

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 7 DECEMBER 2016**

**PRESENT**

**CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr David Oldman

The Chairman reported the death of former County Councillor David Oldman who had died in June aged 66 whilst hiking from London to Gibraltar. Mr Oldman had represented the Leicester (Newton) Electoral Division between 1977 and 1981. He had mainly served on the Social Services Committee and Education Arts Committee.

The Chairman invited all members to stand in silent tribute to the memory of Mr David Oldman.

Anthony Nolan Trust

The Chairman drew Members' attention to the Anthony Nolan Trust stall which had been set up in the Members' Lounge at which Rik Basra had provided further information about the Trust's work and his personal campaign to get people to register with the Stem Cell Donor Register. The Chairman reminded Members that Rik was a former Police Officer, who, with just two weeks to live, had managed to find the perfect match. The Chairman was pleased to report that Rik was now an employee of the County Council, having joined the Community Safety Team, and would be a tremendous asset to the County Council, and was sure that all Members would do all they could to help support Rik's high profile campaign.

Local Conscientious Objectors, 1916-1919

The Chairman reported that 2016 was the centenary of the passing of the Military Service Act which had introduced military conscription into this country for the first time. Members had seen the exhibition in the Members Lounge entitled 'No Shirking Coward but a Man of Honour'. The exhibition, which had been researched and devised by the Record Office, told the tale of some of those men in Leicestershire whose faith or political views had led them to refuse to join the army. It was a story that should be told.

Film highlights forgotten war

The Chairman reported that the County Council's war memorials project and the East Midlands Oral History Archive had interviewed members of the British Korean Veteran's Association to mark the 60<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the end of the Korean War. The Veterans had described their experiences of living in trenches, facing enemy attacks and coping with fierce winds and bleak hills.

The footage had now been edited and released as a one hour, six minutes long film, including photographs taken by the veterans. The film, entitled Memories of the Korean War, was available on Youtube.

### **Visitors**

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

### **MINUTES**

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

“That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 28<sup>th</sup> September 2016, copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed.

### **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.

Dr Eynon declared a personal interest in the Annual Report of the Director of Public Health, as she was a salaried GP.

There were no other declarations.

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

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

“With regard to the LGA Climate Local will the Leader:-

- a) Reaffirm the Council’s support for LGA’s Climate Local to drive and inspire action on Climate Change?
- b) Note that Climate Local promotes joint working, shared experience and ideas and as such advise me as to what more can be done jointly with our neighbours to raise the profile of carbon reduction and meet the objectives of the Paris Accord?
- c) Advise me how many annual progress reports towards the County Council’s carbon reduction target and climate change resilience have been submitted to Climate Local and where these reports are published?”

**Mrs Posnett replied as follows:-**

- “a) Climate Local ceased at the end of March 2016. Climate Local was coordinated by the Environment Agency working with the LGA. The Environment Agency is no longer able to support the programme and the LGA and the Climate Local

Board have not been able to secure the resources needed to keep the programme going.

However, we will continue to deliver on the actions within the Environment Strategy and Carbon Reduction Strategy both of which have the objective of reducing carbon emissions.

- b) The Carbon Reduction Strategy is delivered in partnership with other parties including district councils, Leicester Energy Agency, LLEP and the National Forest Company. Where possible joint action has taken place to deliver on various actions such as the Warm Homes, Healthy Homes project which implements heating and insulation measures for those experiencing fuel poverty; the Green Belle project (a joint project with the Leicester Energy Agency) which provides funding and support to SMEs to introduce energy efficiency measures and also support SME's to develop renewable energy businesses; and the work with Leicester City Council and local bus operators to improve ticketing options for passengers which will better encourage the use of public transport.

There is also the CLIMA group which consists of Climate and Environment Officers from County, City, District Councils and the Environment Agency. This group shares good practice and seeks to identify opportunities for joint working.

While the UK has signed and ratified the Paris Agreement we do not as yet have much detail on how the Paris Agreement will be implemented and what, if any, responsibilities will be required of local government.

