

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL  
HELD AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 20 FEBRUARY  
2008**

**PRESENT**

Mr. Mike Jones CC (in the Chair)

Mr. A. D. Bailey CC, Mr. D. C. Bill CC, Mr. G. A. Boulter CC, Mr. D. R. Bown CC, Mr. N. J. Brown CC, Mr. P. Callis 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

**132. CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS.**

**Major G F Wyatt**

The Chairman reported with sadness that former County Councillor Major George Wyatt had died on 10th February, 2008. Major Wyatt had been elected to the Council in 1977 and served until 1981 representing the former Market Harborough Rural No. 2 electoral division. He had served on the Environment, Education Arts, and Police Committees and Manpower Subcommittee.

Members joined the Chairman in standing in silent tribute to the memory of Major George Wyatt.

**133. MINUTES.**

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

"That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 5 December 2007 copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed."

**134. 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:-

<u>Member</u>	<u>Minute No.</u>	<u>Interest</u>
Mr. Sheahan	136	Personal Non Prejudicial (Home to School Transport)
Dr. O'Callaghan	136	Personal Non Prejudicial (School Governor)
Mr Shepherd	137	Personal Non Prejudicial

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

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

- "1. Does the Leader support the idea that an endowment fund should be established to give a greater degree of independence to the Bradgate Park Trust and to provide funds for new initiatives, leaving existing funding channels to meet the costs of ongoing management and upkeep of the Park?
2. Would the Leader support the making of a contribution to any such fund by the County Council?"

**Mr White replied as follows:**

- "1. I am advised that the Bradgate Park Trust established two endowment funds in 2006 and the Trust is actively seeking contributions.
2. No doubt the Trust would be delighted to receive a contribution for the endowment from the County Council or indeed the City Council who is the other Holding Trustee for Bradgate Park. Mr Boulter may know if a similar question is being asked of the City Council. It is a matter of priorities and I note that no request for a contribution to the Endowment Fund has been made to the County Council by the Trust. I also note that the letter requesting the 2008/2009 annual contribution by the County Council to the Bradgate Park Trust maintains that the Trustees "are very conscious of the financial pressure faced by the Holding Trustees" and have therefore retained the level of requested annual contributions at the same level (in cash terms) for the last 5 years."

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

"Energy firm Npower recently announced that electricity prices for its domestic customers will rise by 12.7% while gas bills will see a 17.2% increase. Furthermore, it was highlighted that some customers in the East Midlands face a rise of almost 27% in electricity prices and 24% for gas.

Does the Leader agree that this regional variation in pricing discriminates against people in Leicestershire and that some of our most vulnerable residents, including older people, will be forced to choose between heating and other essentials as fuel bills rise?"

**Mr Sprason replied as follows:**

"Energy supply companies are justifying the regional variation in price by the variation in costs of transportation, particularly of gas. In addition to Npower, British Gas has recently made changes to its pricing structure with the remaining companies likely to follow. Parts of the East Midlands, including Leicestershire, are particularly vulnerable to these price variations due to their distance from current gas delivery and storage locations.

Many energy analysts anticipate that high and rising energy prices are likely to continue. It is therefore likely that people in the East Midlands will continue to feel the pressure of rising costs and our vulnerable residents will indeed find themselves at increased risk of fuel poverty. The number of households in fuel poverty has increased from 5.7% in 2004 to 8.1% in 2005 (State of the Region Report 2008).

I recognise that these issues are a priority for our region and for Leicestershire. These increased charges are likely to exacerbate the problem of fuel poverty and impose an additional burden on our vulnerable residents.

There is a need to raise these matters with the appropriate bodies. I will, therefore, undertake to write to the Regional Minister, Phil Hope MP, and the Department of Business, Enterprise and Regulatory Reform (BERR) to raise both the potential of gas storage within our region and the issue of regional variations in price. In addition, I will write to Ofgem about the regional variations in prices and the possibility of additional support for fuel poverty measures through the Carbon Reduction Emissions Target (CERT) mechanism for suppliers. Finally, I will write to Energywatch and DEFRA about the issue of fuel poverty and the additional burden due to unequal transmission costs being passed on to consumers.

