

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 5 DECEMBER 2007**

**PRESENT**

Mr. Mike Jones CC (in the Chair)

Mr. A. D. Bailey CC, Mr. D. C. Bill CC, Mr. G. A. Boulter CC, Mr. N. J. Brown CC, Mrs. R. Camamile CC, Mr. M. H. Charlesworth CC, Mr. J. G. Coxon CC, Mrs. J. A. Dickinson CC, Dr. R. K. A. Feltham CC, Mr. R. Fraser CC, Mr. S. J. Galton CC, Mr. D. A. Gamble CC, Mr. B. Garner CC, Mr. M. Griffiths CC, Mr. P. S. Harley CC, Mr. G. A. Hart CC, Dr. S. Hill CC, Mr. D. W. Houseman CC, Mr. Max Hunt CC, Mr. P. A. Hyde CC, Mr. D. Jennings CC, Mr. A. M. Kershaw CC, Mr. John Legrys CC, Mr. P. G. Lewis CC, Mr. W. Liquorish JP CC, Mr. J. S. Moore CC, Mr. A. P. Natzel CC, Ms. Betty Newton CC, Dr. M. O'Callaghan CC, Mr. J. T. Orson JP CC, Mr. P. C. Osborne CC, Mr. I. D. Ould CC, Mrs. R. Page CC, Mr. M. B. Page CC, Mr. K. Parker CC, Mr. D. R. Parsons CC, Mrs. L. A. S. Pendleton CC, Prof. M. E. Preston CC, Mr. J. B. Rhodes CC, Mr. P. A. Roffey DL, CC, Mr. N. J. Rushton CC, Mr. S. D. Sheahan CC, Mr. R. J. Shepherd CC, Mrs. M. L. Sherwin CC, Mr. E. D. Snartt CC, Mr. D. A. Sprason CC, Mr. C. A. Stanley CC, Mr. N. A. Stork CC, Mr. E. F. White CC, Mr. R. M. Wilson CC and Mr. D. O. Wright CC

**123. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

Mr A.J.B. Thornton

The Chairman reported with sadness that former County Councillor Gus Thornton had died on 22 October, 2007. Mr Thornton had been elected to the Council in 1993 and had served until 1997 representing the former Syston Electoral Division. He had served on the Environment Committee and a number of Social Services Subcommittees.

Members joined the Chairman in standing in silent tribute to the memory of Mr Gus Thornton.

Mr Andrew Fairbairn

The Chairman commented that although very few serving members and officers would have worked alongside him, he was sure the Council would have been sad to learn of the death on 13 October, 2007 of Mr Andrew Fairbairn, a former Director of Education of the County Council, aged 85 years. Mr Fairbairn became Director of Education in 1971 and had served until 1984. Before that he had served as a Deputy Director for a period of 10 years.

Badge – Leicestershire County Council

The Chairman presented members and Chief Officers with a complimentary badge which he had recently commissioned. He hoped that County Councillors would wear the badge with pride on those occasions when they would be representing the County Council. Further supplies of the badge would be available to departments and the Chairman hoped that officers

would also wish to wear them on appropriate occasions such as partnership meetings and conferences. The Chairman believed that the badges would be particularly effective in raising the profile of Leicestershire at events outside the County.

#### Visitors

The Chairman welcomed to the meeting all visitors and guests of members.

#### **124. REPORT OF THE RETURNING OFFICER.**

The Chief Executive presented the report of the Returning Officer on the person duly elected to the County Council at the by-election for the Shepshed Electoral Division held on 4 October, 2007.

The Chairman welcomed the new member, Mr Kevin Parker, to the Council.

#### **125. MINUTES.**

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

“That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 26 September 2007 copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed.”

#### **126. 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.

The following declarations were made:-

<b><u>Member</u></b>	<b><u>Minute No.</u></b>	<b><u>Interest</u></b>
Mr I D Ould	131A	Personal Non-Prejudicial
Mr R M Wilson	130A	Personal Non-Prejudicial
Mr M Griffiths	131B	Personal Non-Prejudicial
Mr E D Snartt	131A	Personal Non-Prejudicial
Mr P A Roffey	131A	Personal Non-Prejudicial

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

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

- “1. Can you confirm that the Government is allocating £40M in each of the next three years to support children from deprived backgrounds who attend schools in less deprived local authorities such as Leicestershire?
2. Does this Authority believe that narrowing the attainment gap between deprived and more affluent pupils is a key priority?

3. Will the Authority ensure that the local funding formulae properly reflects the existing funding for deprivation delivered through Delegated Schools Grant?
4. Will the Authority ensure that areas of deprivation such as my Warren Hills Division receive their fair share of funding in order to help disadvantaged pupils to progress and reach their full potential?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

- "1. Nationally £40.9m has been included within the 2008/09 Schools Budget Settlement to target deprivation specifically. As an authority in the bottom third of deprived authorities in overall terms, Leicestershire will receive £1.335m.
2. The attainment gap within Leicestershire shows a favourable position when compared to both regional and national figures. The underlying principle of the Key Stage 3 Strategy adopted by the authority is to continue to raise achievement at Key Stage 4, this strategy will continue to reduce the identified attainment gap.
3. 2008/09 will be the first year that Dedicated Schools Grant, introduced in 2006, includes a specific funding allocation targeted at deprivation. As an authority low on the deprivation index, Leicestershire has historically received a relatively small element of funding directly targeted at deprivation.

The Funding Formula for individual school budgets targets funding at deprivation on a number of proxy indicators, which include free school meals, the Index of Multiple Deprivation and pupil prior attainment. Dedicated Schools Grant funds not just schools but many other services such as early years and special educational needs. For 2007/08, 85% of the funding notionally identified as deprivation funding by Government was passed directly to schools.

The local authority will work with its Schools (Funding) Forum to ensure that Dedicated Schools Grant effectively delivers funding both to schools and to centrally managed services to ensure it meets identified priorities.