- c) The initial Climate Local Commitments report was submitted in 2013 with a subsequent Progress Report produced in 2014. The Climate Local Commitments were reviewed in September 2014 and it was agreed that these commitments would run to March 2016 and that a progress report would be submitted then. However, no report was produced in 2016 due to Climate Local coming to an end.

The Climate Local Progress reports were published on the former County Council website but are not included on the current website due to Climate Local coming to an end."

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

- "1. With regard to the Carbon Reduction Strategy agreed by the Cabinet in July 2014 will the Leader please advise:-
- a) How the carbon reduction target for Leicestershire of 23% by 2020 compared to 2005 is this being measured and how, after two years, are we measuring up to that target?
  - b) How the target to ensure carbon emissions from transport do not exceed 'current levels' over the life of the strategy, irrespective of

growth in net travel is this being measured and how, after two years are we measuring up to that target?

- c) What contributions to the target of carbon reduction, has been made by the actions concerning the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF) initiatives and what actions will replace the contribution now that the LSTF has closed?
- d) What contributions to the target of carbon reduction, are envisaged in the current bids for major transport schemes, which are set out as one action towards our Carbon Reduction target?

2. In answer to my questions on Carbon Reduction Strategy last year I was advised:-

- a) that the first update report on would be in 2017 but as this has not yet appeared in our work plan for scrutiny could you be more exact?
- b) that progress reports on the strategy would be forwarded to the Group Spokespersons as and when the Cabinet Lead Member received them. Could I be advised how many progress reports have you requested and received?"

**Mrs Posnett replied as follows:-**

"1. a) The latest data available from Government is for the period 2005-2014. This data shows that we are currently under the target level of emissions, which is to be welcomed. However, this data only covers the first 5 months of the Carbon Reduction Strategy during which time any activity would likely have had minimal impact on the level of emissions.

The data includes emissions from industrial and commercial, transport and domestic sources which are said to be under the influence (but not necessarily the control) of the local authority.

b) The data source for measuring this target is: UK local authority and regional estimates of carbon dioxide emissions from 2005 – 2014 published by the Department of Energy & Climate Change which became part of the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy in July 2016. The data suggests that as a County we are on course to meet our objectives. Similarly, outputs from our Leicester and Leicestershire Integrated Transport Model (LLITM) show that despite a general increase in vehicle kilometres driven, congestion and population, we are still forecasting a reduction in carbon generated by transportation. This is largely due to increased efficiencies in engine technologies.

c) The principal objective of the Local Sustainable Transport Fund initiatives was aimed at getting people to work by sustainable transport,

focusing on encouraging walking, cycling or using public transport in targeted parts of the County. In turn this programme helped to target single occupancy car use as a contributor to carbon levels in the County. The LSTF programme has enabled the County Council to get a better understanding of sustainable travel initiatives and their impact on communities and the environment. It has also helped to shape our current and future programmes for sustainable travel.

The County Council, in partnership with Leicester City Council, has submitted a bid to the Department for Transport's Access Fund to augment the existing programme of work in the County aimed at reducing single occupancy car use, which in turn supports our Carbon Reduction Strategy. This programme of work includes such things as sustainable business travel grants, the Wheels to Work scheme and targeted personal travel planning. A successful bid will enable the expansion of these schemes within targeted areas and contribute further to the Carbon Reduction Strategy. The outcome of the bid process will be known at some stage this month and, if successful, these schemes will be rolled out in April 2017 for an initial 3 year period.

Aside from these two specific initiatives, the County Council continues to pursue a number of other actions intended to encourage sustainable travel. These include the appropriate enhancement of walking and cycling facilities as part of major transport projects (such as the crossing and cycleway works recently completed on the A50 in the vicinity of County Hall as part of the Leicester North West Transport Project); working through the strategic planning process (Local Plans) to seek to ensure developments that are of such a scale and location so as to reduce the need for travel (the concept underpinning New Lubbesthorpe and other Sustainable Urban Extensions); and through the development management process to secure infrastructure funding/provision by developers (including a £1m sustainable travel contribution associated with the Castle Acres development at Fosse Park).