In addition to these representations, Leicestershire County Council will continue to do all it can with its partners to enable vulnerable residents to claim their full benefit entitlement. The partnership approach in Leicestershire is working to increase the income of older people through benefits uptake and reduce fuel poverty if at all possible."

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

"With the continued discrimination of all funding for our vulnerable population, would it be possible to raise the unfairness with the Audit Commission?" "

**Mr Sprason replied as follows:**

"Yes, I will seek advice to see if we can actually do that and I agree with you, the discrimination of funding particularly for Leicestershire, on all levels, is outrageous."

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

- "1. During the Christmas period Leicestershire Police had cause to stop and breathalyse 1557 drivers of whom 159 were found to be positive and driving whilst above the permitted legal limit for the consumption of alcohol. Does the Leader agree with me that the continuing high number of drivers prepared to drive whilst under the influence of alcohol remains a cause for concern and that through Leicestershire Together and Local Area Agreements we need to work together to achieve a significant reduction in the number of drivers committing this offence?
2. Would the Leader please say what support the County Council is giving to assist the Police and other partners in tackling the incidence of driving under the influence of alcohol in the County?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. In past years, the Police have breathalysed more people over the Christmas/New Year period and arrested proportionately less. For example, ten years ago some 3,000 drivers were tested with arrest rates around 4%. The higher arrest rate this Christmas was to do with a more targeted approach by the Police. Improved recording methods have resulted in better profiling of offenders. It has become apparent that the 18-25 age group is now more culpable than previously. Changes in licensing hours have led to a wider spread of times where people may be over the limit, but an increase in "morning after" testing has revealed numbers of drivers still over the limit when they may have imagined they were clear. This information educates and enables us to target our campaigns better.

The incidence of drink driving clearly remains an area for concern. Significant effort and resources are invested in dealing with the problem. The County Council works in close collaboration with the Police throughout the year with particular focus on Christmas and on Summer campaigns.

2. As part of the work associated with the Local Area Agreement, an Alcohol Harm Reduction Strategy is being developed based on 3 key themes of prevention, community safety and treatment. One of the actions within the draft Strategy is to promote regular campaigns by the Road Safety Team to raise awareness of drink driving alongside enforcement to detect and punish those who drive above the limit. To that end, the County Council Road Safety Team and the Police Traffic Management Team, have meetings every two months to plan, monitor and evaluate road safety campaigns, including drink drive. This is a very close and valuable working arrangement.

Mindful of the worrying trend towards younger drink drivers, a successful bid (June 2007) was made to the Leicester, Leicestershire and Rutland Road Safety Partnership (LLRRSP) for an additional £50,000 funding to be spread over a two year period to enhance our Christmas Drink Drive campaigns. This money came from surplus funds

available from the Speed Awareness Workshops (managed by the County Council on behalf of the LLRRSP).

This additional funding enabled us to book a professional theatre company from our existing road safety budget to tour the County's Upper Schools and Colleges, targeting 6<sup>th</sup> formers, with a hard hitting drink drive theatre in education production entitled "Too Much Punch For Judy". The play, based on actual events, was very well received by schools.

We anticipate repeating the tour next Autumn Term and continuing to target driver groups by a variety of means and media.

For the most recent drink drive campaign we used radio advertising, road side posters, car parking tickets, beer mats, bar table top messages, football programme advertising, advertising in toilets at the Walkers Stadium, pub bar staff flashing badges, the promotion of alcohol free cocktails at the Melton Food Festival and we were involved in the East Midlands Drink Drive regional launch.

Coverage of the campaign was very positive in the local media."

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

"With regard to the reduction in subsidy for transport of pupils attending faith schools, it is claimed, by the parent of a child attending De Lisle School Loughborough that an additional £80 million is to be made available to the County Council from central government for the coming year. In view of this it is claimed there is no valid reason for the Council to proceed with its decision to require parents of pupils attending denominational schools to make a contribution towards the transport costs from September this year.

