also.”

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

“Leicestershire County Council reviews all collisions annually and investigates any emerging issues or clusters sites in the County where groups of injury collisions have occurred within the most recent five years, or more specifically, looking at the most recent five years of available data as there is a delay between a collision occurring and that data being validated and available to the Council. Currently, the Council has validated data up to the end of 2024.

Where patterns in the data are obvious, and an intervention can be identified, justified, and implemented within the available budget, schemes will be developed, and mitigation measures provided. Throughout the year, this cluster site analysis is reviewed and repeated so that the Council is aware of any emerging problem sites.

In addition, the Council produces an annual casualty reduction report where specific road safety elements are reviewed. This includes cluster site analysis, general route analysis and route analysis for all County roads that are assigned the national speed limit. The report is taken to the Highways and Transport Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its March meeting every year (the latest report being presented on 6 March 2025 can be found [here](#)).

The Ashby Road/Normandy Way junction is currently being investigated as part of the annual cluster site programme. This analysis will determine what improvements could be considered at this junction and along Ashby Road. Once that analysis is complete, an update on the outcome and any proposed improvements which are identified will be provided.

The Council is aware of the incident which occurred on 13 June 2025 and would seek to assure members and the community that this will be reviewed as part of the ongoing analysis and investigations.”

Mr Mullaney asked the following supplementary question:

“The issues of road safety along Ashby Road and Normandy Way in Hinckley continue to be a matter of concern to local residents. I'm glad from the response that road safety issues in this area are going to be looked at as part of the cluster site program. I hope that any recommendations for safety improvements on these stretches of road will be fully implemented. I understand the financial pressures that the County Council is under, but if there are recommendations for road safety action to be taken on these roads, can I please ask that they will be fully implemented?”

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

“Of course, safety always comes first, and I've read in great detail where we're going with this and I completely agree with you that safety is predominant, and it will be. I've noted your comments, and I will take that and act on it.”

(L) Mr Poland asked the following question of the Leader or his

nominee:

“At the Cabinet meeting on 7th February the Director of Environment and Transport confirmed the Department was investigating the possibility of giving local Flood Wardens the power to close roads in a flooding situation. After the flooding on the 6th January, and indeed after previous flooding incidents, Flood Wardens told me they would welcome the power to close roads to stop traffic trying to come through as this creates bow waves which can cause or exacerbate internal property flooding. Would the Leader be able to provide an update on this matter please and can he confirm if Flood Wardens will be given road closing powers in time for any floods which may occur this autumn or winter?”

Mr Tilbury replied as follows:

“The powers to close a road rest with the police and the Highway Authority under sections 14 and 67 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act, but as a Highway Authority, the Council would also need to consider any duties under the Highways Act 1980. There is no clear directive that stipulates that the powers to close a road can be delegated to volunteers and so any delegation of authority to VFWS would have to ensure that all aspects of the relevant statutory obligations are followed.

Statutes surrounding road closures include:

- The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (as amended)
- Road Traffic (Temporary Restrictions) Act 1991
- The Street Works Regulations 1995 (Accreditation Units 1 and 2)
- Traffic Signs Manual, Chapter 8 (as amended)
- Department of Transport Departmental Standard TD 21/85 & TA 47/85
- The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016

The Council is therefore taking legal advice on how to achieve this and also how to ensure the safety of our volunteers. Once a proposal has been developed, it will be presented for consideration by the volunteers and the Lead Member for flooding. It is likely that investment in training will be required in order to meet the requirements of these statutory obligations which will have to be undertaken prior to implementing the scheme.”

Mr Poland asked the following supplementary question:

“I’m very pleased to see that the power to delegate road closures to flood wardens is being progressed. I think that’s something that would be very welcome to many flood wardens I’ve spoken to. I’ve spoken to them officially in my own patch, but also, it’s part of my day job across the wider Melton and Syston area. The impact of vehicles going through flood water and the bow waves that creates can be really devastating to houses. Sometimes it can exacerbate flooding and sometimes it can actually cause flooding where there hadn’t been any previously. When flooding occurs, we need the power to flood wardens to be able to close roads and do that quickly in order to save property. With that in mind, could I ask the Lead Member if it’s possible for him to do everything we can to ensure this is in place in time for Autumn when the flooding season is likely to start again?”

Mr Tilbury replied as follows:

"Firstly, I would say I'm in support of the proposal. It gives local people with local knowledge the chance to act quickly and decisively in devastating times of flooding. The Cabinet and I are already looking into that, and we are finding ways to strategically stop flooding. I'll report back to you as soon as possible."