4. The Schools (Funding) Forum retains many functions in relation to Dedicated Schools Grant, including an overview of the Schools Funding Formula. In conjunction with their Schools Forums, all local authorities have been asked to review their mechanisms for funding deprivation."

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

- "1. 12 months ago, the Legal Department at County Hall requested the County Department of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management to carry out a survey. This was to monitor the usage of certain alleyways on the Little Hill Estate in Wigston. Despite offers of

assistance from both the County Legal Department and Oadby and Wigston Council, nothing has been done. Can the Leader please tell me why?

2. When will the survey be carried out?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. The survey is necessary if proposals to gate three alleyways on the estate are to be proceeded with. Although we have not carried out the survey, we have been investigating the background to gating and find that, though the County Council has powers to introduce gates if anti-social behaviour is causing problems to residents, there are very considerable practical difficulties involved, and gating can often inconvenience many more people than it helps. This concern is underlined by the decision of the Development Control and Regulatory Board in February this year not to approve a proposed gating order in Loughborough.

This being so, we have decided that, sooner than proceed immediately to implement gating in the Little Hill estate, it would be better first to consider all aspects of gating and prepare an appropriate policy for approval. This is underway and will be presented for consideration in the new year.

2. It would be unwise to set a date for a survey in Wigston until the policy is considered and approved. In view of local concerns, and the delay there has been in reaching this point, the Little Hill Estate will be given priority once the policy is resolved and Mr Charlesworth will be kept informed of progress."

**Mr Charlesworth asked the following supplementary questions:**

- "1. Why was Wigston compared with Loughborough when they are totally different cases?
2. Why was I not told twelve months ago that the policy was being updated instead of me wasting a year and a year in the residents' time with this? If something could have been done, why was it left a year for me to be told as a member of this Authority that there was a policy change or a possible policy change?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"The problem of gated alleyways out at Wigston is a very thorny issue because what some people want other people don't want. Obviously, the people who are near the gated alleyways want them and the people who use them do not want them. So when we looked at it, we thought that we really ought to be looking to develop a proper policy for the issue of gated alleyways and we are at present working on that. I will promise to keep Mr Charlesworth informed on the progress of the new policy for gated alleyways. As you can imagine it is a very very thorny issue and one that is not easily readily addressed but I will keep him informed."

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

- “1. Tillson House is in my Division. Can you confirm that there will be no loss of long term care beds as they become vacant for people other than those with dementia?
2. 1 in 14 people over the age of 65 have dementia, will the new service cater for people before the age of 75?
3. Will the people in the residential homes still be protected after the end of the 5 yrs "protection" ?”

**Mr Sprason replied as follows:**

- "1. Tillson House is one of 4 care homes to be retained in-house as approved by Cabinet on 23 November 2007. The 4 in-house homes will be developed in partnership with the Primary Care Trust to provide more specialist community based services for people with dementia. No specific proposals on this have been presented to Cabinet as yet, and there will be no changes at Tillson House until a proposal is approved. Any changes, once approved, would be carefully managed, and long term beds phased out so that no existing residents would have to move home.
2. The proposal is that services for people with dementia will include all older people, not just people over 75.
3. The covenants on the homes to be transferred to the independent sector will be for 5 years, which is felt to be sufficient to protect the majority of existing residents for their lifetime.

A covenant of any greater length is not necessary as it would place an unreasonable restriction on the new provider in relation to service improvements for the benefit of all residents. In addition to this, the County Council intends to work in partnership with new providers to improve services in accordance with the Council's commissioning strategy. This will ensure that service developments are planned taking into account the best interests of residents and the future needs of the older population."

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

“In a recent White Paper the Government announced plans for a business rate supplement to help pay for new transport projects that foster economic development. Higher tier authorities would be able to levy an extra 2p in the pound on business premises with a rateable value in excess of £50,000. How much could this raise in Leicestershire?”

**Mr Page replied as follows:**

"We do not have the information to calculate the figure. Based on total R.V. of all commercial properties approx. £10m could be realised. The district treasurers have been asked for the information excluding properties with an R.V. of under £50,000.

I will arrange to circulate the accurate figure to Mr Sheahan when it is available."

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

"Would the Leader or his representative please supply the following information for each school in Leicestershire?

1. The total current budget for each school.
2. The amount of funding for that school.
3. The total current number of pupils for that school.
4. The amount of funding per pupil for that school.
5. The latest total accumulated balance for that school for when figures were available.
6. If in deficit, the number of years the school has run at a deficit.
7. The total budget for each school three years ago.
8. The total number of pupils for that school three years ago.
9. The amount of funding per pupil for that school three years ago.
10. The current number of teaching staff at the school (FTE).
11. The number of teaching staff at the school three years ago (FTE).
12. The current number of other staff at the school (FTE).
13. The number of other staff three years ago (FTE).

Would the Leader or his representative please supply the following information for the total County?

14. The total accumulated positive balance for schools across the County.
15. The number of schools this includes.
16. The total accumulated deficit for schools across the County.
17. The number of schools this includes.
18. What has the County done to support schools with deficits return to financial balance?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

"It will be appreciated that such a large amount of material takes some time to produce. However, the spreadsheets setting out this information will be made available to Mr Legrys as soon as reasonably possible. He should receive them within the next few days."

**(F) Mr Charlesworth asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee.**

- "1. What are the Leader's views on the protracted job evaluation process involving staff at Birkett House School, which has taken several years to reach a conclusion and which is now having a substantial negative impact on the finances of the school?"

2. What action is being taken to support this valuable institution with a view to ensuring that the excellent services which it provides are not diminished in any way?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

- "1. The introduction of job evaluation on 1 April 2003 affected all school and college support staff and a significant amount of resources were required to advise and assist schools and colleges in implementing and agreeing outcomes.

In the ensuing period the Service received 498 first stage appeals from school and college based employees. 400 of these appeals were resolved at a local level; the remaining 98 progressed to the second stage of the procedure which required reference to a Job Evaluation Appeals Panel. The 98 individual appeals were condensed into 44 different cases.