- d) The development of any major transport scheme requires an assessment of the impact on carbon levels. The current round of bids for major transport schemes is in its infancy and as the business cases are developed the potential impacts for carbon reduction will emerge. These will be reported through full business case submissions for funding.
2. a) The data supplied by the Government covers calendar years and is 2 years in arrears. The 2017 data release will relate to the 2015 calendar year. This data will cover the first full year since the Carbon Reduction Strategy was adopted.

The data is normally supplied by the end of June each year and subject to this a report could be provided in September 2017 as part of the Carbon Reduction Strategy Progress Report.

- b) Since the meeting in December 2015, I have received one progress report and this formed the basis of the MNIB on the Carbon Reduction Strategy Progress Report that was provided to all members on 24 November 2016.”

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

“With regard to the Lightbulb project will the Leader please advise:-

1. As the NHS benefits significantly from the proposed Lightbulb Project, what financial or other contribution will they be making?
2. Will Districts always be the ones that sign-off grant applications under the Lightbulb Project?
3. If any of the Disabled Facilities Grant (DFG) from central government is unspent, will it be returned to the appropriate district under the new scheme?
4. Are the Districts required to make any financial contribution towards the cost of running the hub in the new project?”

**Mr White replied as follows:-**

- “1. NHS partners have been kept fully apprised of this development through regular updates at the Integration Executive which meets monthly.

The Lightbulb Business Case was received, and welcomed by NHS partners, at the Health and Wellbeing Board on 17<sup>th</sup> November.

The Better Care Fund (a £39m pooled budget, majority funded by NHS partners) already contributes to the component of the Lightbulb service which relates to hospital discharge. This totals £114,000 per annum, which is funding housing support officers dedicated to supporting hospital discharge, based at the LRI and the Bradgate Mental Health unit.

Once the Lightbulb service is rolled out across Leicestershire during 2017, we will be using performance and impact data from the service to have further discussions with NHS commissioners about the service and future developments.

2. Capital grants for major adaptations will continue to be authorised by the respective District Council.

3. Each District Council has been asked to forecast its DFG spend as part of the financial refresh of the Better Care Fund for 2017/18 and this information is currently being analysed.

At a meeting with District Councils held in October 2016 it was agreed in principle that, should the full DFG allocation not be required for DFG grants in 2017/18, partners would consider collectively how this allocation could be used in support of other housing/equipment interventions, in line with national guidance.

4. The cost of delivering the Lightbulb service, including the component for the central hub, will be met from combining the existing revenue resources associated with delivering a range of housing support across both Leicestershire County Council and District Councils.

The Lightbulb programme office is currently working with each District, including their finance officers, to confirm the revenue to be apportioned to each District and the hub, based on the details set out in section 10 of the business case.

This is therefore not about a specific contribution to the hub from each District, but is about ensuring all parts of the new Lightbulb service are allocated the correct resources, based on the activities set out in the business case.”

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

- “1. Will the Leader please provide me with details of the number of transactions and the income received from members of the public for disposing of waste types at household waste sites and would it be possible to have this information broken down by types of waste and provide the figures for each of the recycling and household waste sites?
2. Is the Leader aware that according to an article in letsrecycle.com the DCLG’s view is that DIY waste should be classed as household waste rather than non-household waste? Is the Council’s charging policy compliant with regulations that disallow Councils from charging for household waste?”

**Mr Pain replied as follows:-**

- “1. The number of transactions and income received as a result of charging for construction and demolition waste at the 14 Recycling & Household Waste Sites (RHWS) since its introduction in May 2016 are listed in the table below:-

<b>RHWS</b>	<b>Total transactions to 27<sup>th</sup> November 2016</b>	<b>Total income to 27<sup>th</sup> November 2016</b>
Barwell	1939	£10,142.62
Bottesford	192	£1,284.00

Coalville	1162	£9,584.00
Kibworth	553	£5,875.00
Loughborough	1283	£9,121.36
Lount	940	£6,730.00
Lutterworth	569	£3,822.00
Market Harborough	1088	£8,704.11
Melton	854	£5,544.90
Mountsorrel	1594	£14,608.00
Oadby	1129	£6,452.18
Shepshed	940	£6,755.72
Somerby	81	£732.00
Whetstone	1891	£13,126.00
<b>Total</b>	<b>14215</b>	<b>£102,481.89</b>

Note: The breakdown of income from charging for construction and demolition waste is not recorded by waste type.