(M) Mrs Bottomley asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Leicestershire has experienced increasingly regular and devastating flooding in recent years. As the Lead Local Flood Authority, Leicestershire County Council has a statutory duty to provide a section 19 report after major flooding events. The report for Storm Henk, which occurred in January 2024, has an estimated publication date of January 2026. The Leicestershire County Council website states "in the time between flooding occurring and the formal flood investigation publication, the Council and partners seek to keep affected communities up to date with investigations and actions, so that by the time of publication, most of the contents is already known." While this is a sensible and logical practice, it is at odds with the experiences being reported to me by residents, the Parish Councils in my division, and Charnwood Borough Council. Can the Lead Member please detail what actions have been taken, and how and when these have been communicated?"

Mr Tilbury replied as follows:

"Storm Henk resulted in around 89 communities being impacted by flooding which in most cases was recorded as internal flooding. A total of 450 properties across the county were reported as internally flooded. As a result of Storm Henk, the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) received a large number of enquiries from customers reporting flooding and asking for support and advice as well as answers and solutions. The LLFA logged all enquiries and responded as quickly as possible to any reports.

It is not always possible to respond directly to every member of the public where there are multiple reports of internal flooding, which may involve a number of actions and responsible bodies. In this instance, the LLFA would liaise with parish councils, local members and local flood action groups and request that updates are then shared by those bodies more widely.

Based on the current criteria for formal flood investigations, a large number of communities across the county triggered a formal investigation for Storm Henk. Due to the extent and magnitude of impacted communities and internally flooded properties, the LLFA took the decision to undertake one holistic formal Section 19 (S19) investigation covering all impacted communities across the county rather than producing separate investigation reports for each locality.

Within Mrs Bottomley's area, the village of Sileby was one of the locations that triggered a S19 investigation and is therefore included within the holistic

S19 investigation and subsequent report to be published. The status of this investigation is viewable on the County Council's website.

With particular respect to Sileby, there were nine properties recorded as being internally flooded during Storm Henk. Since then, and in order to help inform the S19 investigation, the LLFA has coordinated a number of discussions with key Flood Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) and this has included Charnwood Borough Council as well as the Environment Agency (EA) and Severn Trent Water. A site visit was completed for Sileby on 14th June 2024 which included the local Flood Warden, Charnwood Borough Council, the LLFA and the EA.

While the S19 investigation report is yet to be published, it is clear that the main risk of flooding to Sileby is from the Main River for which the EA has the overarching responsibility. The EA has identified a number of key actions for Sileby of which are currently in progress. Whilst the LLFA has remained in frequent contact with the Parish Council and the Flood Warden for Sileby, in recognition of the concerns raised by the member, a summary of agreed actions and timescale will be discussed with the EA and shared with the community in due course.

In addition to this, following feedback from a recent flood drop-in event in Syston, it is proposed that a flood drop-in event is held in Sileby and the LLFA will coordinate this event to take place in the Autumn 2025."

Mrs Bottomley asked the following supplementary question:

"I welcome the proposed flood drop in event and the summary of agreed actions and a timeline which can be shared with our community. However, as detailed in the original question, and having spoken with both the Chair of the Parish Council and one of the flood wardens as early as this morning, they strongly dispute your statement that the Lead Local Flood Authority has remained in frequent contact with the Parish Council and the flood warden. Can you please clarify what the Lead Local Flood Authority considers frequent contact and what this looks like in practice?"

Mr Tilbury replied as follows:

"I've asked the officers for a report of where we currently are on this report. And I would also say if you got any residents who have particular concerns, direct them directly to me and I'll find out and get a written report to you of what you ask."

(N) Mrs Bottomley asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"Given the brief timeline given for Local Government Reorganisation, can the Leader confirm whether he is continuing to work on the previous Conservative administration's "one Leicestershire" plan, working with the district and boroughs on their "North, City, South" plan, or is planning an entirely different submission for consideration?"

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

"I have looked at all the plans submitted in March, including the City Council's plan to which Mrs Bottomley does not refer. The focus from now on should be on what is best for the County and the City together."

Mrs Bottomley asked the following supplementary question:

"Can the Leader please clarify which proposal, if any, he is going to continue to pursue or is he intending on working with Leicester City Council to potentially concede the extension of their boundaries and create a new proposal? How will this be communicated effectively with members as currently there is a lot of confusion around transparency and the decision-making process?"