School Appeals were not progressed until the majority of the appeals, resulting from the implementation of job evaluation to centrally employed staff in September 2002, had been completed, in approximately October 2005. In order to maintain a consistent approach to the appeal process all school appeals were progressed through the corporate framework. As there was a limited availability of trained panel members, school appeals were subjected to the same time constraints as the corporate appeals. The final appeal from the introduction of job evaluation for centrally employed staff in September 2002 is still to be heard and there are 9 outstanding School appeals. It is my view that such matters take time to resolve.

2. Officers of the department have contacted the school to support them as they plan their budgets for the coming year. On the rare occasions when schools find that they have unexpected demands on their budgets, the Local Authority always works with the Governing Body to ensure that the institution sustains excellent services whilst taking appropriate action to rectify budget shortfalls. I understand that the headteacher and governing body are currently working with the Local Authority to ensure that the quality of education offered by the school is unaffected by this issue."

**Mr Charlesworth asked the following supplementary questions:**

- "1. Has the former officer been contacted by any officer from this Authority concerning Birkett House?
2. Would the Lead Member agree that, with school morale low and serious financial concerns for the future, a more proactive role must be taken by this Authority than the one suggested in the answer?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

"I don't know the answer to the first question. I will endeavour to find out and

let Mr Charlesworth know. On the second question, I think enough support is already going into the School and, if it isn't, I give my undertaking that I will keep my own personal watch on what takes place there."

**(G) Mr Page asked the following question of the Leader of his nominee:**

"Over the past three or four years, much needed safety improvements to the County Hall and A46 roundabouts on the A50, have been kept on hold, while we waited for the Glenfield Hospital PFI scheme to go ahead. Now that there appear to be no immediate plans for development of the hospital when can we expect to see these improvements implemented?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"Improvements have already been made to both roundabouts. Loss of control and shunt accidents at the A46 roundabout were a main concern, and both have been tackled by the provision of anti-skid surfacing and yellow bar markings: whilst it is too early to judge the effectiveness of these measures it is notable that there has only been one recorded injury accident on or near the roundabout since February 2007. At the County Hall roundabout, changes to road markings both on the approaches and on the roundabout itself have been made, and the skid resistance of the road improved. In 2002 and 2003 there was an average of five injury accidents annually but there have been only two in the last two years, and none in the most recent twelve months.

More major investment at the two roundabouts is unlikely to be justified on accident reduction grounds alone, but signalisation could do much to reduce congestion on the A50 and the roads that cross it, and to reduce rat-running. Our own sources of funds are not sufficient to allow the substantial cost of this to be prioritised in the near future. However, we have recently agreed an invigorated park and ride programme with the new leadership at Leicester City Council and I am pleased to say that, as part of this, we are again planning the introduction of a park and ride site at Glenfield. If the park and ride scheme goes ahead, improvements to these two roundabouts will form part of the scheme."

**(H) Dr O'Callaghan asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

"Could the Leader please supply the following information?"

**A. For John Ferneley High School**

The number of pupils in each year from year 7 to year 9.

The total number of students on roll.

The current admission limit.

The proposed admissions limit.

How many pupils from the John Ferneley Catchment Area entered year 7 at the school this year?

What was the total number of pupils for the catchment area which could have entered year 7 at the school?

Where did the pupils go who did not go to John Ferneley?

How many pupils are there currently in the catchment area eligible to go to John Ferneley next academic year?

To date how many of these have opted to go for John Ferneley?

To date how many have not yet made their choice?

Of those not going to John Ferneley, where are they going?

For each of the feeder schools for John Ferneley High School in the Melton Area:

What is the total number of pupils currently on roll?

What is the number of pupils in each year from reception through to year 6?

### **B. For Long Field High School**

The number of pupils in each year from year 7 to year 9.

The total number of students on roll.

The current admission limit.

The proposed admissions limit.

How many pupils from the Long Field Catchment Area entered year 7 at the school this year?

What was the total number of pupils for the catchment area which could have entered year 7 at the school?

Where did the pupils go who did not go to Long Field?

How many pupils are there currently in the catchment area eligible to go to Long Field next academic year?

To date how many of these have opted to go for Long Field?

How many have not yet made their choice?

Of those not going to Long Field, where are they going?

For each of the feeder schools for Long Field in the Melton Area

What is the total number of pupils currently on roll?

What is the number of pupils in each year from reception through to year 6?

### **C. For King Edward VII (Sarson)**

The number of pupils in each year from year 7 to year 9.

The total number of students on roll.

The current admission limit.

The proposed admissions limit.

The number of pupils in each year from year 10 onwards.

How many pupils from the King Edward VII Catchment Area entered year 7 at the school this year?

What was the total number of pupils for the catchment area which could have entered year 7 at the school?

Where did the pupils go who did not go to King Edward VII?

How many pupils are there currently in the catchment area eligible to go to King Edward VII next academic year in year 7?

To date how many of these have opted to go for King Edward VII?

How many have not yet made their choice?

Of those not going to King Edward VII, where are they going?

Likewise for year 10, how many pupils are there currently in the

catchment area eligible to go to King Edward VII next academic year?

To date how many of these have opted to go for King Edward VII?

How many have not yet made their choice?

Of those not going to King Edward VII, where are they going?

How many pupils are there in the current year 10?  
 How many pupils were there in last year's year 10?  
 For each of the feeder schools for King Edward VII (Sarson) in the Melton Area  
 What is the total number of pupils currently on roll?  
 What is the number of pupils in each year from reception through to year 6?

**D. For the Melton Area (John Ferneley, Long Field and KE7)**

For each year what is the total number of projected pupils in the secondary 11-16 system through to 2014?  
 And at the six form level?  
 For each year what is the total number of projected year seven pupils from this year through to 2014?  
 For each year how many of these are expected to come from the current primary schools?  
 For each year how many will be lost from the primary schools to outside the area?  
 For each year how many will come from outside the current primary schools in the area?  
 Where will these come from?  
 For each of the above do you have any projections beyond 2014?