2. The Council charges for receipt of some types of construction and demolition waste at the RHWs. This is allowable and in accordance with the Environmental Protection Act (1990) and Controlled Waste Regulations (2012).

When considering the implementation of these charges the legality of doing so was fully evaluated and charges designed to ensure legal compliance.

In accordance with legislation we do not charge for acceptance of household waste at the RHWs.”

**Mr Boulter asked the following supplementary questions:-**

- “1. Regarding the collection of monies from the household waste sites, does the Lead Member consider this value for money?
2. Can the Lead Member give assurance that no do-it-yourself waste is being charged for at the sites?”

**Mr Pain replied as follows:-**

- “1. First and foremost I don’t think it is a case of being value for money. As you are aware the County Council has an MTFS which dictates that we have got to save many millions of pounds over the medium term. This is a small contribution and these savings in that respect are working for us and they are value.
2. In terms of giving an assurance that no household waste is being charged for. As far as I am aware that is correct and it is only construction and demolition waste that is being charged for.”



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

- “1. Will the Leader please list all the bids submitted to the Local Growth Fund including the amount of funding requested?
2. What is the current situation regarding these bids and how much is the County Council/LLEP expecting to receive?
3. Does the Leader agree with me that consideration of the schemes submitted by the County Council should be judged on their merit alone and not, as reported, be dependent on whether or not the City and County agree to an elected mayor?”

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:-**

- “1. The following sites were submitted by the LLEP to the Local Growth Fund for funding:-

<b>Project</b>	<b>Amount requested(£m)</b>
National Space Park Phase 1: Infrastructure, and National Space Academy Extension	£8.8
National Space Park Phase 2: Construction (subject to successful delivery of Phase 1)	£30.0
M1/J23 and A512 Improvements	£17.0
Logistics Institute of Technology	£11.4
Loughborough Science & Enterprise Park	£14.8
LE-NUCKLE Phase 3/ Leicester Rail Station Gateway	£15.0
Harborough Innovation Centre Grow on Space	£2.8
Connecting Leicester - links into city centre	£7.5
Securing Employability and Education for the Future, East Midlands Airport	£1.6
A47/B582 Desford Crossroads	£6.1
Hinckley Zone 4 Transport	£11.9
Stephenson College: Apprentice Accommodation	£2.3
Waterside Infrastructure	£15.0

2. The Government announced in the Autumn Statement an allocation of £1.8bn from the Local Growth Fund to English regions, including £392m for the Midlands. The allocations to individual LEP areas are still to be confirmed but are expected shortly.
3. Yes. I have made this point to Ministers and am hopeful that the LGF allocation will reflect the high quality of our projects seeking funding.”

**Mr Bill asked the following supplementary questions:-**

“I welcome the assurance that the Leader has given us that this authority is maintaining the stance that those areas which have chosen not to go for the elected mayor model should not be disbenefited.

Can I ask two questions, how confident is the Leader on a scale of 1-10 that these bids will receive approval, and secondly, in the event of the full allocation not being received, can I ask that local Members are involved in any subsequent negotiations that take place?”

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:-**

“On a scale of 1-10 that we would get more than originally offered, I would go for 10. Figures are available but not to be disclosed. The Minister will be disclosing them in January, so I’m not allowed to say today but we will do better than we did.

The second question, well the chances of getting the full allocation are virtually zero as it is all part of the bidding process and what we are hoping to do is at least get some of the money. We wouldn’t get it all because if they gave it to all the bids throughout the whole of the country it would be more than the cost of HS2. There will be no negotiations.”

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

“At the East Midlands Councils Executive on the 30<sup>th</sup> September 2016, dire warnings were presented to the meeting by Glen Garrod, Executive Director of Adult Social Services at Lincolnshire County Council, highlighting specific concerns and implications for local government in view of the current state of Social Care in that County and in the Region. It was stated at that meeting that the financial challenges would have to be addressed in the forthcoming Chancellor’s Statement.

1. Are these concerns shared by this Authority?
2. In view of the total lack of any reference to either the NHS or Social Care in the Autumn Statement, could the Leader please indicate how this Authority will ensure that standards and levels of care provision are maintained?”