Mr Harrison replied as follows:

"I'd apologise, but we're doing everything we can to move at pace. We're starting from a zero position. Remember I spent time, it was within the first two weeks of being Leader of this authority. I went to a meeting of the Leaders of eight bodies in Leicestershire to discuss and we agreed on open transparency which I've always suggested is the key to the whole project, to be open and transparent, and nobody came back to me. Now we're trying to find where we could work, and the logic is in Leicestershire, because nobody's coming up with anything to prove value in what they're doing and sustainability. I've had to then think right so I know about unitary for Leicestershire because I was here in 2019 when we were pioneering that approach. Talking to the City, trying to see the agreements, we both think it's right to go forward as two entities, but we've now got to get down to the more practical and the understanding and we haven't done that as yet. That's the key and as we move over the next two or three weeks, we'll start to understand each other's needs and how we can accommodate it and whether it's practical."

(O) Mr Bray asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"The new Arriva LC14 service from Fosse Park to Hinckley will be welcomed by many people in Hinckley and other villages, however it will cause concern for businesses in the town centre. The loss of the 1 and 2 services serving Hinckley, Barwell and Earl Shilton has meant that many elderly people are no longer able to independently shop in town. Would the Leader please look at whether the County Council could utilise some of the external bus funding received to provide a shoppers' bus on market days that covers the estates in Hinckley, Barwell and Earl Shilton that were previously served by the 1 and 2 services. This will be a huge boost for Hinckley town centre and give back independence to local people - particularly elderly and disabled people who are unable to walk the distances to catch the 158 or 48 services."

Mr Whitford replied as follows:

"The previous services 1 and 2 were commercially operated without subsidy from the Council and therefore, the removal of these services was a commercial decision by the operator due to a lack of patronage. In response

to this and in line with our passenger transport policy and strategy we provided some bookable taxi based Demand Responsive Transport (DRT) services to ensure that those residents without access to an alternative bus service were provided for. The DRT service for Earl Shilton provides journeys to the centre of Earl Shilton and a similar DRT service is in place for Barwell. Residents who are eligible to use both the Earl Shilton and Barwell DRT services, can travel on them to connect to bus services which will take them into Hinckley.

However, the Council is currently progressing a countywide passenger transport network review and as part of the upcoming phase of this review, we will take this feedback on board as we consider how best to utilise the Bus Service Improvement Plan funding in these areas to maximise provision and access to opportunities for residents.

Residents are very welcome to attend and provide their views at Choose How You Move roadshows (details of which can be found here <https://www.choosehowyoumove.co.uk/public-transport/get-around-by-bus/leicestershire-buses/leicestershire-network-review/>) their feedback can also be submitted online by emailing choosehowyoumove@leics.gov.uk team."

(P) Mr Chapman asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"As the Environment and Climate Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee is changing its name to the Environment and Flooding Overview and Scrutiny Committee, will climate change still be on the agenda for this Committee, as many believe that the increase in flooding is often seen as a consequence of climate change?"

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

"Matters related to a changing climate and the associated impacts will fall under the remit of the Environment and Flooding Overview and Scrutiny Committee."

(Q) Mr Page asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:

"After two months in office and having reviewed in full the state of the County's finances, what cuts in services is the Leader intending to make in order to fund his election promise to reduce council tax?"

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

"As a new Administration, we are continuing the process of reviewing the state of the Council's finances inherited from the previous administrations over the last 24 years. We will need to consider the impact on the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) of the Government's Spending review and its potential implications on the County Council's services and finances. No decisions on any potential service reductions or council tax levels have yet been made, as is the case with a rolling 4-year MTFS. Agreeing the County

Council element of the council tax precept will be taken at the Budget meeting of the County Council on 18 February 2026.”

Mr Page asked the following supplementary question:

“With no plan, no decisions, and no idea how to fund a tax cut, was your election promise ever real, or are you about to renege on that commitment? If you're not, something else has to give. So, will it be cuts in school bus services, cuts in home visits to the elderly who've suffered catastrophic falls at home, cuts to SEND places, or perhaps will it be cuts to mental health services? There is perhaps one other option. Is it possible that the Leader is waiting for Nigel and his DOGE stooges, none of whom are, in my view, qualified to even clean the shoes of our excellent officers here at County Hall, I might add, to try to find the secret money tree that they're all convinced is lurking here. And perhaps it's disguised as a flagpole. So, Leader, renege on election promises, impose massive cuts to services, or go find the money tree. Which is it to be? Because the people of Leicestershire have a right to know.”