**E. Catchment Areas**

When does the County intend to consult on catchment areas for the Melton Schools?  
 When is the deadline for the end of any consultation?  
 Does the County have any current proposals for the future of catchment areas in Melton?  
 If so what are they?  
 Will the principles agreed on catchment areas still be part of any proposals for future catchment areas (contiguous boundaries, primary co-terminus with secondary boundaries ie not splitting primary school cohorts between different secondary schools?)"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

"Dr O'Callaghan has asked a number of detailed questions regarding pupil admission data and catchment areas for the secondary schools in Melton Mowbray. These questions fall into three categories:

- Firstly, there are those questions relating to known admission data which are answered below.
- Secondly, there are those questions which relate to future admissions data for schools. This data is currently being evaluated by the CYPs Access and Welfare Service, as part of their normal annual admissions process, to determine first, second and third preferences of parents and the impact to overall school numbers. This information will be made public in March 2008.
- Finally, there are questions relating to the projected size of year

groups to 2014 and beyond, which remain subject to further work, based on the outcome of future admissions data for schools (this is work led by the Organisational Working Group, one of the specialist teams commissioned by CYPS as part of the Melton Review). This information will be confirmed early in the spring term 2008.

### **Current Admissions**

The data below relates solely to pupils in the Leicestershire County Council's school system. Data is not held or included for those pupils who attend education in the independent sector, or within other Local Authorities.

#### **A. For John Ferneley High School**

**The number of pupils in each year from Year 7 to Year 9** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 (DCSF Autumn School Census 2007), Year 7 = 165, Year 8 = 185, Year 9 = 175.

**The total number of students on roll** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 there were 525 pupils.

**The current admission limit** – The current admission limit is 220 for Year 7 entrants.

**The proposed admissions limit** – The proposed admission limit will be 160 for September 2009 Year 7 entry as specified by statutory notice.

**How many pupils from the John Ferneley catchment area entered Year 7 at the school this year?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 148 pupils.

**What was the total number of pupils for the catchment area which could have entered Year 7 at the school?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 195 pupils living in the catchment area could have attended the school.

**Where did the pupils go who did not go to John Ferneley?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October of those pupils attending schools in catchment; 8 pupils opted to attend Melton King Edward VII, 20 pupils opted to attend Long Field High School, 4 pupils opted to attend Belvoir High School, 1 pupil attends Wreake Valley Community College, 12 pupils attend De Lisle Catholic School, and 2 pupils attend Birch Wood (Melton Area Special School).

**How many pupils are there currently in the catchment area eligible to go to John Ferneley next academic year?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 223 pupils currently attending maintained schools in catchment are eligible to attend.

**For each of the feeder schools for John Ferneley High School in the Melton Area:**

**What is the total number of pupils currently on roll?**

**What is the number of pupils in each year from reception through to year 6?**

– Please refer to Table 1 (attached to these minutes).

**B. For Long Field High School**

**The number of pupils in each year from Year 7 to Year 9** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 (DCSF Autumn School Census 2007), Year 7 = 167, Year 8 = 132, Year 9 = 174.

**The total number of students on roll** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 473 pupils.

**The current admission limit** – The current admission limit is 181 for Year 7 entrants.

**The proposed admissions limit** – The proposed admission limit will be 160 for September 2009 Year 7 entry as specified by statutory notice.

**How many pupils from the Long Field catchment area entered Year 7 at the school this year?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 97 pupils.

**What was the total number of pupils for the catchment area which could have entered Year 7 at the school?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 127 pupils living in the catchment area could have attended the school.

**Where did the pupils go who did not go to Long Field?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October of those pupils attending maintained schools in catchment: 13 pupils opted to attend Melton KEVII, 5 pupils opted to attend John Ferneley High School, 1 pupil attends Wreake Valley, 10 pupils attend De Lisle Catholic School, and 1 pupil attends Birch Wood (Melton Area Special School).

**How many pupils are there currently in the catchment area eligible to go to Long Field next academic year?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 112 pupils currently attending maintained schools in catchment are eligible to attend.

**For each of the feeder schools for Long Field in the Melton Area:**

**What is the total number of pupils currently on roll?  
What is the number of pupils in each year from reception through to Year 6?**

– Please refer to Table 1 (attached to these minutes).

**C. For King Edward VII (Sarson)**

**The number of pupils in each year from Year 7 to Year 9** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 (DCSF Autumn School Census 2007), Year 7 = 68,

Year 8 = 90, Year 9 = 92.

**The total number of students on roll** - As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 1,780 pupils are on roll for all Year Groups (including years 12, 13 and 14).

**The current admission limit** – This is 105 for Year 7 and 515 for Year 10.

**The proposed admissions limit** - The proposed admission limit will be 160 for September 2009 Year 7 entry as specified by statutory notice.

**The number of pupils in each year from Year 10 onwards?** - As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 494 pupils are in Year 10, 538 pupils in Year 11, 262 pupils in Year 12, 213 pupils in Year 13 and 23 pupils in Year 14

**How many pupils from the King Edward VII Catchment Area entered Year 7 at the school this year?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 46 pupils.

**What was the total number of pupils for the catchment area which could have entered Year 7 at the school?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 99 pupils living in the catchment area could have attended the school.

**Where did the pupils go who did not go to King Edward VII?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 of those pupils attending maintained schools in catchment: 8 pupils opted to attend John Ferneley, 32 pupils attended Long Field, 1 pupil attends Roundhill Community College, 1 pupil attends Belvoir High School, 1 pupil attends Wreake Valley Community College, 7 pupils attend De Lisle, 1 pupil attends Ashmount School and 2 pupils attend Birch Wood (Melton Area Special School).

**How many pupils are there currently in the catchment area eligible to go to King Edward VII next academic year in Year 7?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 86 pupils currently attending maintained schools in catchment are eligible to attend.