**Mr Houseman replied as follows:-**

- “1. This Council does share the concerns expressed by Mr Garrod in respect to the overall national funding levels of social care both now and in the medium term.

The demand for social care across both children and adults services continue to represent the biggest cost and demand pressure for the County Council.

74% of local authorities are overspent this year to the tune of £450m. However, Leicestershire is not in this position and manages to meet social care needs and deliver within budget.

Since 2010 local authorities nationally have saved £5bn in real terms from adult social care budgets. In Leicestershire alone we have made savings of around £50m over this period.

The Local Government Association has calculated that an additional £1.9bn is required to meet the demands for adult social care by 2021.

Nationally the 2% additional council tax precept raised £380m in 2016/17. However, the cost of implementing the Living Wage alone has been estimated at £612m. Locally the precept raised £5m and the Living Wage cost £6m.

2. The Chancellor's Autumn Statement did not make mention of additional funding for social care or the NHS. However, the Government have previously announced an additional £1.5bn of Better Care Fund funding for local authorities.

This additional £1.5bn is not due to be implemented until 2018/19, and Leicestershire is likely to receive less than our per capita allocation as Government is seeking to allocate additional funds to local authorities with lower council tax base that have reduced scope to raise funds through the social care precept. In addition, due to lack of guidance it is by no means certain that the provisional allocation of £11m by 2019/20 will be available for social care.

The County Council has over the last two years maintained social care services whilst making savings and efficiencies across a range of service areas and will continue to do so. Notwithstanding the requirements to make savings, the Council has supported social care services with significant budget growth in the Medium Term Financial Strategy to reflect the demand and cost pressures which the Council faces. This commitment to continue to meet the social care needs of local residents has resulted in an increased proportion of the Council spending being expended on social care services year on year.

In addition, the County Council continues to work together with NHS partners to ensure a system wide approach to health and care delivery, recognising the intrinsic link between health and care needs. The delivery of the Sustainability and Transformation Plan (STP) will build on the success of the Better Care Fund, through which the Council receives over £20m of NHS funding to deliver services.

The implementation of the STP will transform care services to ensure that demand for services can be met, whilst improving people's health and wellbeing with care delivered as close to home as possible."

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

“I note in the Leader’s Statement that it was extremely disappointing that the Autumn Statement made no mention of any new funding for Health or Children and Adult Social Care. Can I ask that in the event of the Sustainability and Transformation Plan not being fully funded that we will all be involved, or at least a request will be made that we as a Council are involved, in any subsequent negotiations because this is going to affect every single person in the City and County and we cannot leave it to others to negotiate on our behalf?”

**Mr Houseman replied as follows:-**

“The STP which you are concerned about, I am concerned about and others across the country, is because until more recently elected members were not being involved in its development. The draft will be considered at the next Cabinet meeting. It will then, at a later date, be subject to consultation and so, yes, we will be able to have an input into the STP. What I will say is that I am concerned about the funding and the future partly because I won’t be here and I would not want to leave a situation where there seems to be problems and we have not done something about it. Byron Rhodes is working very hard with officers, as you know, to emphasise that we do have funding challenges here. In a recent poll, two-thirds of people believe that a greater share of the total Health and Social Care budget should be spend on Adult Social Care because at the moment apparently it is only 11% of the £129bn Health and Care budget which is spent on Adult Social Care with the remainder on Health services.

The Chairman of the LGA’s Community and Wellbeing Board is fighting our corner and one of the things which she said which struck me is that there cannot be a sustainable NHS without a sustainable Adult Social Care system and that is certainly true. Here at the County Council we need over the next four years as shown in our Medium Term Financial Strategy over £½bn and I am confident that one way or another that will be found. We have got to have that to deliver a meaningful Adult Social Care Service but at the same time ASC has got to make savings of £9m and so it is a very difficult time ahead. Lastly, I will say that whatever funding envelope we have to work with within this Council we will always put the safety of services first.”