Mr D Harrison replied as follows:

“Really, the history is that your party had cuts. This party isn't going to cut services. I'm going to tell you straight. The truth is this, that we are, in part, moving this operation towards a strategic overview of the whole efficiency of Leicestershire County Council. That was what we said we'd do, and that's what we are doing because through that we should be able to manage a better budget. Remember, we've inherited a hard job to follow. We've got the £90 odd million that's in the budget at the moment running forward. We've also got probably £60 million of SEND value that the Government said it might pay half, it might pay all, it might pay none. There are difficulties left here that we're dealing with, but trust me, we are proceeding at pace to move forward to talk to people who could come in and provide us with this service. I can only tell you that and I won't say anymore but we will be doing something. I hope one day you can stand up and say “I feel a right fool because what you've done is fantastic.” What you did was cut services. Now, remember that. You weren't here. You've walked in and somebody's gave you a lovely script. You're able to cut back over the years because we haven't been able to fund what we're doing. That's what we were told, and that's what we actually did, to look at things. Let's be honest. It's no good offering bull. We're offering fact. Sit tight and we will show you what we're going to do. Let's hope you approve it when we come forward to do it. Let's hope you will do that.”

19. POSITION STATEMENTS UNDER STANDING ORDER 8.

There were no position statements.

20. REPORTS OF THE CABINET.

(a) Local Transport Plan 4.

It was moved by Mrs Taylor, seconded by Mr Poland and carried

unanimously:

- “(a) That subject to (b) below, the Local Transport Plan (LTP4) Core Document, attached as Appendix A to the report, be approved;
- (b) That the Director of Environment and Transport, following consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member, be authorised to update the LTP4, including the focused strategies, Multi-Modal Area Investment Plans (MMAIPs), and the County Strategic Transport Investment Plan, as a result of evidence arising from the delivery of the LTP4 Core Document and consideration of future iterations of the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

(b) Local Nature Recovery Strategy.

It was moved by Mr Tilbury, seconded by Mr Whitford and carried unanimously:

“That the Local Nature Recovery Strategy for Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland be approved.”

21. REPORT OF THE CORPORATE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

(a) Annual Report of the Corporate Governance Committee.

It was moved by Mr Bray, seconded by Mr Cooke and carried unanimously:

“That the Corporate Governance Committee Annual Report 2024-25, attached to the report, be noted.”

22. REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY COMMISSION.

(a) Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report.

It was moved by Mrs Taylor, seconded by Mr Mullaney and carried unanimously:

“That the information contained in the Overview and Scrutiny Annual Report 2024-25, appended to the report, be noted.”

23. REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.

(a) Review of the Constitution.

It was moved by Mr Harrison and seconded by Mrs Taylor:

“That the proposed changes to the terms of reference of the Council’s Overview and Scrutiny Committees, as set out in the Appendix to this report, and any consequential amendments to the Constitution required as a result

of these changes, be approved.”

The motion was put and not carried, with 22 members voting for the motion and 27 members voting against.

25. TO CONSIDER THE FOLLOWING NOTICES OF MOTION:

(a) Local Government Reorganisation.

It was moved by Mr Mullaney and seconded by Mr Bray:

"Following the outcome of the election in which the Conservatives lost their majority fighting on a platform of one unitary authority for the whole of Leicestershire this County Council resolves to:

- (a) Withdraw the bid with the Government for one unitary authority for the whole of Leicestershire and support the proposals from the Borough and District Councils and Rutland County Council for two Unitary authorities for Leicestershire (a North and a South);
- (b) Record its objection to any proposal that would involve parts of the County of Leicestershire being taken over by an enlarged Leicester City Authority."

An amendment was moved by Mr D Harrison and seconded by Mr Boam:

"That

- i) following advice from chief officers on the proposals for local government reorganisation (LGR) from the district councils and Rutland, which include a proposed north/south split of the county, the County Council believes that the proposal if implemented:
 - (a) would lead to a significant risk to the stability of countywide services, particularly social care.
 - (b) would also cause unnecessary disaggregation of services leading to cost increases, duplication and reduced economies of scale for upper tier functions such as highways, waste disposal and social care.

It is also noted that:

- (c) the County Council was informed by the leaders of the district councils and Rutland at a meeting in January 2025 that, following earlier meetings to which the County Council had not been invited, those leaders supported a unitary authority for Leicester with an extended boundary and two unitary authorities for the remaining area of Leicestershire and Rutland.
- (d) the County Council under the previous administration changed its position when the Government refused a request to delay elections

to join the fast-track LGR programme to unlock devolution.