**Likewise for Year 10, how many pupils are there currently in the catchment area eligible to go to King Edward VII next academic year?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 422 pupils currently attending maintained schools in the Melton catchment covering all secondary schools are eligible to attend.

**How many pupils are there in the current Year 10?** – As at 4<sup>th</sup> October 2007 494 pupils.

**How many pupils were there in last year's Year 10?** – As at 18<sup>th</sup> January 2007 (DCSF Spring School Census) 534 pupils

**For each of the feeder schools for King Edward VII (Sarson) in the Melton Area:**

**What is the total number of pupils currently on roll?  
What is the number of pupils in each year from reception through to Year 6?**

– Please refer to Table 1 (attached to these minutes).

#### **E. Catchment Areas**

**When does the County intend to consult on catchment areas for the Melton Schools?** – This will commence following approval by the Cabinet to do so, expected to be given on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2008.

**When is the deadline for the end of any consultation?** – Consultation must be completed by 1<sup>st</sup> March 2008, in keeping with the legal requirements for admission arrangements.

**If so does the County have any current proposals for the future of catchment areas in Melton?**

**What are they?**

**Will the principles agreed on catchment areas still be part of any proposals for future catchment areas (contiguous boundaries, primary co-terminus with secondary boundaries ie. not splitting primary school cohorts between different secondary schools)?**

Proposals for future catchment area adjustments (if required) remain subject to the outcomes of the Organisational Working Group and the decisions to be taken by Cabinet on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2008. This will include consideration of the principles previously put forward and any others that might be appropriate to the catchment proposals.

**The answer to the remaining questions concerning future admission numbers can only be made available in the spring term 2008 following the normal admissions process."**

See Table 1 (attached to these minutes).

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

- “1 What is the estimated cost of the whole process of identifying and consulting on the most recent proposals for three travellers' transit site options on the Coalville fringe?
2. What is the estimated cost of the whole process of identifying and consulting on proposals for a traveller transit site published February 2007 for sites in the Castle Donington area?
3. A Conservative Party Parliamentary Candidate was quoted in the Leicester Mercury on the 27th November, that "Traveller sites should be built closer to Leicester rather than in rural areas". Does the Leader agree with this position?"

**Mr Parsons replied as follows:**

"1.and 2. It is not possible to arrive at a realistic estimate of all the costs involved or indeed to break down items in the way requested. However, in relation to Property Services, the estimated cost of the whole process of identifying and consulting on both proposals was £76,500 broken down as follows:-

£75,000 covering feasibility work 50% and officer time 50%.

£1,500 covering the consultation exercise on the most recent proposals.

3. My understanding is that to be successful, transit sites must be located close to the problems they are attempting to solve."

**(J) Dr Feltham asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

"1. Developer temporary traffic lights on the A6/Wistow Road junction at Kibworth Harcourt have caused major inconvenience for motorists since June, with massive verge damage caused by drivers avoiding the bottle-neck on single track roads through Carlton Curliou and Burton Overy.

(a) When can villagers expect the desecrated roadside verges on these single track roads to be restored? and

(b) Can the developer be made to contribute to this considerable non-budgeted financial expense for County Highways?

2. Recently, there have been a series of unfortunate, and sometimes fatal, road traffic accidents on the section of the B6047 between the A47 at Billesdon and the A6 at West Langton.

(a) What traffic safety measures can be implemented to ensure a reduction of this unacceptable accident rate on this important rural route?

(b) Will local parish councils be included in any review of safety measures? and

(c) When can we expect such measures to be installed?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"1. (a) The work associated with a new housing development in Kibworth is expected to be complete by Christmas. Any significant defects to the carriageway on roads used by diverting traffic will be dealt with urgently and restoration of the verges will take place when ground conditions are right, next spring.

(b) The works are controlled by temporary traffic signals and there

is no suitable diversion route. This being the case, the developer cannot be held responsible for any damage to other roads caused by motorists who choose to divert onto them. However, discussions are taking place with the developer regarding the verge damage and I am hopeful that a satisfactory solution will be achieved.

2. (a) The most appropriate measures will depend on the exact circumstances of the accidents and the accident history. In investigating the route we will examine these before deciding on what will probably be a combination of improvements to signs and road markings, vehicle-activated warning signs, improved skid resistance of the road surface and minor changes to the road layout.
- (b) Yes, they will be consulted on the measures we propose.
- (c) We are already improving the road warning signs near East Langton railway bridge, where there was recently a fatal accident. Beyond that, we have a programme of route treatments for roads such as this, giving priority to routes where the problems are greatest. Within these overall priorities we expect to examine the route next year and to implement any required further measures in 2009."

**(K) Dr Feltham asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

"Earlier this year the Government announced a nationwide initiative for developers to propose plans for up to ten Eco-Towns. This competition is to be managed by a new Homes and Communities Agency and the planning process would be separate from all current development applications. The Co-operative Group are a major agricultural landowner in south-east Leicestershire, as well as a contributor to Labour Party funding. Under less than transparent information-sharing procedures, the Co-operative Group, in association with English Partnerships who are the agents for NHS property near Great Glen, are bidding to develop an Eco-Town based around the site of Leicester Airport near Stoughton. If the bid is short-listed and then selected in early 2008, could the Leader please explain,

1. What will be the process for consultation with the local community and planning authorities?
2. Who is expected to take the final decision on the planning application?
3. What effect a 15,000 home Eco-Town would have on the Regional Spatial Strategy, New Growth Points, and the regeneration plans for Leicester City?
4. What would be the likely effect of some 45,000 new residents living in a brand new Eco-Town, situated on the edge of Oadby and Leicester between the A6 and A47, on transport, employment, education and social care in this area?"