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

- “1. Will the Leader join me in apologising to anyone negatively affected by the introduction of the new Help to Live at Home contracts?
2. How many people in receipt of home care have contacted the Council; whether in person or through their family, relatives or friends; to report a problem or make a complaint about the provision of the service since the introduction of the new contracts on 7<sup>th</sup> November?

3. How many appointments / care visits is the Council aware of that have been missed or not delivered within the agreed timescale since the introduction of the new contracts on 7<sup>th</sup> November and could this information be listed for each of the nine areas covered by the contracts?
4. Has the County Council incurred additional costs including transport to provide temporary cover for clients affected by the late withdrawal of one of the providers and non-availability of staff by the other 8 providers? Does this include having to pay taxi fares as reported in the Leicester Mercury?
5. Is the Council still expecting to achieve the £1m per year savings from these new contracts, as set out in the MTFFS, from 2017/18 onwards?"

**Mr Houseman replied as follows:-**

- "1. It is deeply regrettable that a number of people experienced initial difficulties at the start of our Help to Live at Home service as a result of one of the providers withdrawing at the last minute. The work undertaken by our officers has ensured that any risk has been kept to a minimum.
2. Up to 2<sup>nd</sup> December 2016, 31 complaints relating to Help to Live at Home provision have been received out of 1430 people who receive home care.
3. Since 7<sup>th</sup> November, 82 people have contacted the Council to report missed or late visits from their Help to Live at Home provider. Missed calls have been categorised by provider, not by area, and have been received for five providers in total.
4. The providers who are delivering contingency care cover are being paid at their current framework rate, with the exception of one provider who is receiving an enhancement for covering outside of their normal geographic area. The contingency arrangements have not included payments for taxi fares.
5. When the Help to Live at Home contracts were originally awarded, the savings model was reviewed against the award prices across the '18 lots' and confirmed that the Medium Term Financial Strategy target remained achievable. As a result of the withdrawal of one provider a re-procurement for 'three lots' is now underway. The savings position will be reviewed again when contracts are awarded."

**Mr Charlesworth asked the following supplementary question in reply to question 2:-**

"You have actually specified 31 complaints. Can I please have the answer whether in person, through the family relatives or friends report a problem or make a complaint? The figures are about complaints. Can I please have the question answered?"

**Mr Houseman replied as follows:-**

“We will certainly forward a written answer to you.”

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

“Last month, the Leader responded to the Government’s announcement of a new preferred route for HS2, welcoming that its publication would provide more certainty for communities.

1. Does the Leader agree with me that the new preferred route on HS2 will still have a negative impact on several villages within North West Leicestershire?
2. Can I have assurance that officers work with local communities to make sure that residents are fully aware of their rights in claiming compensation from the Government?”

**Mr Osborne replied as follows:-**

- “1. County Council officers have undertaken a preliminary assessment of the number of properties affected by the HS2 route previously published in 2013, compared with the recently published revised route. Whilst properties are affected by both published routes, the new 2016 route affects marginally less properties than the route previously published in 2013.
2. Along with the recent route announcement, HS2 Limited have published guidelines on compensation if properties are affected by the route. HS2 Ltd are proposing a series of public information events in the New Year, where they are expected to advise residents of all aspects of their proposals including compensation. Nevertheless, County officers will signpost residents to this information if required.”

**(I) Mr Galton asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:-**

- “1. Will the Leader give consideration to the benefits of allowing ambulances to drive in bus lanes when they are not responding to an emergency?
2. Does the Leader agree with me that if an empty taxi returning to a taxi rank can drive in a bus lane then an ambulance returning to a hospital should also be able to do so?
3. Given that most bus lanes in the County cross the City boundary and run into the City Centre will he undertake to raise the matter with the City Mayor at his next meeting?”

**Mr Osborne replied as follows:-**

- “1. The Traffic Regulation Orders for the seven bus lanes in Leicestershire do not allow for emergency vehicles to use the bus lanes when not responding to an incident. None of the emergency services requested such use when the bus lanes were being introduced. If such amendments are considered appropriate

for the efficient operation of their services then the County Council would be happy to discuss the potential for such changes with the emergency services.