- (e) the County Council is not aware that the district councils and Rutland have changed their position from January 2025 but are currently carrying out a 'public engagement' exercise on a proposal which does not support an extended City boundary.
- ii) the County Council believes it is important to be open and transparent in the LGR process.
- iii) the County Council is therefore unable to support the proposals from the district councils and Rutland for two unitary authorities for Leicestershire, which would create unviable new authorities, contrary to Government requirements as set out in the Devolution White Paper that new unitary councils must be the right size to achieve efficiencies, improve capacity and withstand financial shocks.
- iv) the County Council is having constructive discussions with the City Council and there is joint agreement that the best option for LGR in Leicester and Leicestershire is a two unitary model, one City, one County, that both authorities must be financially sustainable with the capacity to enable strategic land use planning across City and County, providing the optimum structure for devolution of powers, responsibilities and funding."

On the amendment 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 Amendment

Mr Abbott, Mr Bailey, Dr Bloxham, Mr Boam, Mr Bradshaw, Miss Butler, Mr Cooke, Mr Crook, Mrs Danks, Mr England, Mr Fowler, Mr Grimley, Mr Hamilton-Gray, Mr D Harrison, Mr P Harrison, Mr Innes, Mr King, Mrs Knight, Mr Lovegrove, Mr McDonald, Mr Melen, Mr Morris, Mr O'Shea, Mr Orson, Mr Page, Mrs Page, Mr Poland, Mr Richichi, Mr Rudkin, Mrs Seaton, Mr Smith, Mr Squires, Mrs Taylor, Mr Tilbury, Mr Whitford

Against the Amendment

Mr Bools, Mrs Bottomley, Mr Bray, Mr Charlesworth, Mr Durrani, Mr Galton, Mr Gamble, Ms Gray, Dr Hill, Mr Holt, Mr Mullaney, Mrs Pendlebury, Mr Walker

The amendment was put and carried, with 35 members voting for the amendment and 13 members voting against.

On the substantive 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 Substantive Motion

Mr Abbott, Mr Bailey, Dr Bloxham, Mr Boam, Mr Bradshaw, Miss Butler, Mr Cooke, Mr Crook, Mrs Danks, Mr England, Mr Fowler, Mr Grimley, Mr Hamilton-Gray, Mr D Harrison, Mr P Harrison, Mr Innes, Mr King, Mrs Knight, Mr Lovegrove, Mr McDonald, Mr Melen, Mr Morris, Mr O'Shea, Mr Orson, Mr Page, Mrs Page, Mr Poland, Mr Richichi, Mr Rudkin, Mrs Seaton, Mr Smith, Mr Squires, Mrs Taylor, Mr Tilbury, Mr Whitford

Against the Substantive Motion

Mr Bools, Mrs Bottomley, Mr Bray, Mr Charlesworth, Mr Durrani, Mr Galton, Mr Gamble, Ms Gray, Dr Hill, Mr Holt, Mr Mullaney, Mrs Pendlebury, Mr Walker

The substantive motion was put and carried, with 35 members voting for the amendment and 13 members voting against.

(b) Spending Review.

With the consent of the Council, Mr Mullaney moved the following altered motion, seconded by Mrs Pendlebury:

“In the interests of seeking a way forward which we can all support and in recognition of the omission of the Chancellor to address issues in Leicestershire in either the Budget or the Spending Review, this Council resolves to make representation to the Government in order to persuade it:

- (i) To provide fair funding for the County Council as Leicestershire remains rooted at the bottom of the league;
- (ii) To provide adequate resources for the maintenance of the three emergency services in the County, Fire, Police and Ambulance, all of which are profoundly under funded;
- (iii) To outline the action it intends to take to tackle continuing flooding problems;
- (iv) To address the issue of retention, recruitment and improvements in the NHS and Social Care across the County;
- (v) To bring forward an early programme to road and rail schemes across the County including the A5, Junctions 21 and 24 of the M1, the A46 Hobby Horse Island and the long promised Coventry – Leicester rail project.”

The motion was put and carried, with 42 members voting for the motion and no members voting against.

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL
HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 30 JULY 2025**

PRESENT

Mr. P. Harrison CC (in the Chair)