**Mr Parsons replied as follows:**

- "1. The Government seems to have no plans to consult local authorities or other local organisations before short listing about 10 eco-towns from the 57 applications. This is clearly unacceptable and representations to that effect have been made to the Government Office for the East Midlands. Shortlisted proposals will then be subject to consideration through a mini-review of the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). The Government has stated that this "will enable proposals for new eco-towns to be properly assessed within the planning system". Clearly, appropriate consultation should be undertaken to enable that assessment to take place.
2. It is not clear who would take the final decision on any planning application.
3. There is a major concern that the eco-town proposal will threaten the regeneration of Leicester City. The current draft RSS does not make provision for the eco-town, nor is it part of the recommendations in the recently published report of the Panel that examined the draft Strategy.
4. The proposal is for a 'self contained' new settlement with local services, major employment and limited car usage. The issue is the extent to which these objectives can be achieved. The County Council has previously advised that a development of more than 3,000 houses to the east of the City would have unacceptable traffic impacts without a direct link to the M1. Furthermore, independent advice on the prospects for an employment site in the same area suggested that its potential would be limited because of poor accessibility to the major road network."

**Dr Feltham asked the following supplementary question:**

"I am aware that the information that the Leader has provided here is relatively brief but that is only because of the amount of information that has been provided by the Co-op until they hear whether or not they've managed to be shortlisted for their bid, perhaps next year. But bearing in mind that there is very little information on who will actually make the decision over this application for an Eco Town, I wonder if the Leader is aware that two Leicestershire MPs should perhaps now declare an interest as they are both supported financially by the Co-op?"

**Mr Parsons replied as follows:**

"Actually, I was not. I was aware one member of Parliament was a Co-operative Member of Parliament. I wasn't aware of both of them. All I can say is I hope that in any campaigns they may have run that they have declared all their expenses properly."

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

- "1. Could the Leader tell the Council what progress has been made on shared services with the district councils in line with the requirements of the Government White Paper?
2. Can he give any specific examples of where progress has been made since the district elections in May?
3. What response was received to the list of suggested shared services put forward by the Cabinet earlier this year and is this list still under discussion?"

**Mr Parsons replied as follows:**

"1., 2. Progress has not been as positive or at the rate I had hoped.  
& 3. The specific proposals on which the Cabinet had invited a response from the District Councils were:

- a single revenues and benefits collection service for Leicestershire
- a single waste collection contract for Leicestershire, including standardised collection arrangements
- the reorganisation of one or more technical services currently delivered separately by the District Councils into a countywide structure with a single management arrangement

Collectively the response from Districts has been disappointing. That is regrettable since the proposals offer significant ongoing savings for Council Taxpayers as well as more effective services county-wide.

Since the District elections I have met with or been in correspondence personally with each District Council Leader about what it would take to make this sort of change. I believe the District Leaders would agree that the key decisions lie mostly with them. I have had, however, constructive discussions recently with the Leader and Deputy Leader of North West Leicestershire District Council.

Officer level discussions have taken place with several Districts about support services but the scale of any shared service is likely to be relatively small and unlikely to generate significant savings.

Grass cutting has often been mentioned as an opportunity for a more effective service since both the County and District Councils have their own operations. From 2008, as part of the Highway Works Alliance (the subject of a separate question) Tarmac will undertake grass cutting on all County roads except in Blaby, where a contract with the District Council runs until March 2009. The aim is to bring together highway environmental maintenance and general grounds maintenance. One District has indicated a desire to explore its

involvement in this and officers will be having discussions with all Districts before the 2008 growing season to explore the shared service potential further."

**Mr Galton asked the following supplementary question:**

"Would the Leader agree with me that the lack of progress is indeed disappointing, particularly noting his answer in the last part and the possibility of more co-operation on environmental services? Would he agree with me that in view of the outcome of the last residents' satisfaction survey which is really measuring what people think about Council services in general rather than in any particular tier, that this does present an opportunity to address the issue of grass-cutting and really try and resolve this by some kind of better working between the different tiers?"

**Mr Parsons replied as follows:**

"Yes. I was involved in a previous agreement between Blaby District Council and Leicestershire County Council. I always listen to Simon Galton on issues like these. He is a good practical politician in my view and if he can offer any help as well, it would be gratefully received."

**(M) Dr O'Callaghan asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

1. Would the Leader provide the following information?
  - a) A list of all road schemes in the County over the last ten years of £3m or over by date.
  - b) For each scheme the start and completion date and the total cost of the scheme and length (miles).
  - c) For each scheme the cost benefit ratio.
  - d) For each scheme how much was funded by the Government, by the County Council, by developers and by other sources.
  - e) For those funded by developers, where relevant how many houses or other development was involved?
  - f) Would the Leader provide the same information for current schemes such as the Earl Shilton Bypass and proposed schemes such as the Loughborough Inner Relief Road?
  
2. In a recent report approved on 28th November by Melton Borough Council's REEA Committee on the core strategy (preferred options) development plan document, three growth options were given for the Direction of Housing Growth, A South, B East and C North.
  - a) Would the Leader confirm that it is the County Council's view that the bypass option associated with Option C: North 'would produce the highest network-wide average speed and the

greatest relief to roads in the central part of the town' and that Option B: East 'would produce the lowest network-wide average speed and the least relief to roads in the central part of the town'?

- b) Can the Leader roughly quantify the extent of relief to roads in the central part of the town for the various options and the extent of the advantage of Option C: North over Option A: South and over Option B: East?
  - c) Would the Leader confirm that it is the County Council's view that the bypass option associated with Option C: North 'would also be the cheapest to construct' and that Option B: East 'would also be the most expensive to construct'?
  - d) Would the Leader be able to give a rough estimate of the costs of a bypass for Option C North, Option A: South and Option B: East?
  - e) Would the Leader be able to give a rough estimate of how much cheaper Option C: North would be over Option A: South and over Option B: East?
  - f) Would the Leader be able to give a rough estimate for each option the cost benefit ratio?
3. The Leader in his position statement at the last meeting of the County Council referred to a lobby group to present the petition to Westminster.
- a) When was the date for this lobby fixed?
  - b) Who was invited?
  - c) If they were unable to attend what was the reason given?
  - d) With the exception of the editor of the Melton Times only Conservative members at county and district level attended the lobby. Were members of political groups other than the Conservatives invited at district level?
  - e) Does the Leader believe that all political groups should be involved in the campaign for a bypass?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. See Appendix 1 (attached to these minutes).
- 2. The work that has been done to date involves the use of a computer model to estimate the traffic impacts of three bypass options, together with associated major new development. Preliminary analysis of the likely cost of bypass construction has also been carried out. This work shows, in answer to the specific questions, that:

- (a) Option C (a northern bypass) would produce an overall morning peak hour network average speed of approximately 47km/hour compared with 45 km/hour for Option A (a south-western bypass) and 41 km/hour for Option B (a south-eastern bypass).
- (b) Using Norman Way as an example of a town centre road, Option C would produce a reduction in all-day traffic in 2016 of 22%, compared with the situation at that date if there was new development but no bypass. Option A would produce a 10% reduction and Option B 3%.
- (c) Option C would cost approximately £21m, works cost only. Equivalent costs for the other options would be £22m for Option A and £23m for Option B.

No estimate of the likely cost benefit ratio has been made at this stage of the analysis.

Although these results show some advantage for Option C over other options, it would be wrong to consider this as decisive. The cost difference between the options is marginal and might be overturned when more detailed costings are produced; similarly the modelled traffic impacts, particularly between Options C and B, are not greatly different and at this stage no account has been taken of the possible location of additional employment land. The final decision, taken within the local development framework process, will have to take account not only of the cost and effectiveness of a bypass but also of the many other planning factors influencing the choice of a location for major housing development.

- 3. (a) Provisionally on 19th October, 2007;
- (b) All County Councillors representing Melton Electoral Divisions, the Leader of Melton Borough Council, the Chairman of Melton Chamber of Commerce and the Editor of the Melton Times, together with the local Member of Parliament. We worked closely with the Melton Times in making these arrangements.
- (c) Dr O'Callaghan gave his apologies because he was already committed to a visit abroad. The Chairman of the Melton Chamber of Commerce was sadly unable to attend, at the last minute, because of illness.
- (d) As explained above, invitations were sent to local county councillors on a cross-party basis, and to the Leader of the Borough Council.
- (e) Yes, and indeed the subsequent article in the Melton Times referred to the fact that the delegation had 'all party backing and the overwhelming support of Melton Times readers'."

**(N) Dr O'Callaghan asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

"Would the Leader indicate the extent to which, if at all, the County Council is exposed to the Northern Rock crisis?"

**Mr Page replied as follows:**

"Leicestershire County Council did not lend any money to Northern Rock as the bank's credit rating did not match our minimum acceptable level.

The County Council's Pension Fund also had no exposure to Northern Rock, either as an investor in its shares or through a cash investment. Of the four external investment managers employed by the Fund who could have held the shares, none of them felt them to be an attractive proposition."

**128. TO DISPOSE OF BUSINESS REMAINING FROM THE LAST MEETING.**

**REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.**

**(A) REVISION OF STANDING ORDERS (MEETING PROCEDURE RULES).**

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

"That the changes to Standing Orders (the Meeting Procedure Rules) as set out in Appendix 1 to the report of the Constitution Committee, be approved."

**129. POSITION STATEMENTS UNDER STANDING ORDER 8.**

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

The Connect2 Project – Watermead Country Park  
The Council's Disabled Workers' Group  
Melton Mowbray By Pass  
Local Government Finance Settlement  
Community Forums  
"Most Innovative Local Authority of the Year"  
Inspections.

The Lead Member for the Children and Young People's Service presented a position statement on performance issues.

The Lead Member for the Adult Social Care Service presented a position statement on transforming adult social care in Leicestershire.

The Chairman of the Scrutiny Commission presented a position statement on the following matters:-

Review of Overview and Scrutiny

The Forward Plan  
Issues before Overview and Scrutiny bodies.

Copies of the Position Statements are filed with these minutes.

**130. REPORT OF THE CABINET.**

**(A) SUPPORTED ACCOMMODATION FOR OLDER PEOPLE.**

It was moved by Mr Sprason and seconded by Mr Orson:-

"That the action taken by the Cabinet in relation to the future provision of care services for older people, which includes the transfer of six in-house care homes as going concerns to the independent sector, as set out in Part A of the report of the Cabinet, be noted."

An amendment was moved by Dr O'Callaghan and seconded by Mr Galton:-

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

- "(a) That the action taken by the Cabinet in relation to the future provision of care services for older people, which includes the transfer of six in-house care homes as going concerns to the independent sector, as set out in Part A of the report of the Cabinet, be noted, with regret;
- (b) That the Council still believes the previous consensus of retaining at least one in-house care home in each district was the right approach;
- (c) Therefore, the Council opposes the proposal to transfer the six in-house care homes; Catherine Dalley House, Hadrian House, Huntingdon Court, Harvey House, Kirby House and Woodmarket House to the independent sector;
- (d) That the Cabinet be requested to reconsider its decision accordingly." '

On the amendment 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 Amendment

Mr Bailey, Mr Bill, Mr Boulter, Mr Brown, Mr Charlesworth, Mr Galton, Mr Gamble, Mr Griffiths, Dr Hill, Mr Hunt, Mr Hyde, Mr Jones, Mr Legrys, Ms Newton, Dr O'Callaghan, Mr Parker, Mr Sheahan, Mr Stanley, Mr Stork, Mr Wilson, Mr Wright.

Against the Amendment

Mrs Camamile, Mr Coxon, Mrs Dickinson, Dr Feltham, Mr Fraser, Mr Garner,

Mr Harley, Mr Hart, Mr Houseman, Mr Jennings, Mr Kershaw, Mr Lewis, Mr Liquorish, Mr Moore, Mr Natzel, Mr Orson, Mr Osborne, Mr Ould, Mr Page, Mr Parsons, Mrs Pendleton, Prof Preston, Mr Rhodes, Mr Roffey, Mr Rushton, Mr Shepherd, Mrs Sherwin, Mr Snartt, Mr Sprason, Mr White.