2. Whilst taxis are allowed to use the three cross-boundary bus lanes, those wholly within Leicestershire do not allow taxi use. No bus lanes outside of the City boundary are in close proximity to a hospital.
3. Changes to cross-boundary bus lanes would need cooperation of the City Council and I will raise this matter with the City Mayor at the next meeting should the ambulance service request such changes.”

### **Position Statements from Members of the Cabinet**

#### **(A) General Position Statements**

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

- Help to Live at Home
- Syrian Refugees and Unaccompanied Asylum Seeking Children
- Digital Strategy
- Medium Term Financial Strategy and Fairer Funding
- Sustainability and Transformation Plan
- Infrastructure Funding
- Police and Crime Commissioner and Chief Constable’s Briefing
- Bishop of Leicester

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

### **Report of the Corporate Governance Committee**

#### **(A) Appointment of External Auditors 2018/19**

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

“That Option 3: Opting in to a Sector Led Body appointed by the Secretary of State under the Local Audit and Accountability Act for the appointment of External Auditors, be approved.”

#### **(B) Proposed changes to the Contract Procedure Rules**

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

“That the proposed amendments to the Contract Procedure Rules, set out in Appendix A to the report of the Corporate Governance Committee, be approved.”

#### **(C) Proposed changes to the Financial Procedure Rules**

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

“That the proposed amendments to the Financial Procedure Rules, set out in Appendix B to the report of the Corporate Governance Committee, be approved.”

### **Report of the Cabinet**

#### **(A) Annual Performance Report**

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

“That the Leicestershire County Council Annual Performance Report 2016, as referred to in Section A of the report of the Cabinet, be approved.”

#### **(B) Annual Report of the Director of Public Health**

It was moved by Mr White, seconded by Mr Houseman:-

“That the Director of Public Health Annual Report 2016 be noted with support.”

On the motion being put and before the vote was taken, five members rose asking that the vote be recorded. The vote was recorded as follows:-

#### **For the motion:-**

Mr Bentley, Mr Bill, Mr Blunt, Mrs Camamile, Mr Coxon, Mrs Dickinson, Dr Eynon, Dr Feltham, Mr Galton, Mr Hampson, Mr Hart, Mr Houseman, Mr Hunt, Mr Jennings, Mr Kaufman, Ms Knaggs, Mr Lewis, Mr Liquorish, Mr Lynch, Mr Miah, Ms Newton, Mr Orson, Mr Osborne, Mr O’Shea, Mr Ould, Mrs Page, Mr Pain, Mr Pearson, Mr Pendleton, Mrs Posnett, Mrs Radford, Mr Rhodes, Mrs Richards, Mr Richardson, Mr Rushton, Mr Sharp, Mr Sheahan, Mr Shepherd, Mr Snartt, Mr Sprason, Mr White, Miss Worman, Mr Yates

The motion was carried, 43 members voting for the motion and none against.

### **Notice of Motion**

#### **(A) ‘Dying to Work’ Charter – Mrs Betty Newton**

It was moved by Mrs Newton, seconded by Mr Rhodes, and carried unanimously:-

“1. That this Council notes:-

- a) The TUC ‘Dying To Work’ Campaign calling for terminal illness to be made a ‘protected characteristic’;
- b) The TUC is requesting employers to sign up to a Voluntary Charter which states the following:-
  - We recognise that terminal illness requires support and understanding and not additional and avoidable stress and worry.



- Terminally ill workers will be secure in the knowledge that we will support them following their diagnosis and we recognise that safe and reasonable work can help maintain dignity, offer a valuable distraction and can be therapeutic in itself.
  - We will provide our employees with the security of work, peace of mind and the right to choose the best course of action for themselves and their families which helps them through this challenging period with dignity and without undue financial loss.
  - We will support the TUC's Dying to Work campaign so that all employees battling terminal illness have adequate employment protection and have their death in service benefits protected for the loved ones they leave behind.
2. That this Council, as a responsible employer, agrees to sign the voluntary Charter so that employees who are battling terminal illness are supported, guided and protected following diagnosis.
  3. That the Employment Committee be asked to consider how best the County Council's existing policies could be modified to support the principles outlined in the Charter."

2.30 p.m. – 5.27 p.m.  
7<sup>th</sup> December 2016

CHAIRMAN

This page is intentionally left blank