Mr. C. Abbott CC, Mr. R. Bailey CC, Dr. J. Bloxham CC, Mr. J. Boam CC, Mrs. N. Bottomley CC, Mr. S. L. Bray CC, Mrs. L. Broadley CC, Miss. H. Butler CC, Mr. M. H. Charlesworth CC, Mr. G. Cooke CC, Mr. K. Crook CC, Mrs. L. Danks CC, Mr. M. Durrani CC, Mr. M. R. England CC, Mr. H. Fowler CC, Mr. S. J. Galton CC, Mr. D. A. Gamble CC, Mr. D. J. Grimley CC, Mr. A. Hamilton-Gray CC, Mr. D. Harrison CC, Dr. S. Hill CC, Mr. N. Holt CC, Mr. A. Innes CC, Mr. P. King CC, Mrs. K. Knight CC, Mr. B. Lovegrove CC, Mr. J. McDonald CC, Mr. J. Melen CC, Mr. J. Miah CC, Mr. P. Morris CC, Mr. M. T. Mullaney CC, Mr. O. O'Shea JP CC, Mr. D. Page CC, Mrs. R. Page CC, Mr J. Poland CC, Mr. C. Pugsley CC, Mr. V. Richichi CC, Mr. K. Robinson CC, Mrs B. Seaton CC, Mr. C. A. Smith CC, Mr. M. Squires CC, Mrs D. Taylor CC, Mr. A. Tilbury CC, Mr. B. Walker CC and Mr. C. Whitford CC

26. 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 Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in the Notice of Motion on Local Government Reorganisation. The Corporate Governance Committee on 23 June approved a dispensation for all members to allow them to take part in any discussion and vote on any matter relating to the office they hold at the County Council, so all members were able to stay in the room and vote on this matter.

27. NOTICE OF MOTION:

(a) Local Government Reorganisation.

It was moved by Mrs Taylor and seconded by Mr Poland:

“Following receipt of the Interim Plan Feedback document from the government in June on local government reorganisation proposals for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland, and comments from the City Mayor of Leicester at the Full Council meeting of Leicester City Council on Thursday 3rd July that “both the County Council Leadership in public, and District Council Leaders in private acknowledge that the case for boundary revision for the city is unarguable”, this County Council resolves to:

- (A) Require that proposals for, or agreements to Devolution and Local Government Reorganisation made on behalf of Leicestershire County Council by the Leader and/or Cabinet and/or Chief Executive, be subject to debate by and a vote of Full Council before submission to the

Government. A Special Council meeting will be scheduled in November 2025 in anticipation of this vote;

- (B) Recognise that such a submission would only pass this County Council with the support of opposition Councillors and therefore requires the Leader to consult with all Group Leaders on a weekly basis to update them on progress of discussions with Leicester City Council and/or Rutland County Council and/or the Borough and District Councils;
- (C) Confirm that Leicestershire County Council does not support any expansion of the Leicester City Council area boundaries.”

An amendment was moved by Mr D Harrison and seconded by Mr Squires:

“That the County Council:

- i. supports the Leader of the County Council in writing to the Government to request they hold a local referendum given the potential effect of local government reorganisation on Leicestershire and the importance of testing public support;
- ii. recognises that, if reorganisation is required by the Government, the key consideration in deciding on a new unitary structure for Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland will be the proposed City boundary extension and therefore must be in an informed position about the consequences of a boundary extension in order to make a final submission for a new unitary structure to the Government in November 2025;
- iii. confirms its view that the best option is a two unitary model, one City, one County, and that both authorities must be financially sustainable with the capacity to enable strategic land use planning across the area, providing the optimum structure for devolution of powers, responsibilities and funding;
- iv. accordingly regards modelling of the different options for two unitary authorities, and other options, as a prerequisite for informed debate and decision, the initial results from the modelling to be shared with the opposition Group Leaders at the earliest opportunity;
- v. notes that modelling the financial impact of an extended City boundary on the County is in line with the County Council’s interim plan for reorganisation submitted by the previous administration to the Government in March 2025;
- vi. notes that the submission to be made to the Government in November 2025 is a matter for the Cabinet.”

On the amendment 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 Amendment

Mr Abbott, Dr Bloxham, Mr Boam, Miss Butler, Mr Cooke, Mr Crook, Mrs Danks, Mr England, Mr Fowler, Mr Hamilton-Gray, Mr D Harrison, Mr P Harrison, Mr Innes, Mrs Knight, Mr McDonald, Mr Morris, Mr Pugsley, Mr Richichi, Mr Robinson, Mr Squires, Mr Tilbury, Mr Whitford.

Against the Amendment

Mr Bailey, Mrs Bottomley, Mr Bray, Mrs Broadley, Mr Charlesworth, Mr Durrani, Mr Galton, Mr Gamble, Mr Grimley, Dr Hill, Mr Holt, Mr King, Mr Lovegrove, Mr Melen, Mr Miah, Mr Mullaney, Mr O'Shea, Mr Page, Mrs Page, Mr Poland, Mrs Seaton, Mr Smith, Mrs Taylor, Mr Walker.

The amendment was not carried, with 22 members voting for the amendment and 24 members voting against.