Abstaining

Mrs R Page.

The amendment was not carried, 21 members voting for the amendment and 30 against, with 1 abstention.

An amendment was moved by Mrs Newton and seconded by Mr Bailey:-

'That the following be added at the end of the motion:-

"(b) The Council requests the Cabinet

1. To establish an ongoing process with representatives of residents and staff to consult on the selection of provider/s and on issues in connection with the transfer of the care homes and beyond.
2. To establish through partnership arrangements annually at least for the first five years monitoring of the transferred homes and dialogue between the County Council and staff, residents and their families.
3. To guarantee via block-purchases from the new provider(s) care for existing residents, including self-funders, so they incur no additional costs.
4. To guarantee a sufficient number of respite, assessment and day care beds over the 6 sites, to match the expected future demand and in addition to existing contracts. Also to guarantee sufficient rehabilitation beds elsewhere.
5. To consider extending the covenant in the report up to the life-time of current residents rather than just five years." '

The amendment was not carried, 21 members voting for the amendment and 30 against, with 1 abstention.

On the original 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 Original Motion

Mrs Camamile, Mr Coxon, Mrs Dickinson, Dr Feltham, Mr Fraser, Mr Garner, Mr Harley, Mr Hart, Mr Houseman, Mr Jennings, Mr Kershaw, Mr Lewis, Mr

Liquorish, Mr Moore, Mr Natzel, Mr Orson, Mr Osborne, Mr Ould, Mr Page, Mr Parsons, Mrs Pendleton, Prof Preston, Mr Rhodes, Mr Roffey, Mr Rushton, Mr Shepherd, Mrs Sherwin, Mr Snartt, Mr Sprason, Mr White.

Against the Original Motion

Mr Bailey, Mr Bill, Mr Boulter, Mr Brown, Mr Charlesworth, Mr Galton, Mr Gamble, Mr Griffiths, Dr Hill, Mr Hunt, Mr Hyde, Mr Jones, Mr Legrys, Ms Newton, Dr O'Callaghan, Mr Parker, Mr Sheahan, Mr Stanley, Mr Stork, Mr Wilson, Mr Wright.

Abstaining

Mrs R Page.

The original motion was carried, 30 members voting for the motion and 21 against with 1 abstention.

**(B) REVIEW OF DESIGN GUIDE 'HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT'.**

It was moved by Mr Rushton, seconded by Mr Orson and carried.

- "(a) That the revised version of 'Highways, Transportation and Development' as referred to in Section B of the report to the Cabinet be approved;
- (b) That the Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management be authorised, in consultation with the Cabinet Lead Member, to make such revisions to the document as he considers necessary provided that they do not involved any changes in policy."

**131. NOTICES OF MOTION:**

**(A) DUTY OF CARE TO ARMED FORCES - MR GRIFFITHS.**

It was moved by Mr Griffiths and seconded by Mr Roffey:-

- "(a) Leicestershire County Council reminds H.M. Government of the unwritten covenant that the citizens of the United Kingdom have with the Armed Forces of the Crown;
- (b) The Council urges the Government to ensure that the families of personnel killed in action, together with those who are injured in the pursuance of their duties, are more appropriately financially compensated and receive full medical and counselling assistance as is necessary for their continued well being;
- (c) The Council urges the Government to do all in its power to improve the support given to bereaved families with regard to

legal representation during coroners' inquests and to avoid the current delays in the undertaking of inquests;

- (d) The Council calls upon the Government to honour the life-long duty of care, implicit in the "Military Covenant", for those making this unique commitment to the United Kingdom through military service;
- (e) The Council resolves to copy this resolution to the Minister for Defence, the Chief of the Defence Staff and the National President of the Royal British Legion and in so doing record the Council's continuing support and admiration for those serving in H.M. Armed Forces."

An amendment was moved by Mr John Legrys and seconded by Mr Brown:-

'That the following be added at the end of the motion:-

"This County Council acknowledges its own covenant with Members of the Armed Forces from Leicestershire killed or injured in action, by for example:

- installing a plaque, memorial or other record with the names of those killed in action at a suitable location at County Hall
- encouraging the names of those more recently killed whilst serving their country to be added to the war memorials across the County
- encouraging the organisation of welcome home parades for returning forces
- continuing the tradition of hosting a dinner for the armed forces but look how it may be more commemorative of this covenant
- requesting the Directors of Adult Social Care and Children and Young People's Services to see how we may develop additional support packages for families of those killed or injured in action as a mark of respect from the people of Leicestershire.

This County Council suggests the formation of an all party group to consider these and other proposals and to consult with the British Legion.

This County Council requests the group to consider to what extent the emergency and other similar services might be included." '

The amendment was put and not carried.

An amendment was moved by Mr Parsons and seconded by Dr

O'Callaghan:-

'That the following words be added at the end of the motion:-

- "(f) That the suggestions for local action raised in the debate be referred for consideration at the next meeting of Group Leaders." '

The amendment was put and carried.

The substantive motion was put and carried.

**(B) POST OFFICE CLOSURES - MR OULD**

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

"That the County Council notes with regret the proposals by Post Office Ltd to close 16 Post Offices in Leicestershire and to reduce hours at a further 5. Some of the Post Offices to be closed are an important commercial part of the only retail outlet in a village. The County Council has worked with post offices to help them invest to diversify their businesses and it is disappointing that Government and Post Office Ltd have not made more effort in this direction. Preliminary work has indicated that the judgement of Post Office Ltd in asserting that adequate alternative provision is available to the areas affected is in some cases flawed. Accordingly, that the Chief Executive be authorised to make representations on behalf of the County Council, having first checked the closure proposals against Post Office Ltd's own criteria, such representations to take into account all relevant factors and any specific points which may be put forward by local members."

5 December 2007  
2.30 p.m. – 7.25 p.m.

CHAIRMAN