On the original 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 Bailey, Mrs Bottomley, Mr Bray, Mrs Broadley, Mr Charlesworth, Mr Durrani, Mr Galton, Mr Gamble, Mr Grimley, Dr Hill, Mr Holt, Mr King, Mr Lovegrove, Mr Melen, Mr Mullaney, Mr O'Shea, Mr Page, Mrs Page, Mr Poland, Mrs Seaton, Mr Smith, Mrs Taylor, Mr Walker.

Against the Motion

Mr Abbott, Dr Bloxham, Mr Boam, Miss Butler, Mr Cooke, Mr Crook, Mrs Danks, Mr England, Mr Fowler, Mr Hamilton-Gray, Mr D Harrison, Mr P Harrison, Mr Innes, Mrs Knight, Mr McDonald, Mr Morris, Mr Pugsley, Mr Richichi, Mr Robinson, Mr Squires, Mr Tilbury, Mr Whitford.

The original motion was put and carried, with 23 members voting for the motion and 22 members voting against.

2.00 pm – 3.37 pm
30 July 2025

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank

REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE

A. REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION

Introduction

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend changes to the terms of reference of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Bodies set out in Table A of Part 2 of the Council's Constitution.

Background

2. Article 15 of the County Council's Constitution gives the Chief Executive a duty to monitor and review the operation of the Constitution to ensure that the aims and principles of the Constitution are given full effect. It requires that changes to the document should only be approved by the full County Council after consideration of the proposal by the Chief Executive and the Constitution Committee or, in the case of Financial Procedure Rules, Contract Procedure Rules and Members' Code of Conduct, the recommendations of the Corporate Governance Committee.

Review of Scrutiny Arrangements

3. As previously presented to full Council in July, following the election and the Leader's appointment to his Cabinet the terms of reference of the Council's overview and scrutiny committees need to be reviewed to align with the newly appointed Cabinet Lead Member portfolios.
4. The proposed changes to the terms of reference which were considered by full Council on 2nd July 2025 included changing the name of the Environment and Climate Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee to the Environment and Flooding Overview and Scrutiny Committee. These changes were not approved, due to concerns regarding the removal of reference to climate change from both the Committee title and its terms of reference.
5. The options available to address the Council's decision were presented to the Constitution Committee for consideration at its meeting on 29 July 2025. Two options were presented to change the current Environment and Climate Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee as follows:
 - (a) to change the name of the Committee to the **'Environment and Flooding Overview and Scrutiny Committee'** and include the following into its terms of reference:

"1. The executive functions of the County Council in respect of the Council's Environment Agenda, **including Climate Change**, and Flooding Risk.

OR

- (b) to change the name of the Committee to the '**Environment, Flooding and Climate Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee**' and include the following into this Committee's terms of reference:

"1. The executive functions of the County Council in respect of the Council's Environment Agenda, **including Climate Change**, and Flooding Risk."

6. The Constitution Committee unanimously agreed to option (b) which is now set out in the Appendix attached to this report.
7. As previously reported, the Scrutiny Commission's terms of reference have also been amended to provide clarity regarding property energy efficiency matters, which will now fall within its remit. Reference to the Leicester and Leicestershire Local Enterprise Partnership and the Leicester and Leicestershire Transport Board has also been removed and replaced with the establishment of the Leicester and Leicestershire Business and Skills Partnership.
8. The Adults and Communities and Children and Families Overview and Scrutiny Committees' terms of reference remain unchanged.
9. There will be consequential amendments to the Constitution arising from the changes now proposed.

Resource Implications

10. There are no resource implications arising from this report.

Equality Implications

11. There are no discernible equality implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

Consideration by the Constitution Committee

12. The Constitution Committee at its meeting on 23 June considered the proposed revisions of the Constitution as set out above and in the Appendix. The decision of the Constitution Committee is reflected in the motion below.

(Motion to be moved: -

That the proposed changes to the terms of reference of the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Committees, as set out in the Appendix to this report, and any consequential amendments to the Constitution required as a result of these changes, be approved.)

29 July 2025

**Mr D Harrison CC
Chairman of the
Constitution Committee**

Background Papers

Report of the Chief Executive to the Constitution Committee on 23 June – Revision of the Constitution

<https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/mgCommitteeDetails.aspx?ID=150>

Report of the Constitution Committee to the County Council on 2 July 2025 – Review of the Constitution

<https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=134&MId=7859&Ver=4>

Report of the Chief Executive to the Constitution Committee on 29 July 2025 – Revision of the Constitution

<https://democracy.leics.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=150&MId=8227&Ver=4>

Appendix

Appendix – Proposed Changes to the Constitution

This page is intentionally left blank

SCHEDULE 3 TABLES

TABLE A

Overview and scrutiny committees (Article 6.01)

[Note:

- *Articles 2.03(b) of this Constitution states that all County Councillors will act in the capacity to which they are elected to the County Council and not speak on behalf of any other local authority whilst they are acting as a County Councillor. This applies when overview and scrutiny committees consider matters which also affect district councils, for example growth and associated infrastructure items.*
- *Neither the Scrutiny Commission nor any of the other overview and scrutiny committees or subcommittees are empowered to take decisions or exercise any responsibilities of the Executive or County Council or Health Service bodies. The general role and specific functions are described in Article 6 and for the purposes of that Article the Scrutiny Commission is regarded as an overview and scrutiny committee for those matters which come within its scope.]*

Committee	Scope
Scrutiny Commission	1. The executive functions of the County Council in respect of (but not limited to): (i) The Budget (the revenue budget and capital programme) (ii) Strategic and Operational Property including property energy efficiency and the Investing in Leicestershire Programme (iii) Information and Communications Technology (ICT) (iv) Leicestershire Traded Services and Customer Services (v) Growth and associated Infrastructure (vi) Corporate Transformation and Ways of Working (i) Working with Communities (ii) Corporate Performance, complaints and compliments. 2. Any functions which are not specifically within the scope of any other overview and scrutiny committee. 3. To act as the Crime and Disorder Committee in accordance with Section 19 of Part 3 of the Police and Justice Act 2006 and work with the Police and Crime Panel to scrutinise the delivery of effectiveness of measures aimed at reducing crime and disorder. 4. To monitor the performance and activities of: (a) The Leicester and Leicestershire Business and Skills Partnership;

Committee	Scope
	(b) The Leicester and Leicestershire Transport Board; (b) Any other partnerships that are associated with the executive functions outlined above and not within the scope of any other overview and scrutiny committee. 5. Oversight and co-ordination of the work of the overview and scrutiny committees and scrutiny review panels. 6. Resolving any disagreements between overview and scrutiny committees. <i>[Note:</i> <i>The scope of the Scrutiny Commission will not extend to exercising functions relating to the scrutiny of:</i> • Any matters linked to the Council's Green Agenda such as energy from the Council's property portfolio which will be a matter for the Environment and Climate Change Overview and Scrutiny Committee; • Operational Transformation within service departments which will be a matter for each of the service related overview and scrutiny committee; • the National Health Service in the County, which will be a matter for the designated scrutiny committee. <i>See Rule 2A of the Overview and Scrutiny Procedure Rules (Part 4E) for the functions of the Scrutiny Commissioners.]</i>
Children and Families	1. The executive functions of the County Council in respect of Children and Family Services. 2. To monitor the performance and activities of any partnerships that are associated with the executive functions outlined in 1. above.
Adults and Communities	1. The executive functions of the County Council in respect of the Adults and Communities Department. 2. To monitor the performance and activities of any partnerships that are associated with the executive functions outlined in 1. above.
Highways, Transport and Waste	1. The executive functions of the County Council in respect of Highways, Transport and Waste Management within the Environment and Transport Department. 2. To monitor the performance and activities of the Flood Risk Management Board in accordance with Section 9FH of

Committee	Scope
	Schedule 2 of the Localism Act 2011. 2. To monitor the performance and activities of any partnerships that are associated with the executive functions outlined in 1. and 2. above.
Environment, Flooding and Climate Change	1. The executive functions of the County Council in respect of the Council's Environment Agenda, including Climate Change, and Flooding Risk (a) Environment and Waste Management Services within the Council's Environment and Transport Department; (b) Climate Change and delivery of the Council's Green Agenda including Green spaces. 2. To monitor the performance and activities of the Flood Risk Management Board in accordance with Section 9FH of Schedule 2 of the Localism Act 2011. 3. To monitor the performance and activities of any partnerships that are associated with the executive functions outlined in 1. above.
Health	1. The executive functions of the County Council in relation to Public Health. 2. To monitor the performance of the Health and Wellbeing Board in respect of the executive functions outlined in 1. above and any other partnerships as appropriate that are associated with those functions. 3. <u>Health Service Functions</u> (a) The exercise by health bodies of functions which affect the area of the County Council; (b) Arrangements for responding to consultation by local health bodies for substantial development of the health service or substantial variation in the provision of such services save where these are dealt with through a joint committee with other Social Services authorities.

[Note: Article 6.09 makes provision for the County Council to establish a joint committee with other Social Services authorities, to scrutinise any health issue or consultation which has an area larger than the County Council where it considers it necessary or is required to do so.]

This page is intentionally left blank