Would the Leader please say whether such an additional sum of money is to be received from Government for 2008/2009 and, if not, can he throw any light on the claims?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

"As has been belatedly acknowledged by Dr O'Callaghan, the £80m extra government funding is a myth. The increase in schools' funding (Dedicated Schools Grant) is estimated to be £12m but Government rules mean this has to be spent on schools and cannot be used to maintain subsidised school transport.

The increase in Formula Grant is £4.4m of which £1.4m will go back to the Government in increased landfill tax and £1.8m is needed to meet the costs of Government approved borrowing to fund capital investment in roads and schools. This leaves £1.2m to fund inflation and all other spending pressures in the £314m budget.

An £80m figure could relate to the total of Area Based Grant (ABG) to be received over the next 3 years. In the main ABG is branding of our current specific grants. The increase in 2008/9 is approximately £2m. Although the

ABG is not ring fenced, the majority of the increase relates to Children's and Adults' Social Care.

Within the DCSF funding to the County Council there is £0.158m in 2008/9 for extended rights to free transport for low income families to allow them a wider choice of schools including faith schools. By providing extra funding for this change in legislation the Government is acknowledging that there is no expectation or funding to provide free transport to all pupils attending faith schools other than to low income families in certain circumstances. Support for low income families in respect of faith schools is already provided by the County Council."

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

- "1. According to the County Council's website the Leicestershire County Council's current eligibility threshold for Social Care is "Substantial".

Does the Leader expect the Council's eligibility needs threshold to change during the lifetime of the Medium Term Financial Strategy?

2. The Social Care Minister recently said that councils should be looking to address moderate needs before they became critical. Is it Leicestershire County Council's policy to do this, given that the Council's current threshold is "Substantial"?
3. The Government might well be reforming the way that social care is delivered, and the Minister has ordered "a fundamental review of the system of who gets care". Can the Leader confirm that the Council will ensure that any changes in procedures will not impact detrimentally on the services received by Leicestershire's service users?"

**Mr Sprason replied as follows:**

- "1. The Council's current eligibility threshold for social care is not Substantial, it is Moderate. In order to fully clarify this for Members the description of the Moderate band on the County Council's website is given in full below:

**"Moderate** category essential community care services will only be provided if the support needed is essential to maintaining a basic level of living and independence **or** to prevent further loss of skills and increased risks **or** where short term rehabilitation would enable skills to be regained.

This clearly shows that Leicestershire County Council is addressing Moderate needs if there is a risk that they might become Substantial or Critical.

2. As can be seen from the answer to Question 1, the Council is already addressing moderate needs before they become critical.
3. The Council welcomes the Government's commitment to reform the way that Adult Social Care is delivered. However, 'a fundamental review of the system of who gets care' cannot be achieved successfully without also reviewing the funding available. The planned Green Paper

on the funding of Adult Social Care later in the year must give some recognition to the pressures that local authorities are currently experiencing in this area of service, which is so vital for the most vulnerable members of our community. The Council will continue to do all it can with the resources available to make the most positive impact possible on the lives of people who need our services."

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

- "1. How many of Leicestershire County Council's School Crossing Patrol posts are currently vacant?
2. How many of these posts have been unfilled for over three months?
3. (i) Is the Leader aware that of three School Crossing Patrol posts in Blaby and Glen Parva, two are currently unfilled, one of which has been vacant since September, 2006?
- (ii) What measures does the Leader intend to take to fill these posts, since their continued vacancy leaves young children and their families at risk on a daily basis?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. 47 out of 159
2. 43
3. (i) There are 5 approved sites within Blaby and Glen Parva of which 2 are vacant. One of these sites (Blaby) is pending, awaiting the outcome of a Criminal Records Bureau Disclosure.
- (ii) The School Crossing Patrol Service is to launch a recruitment drive on the 26<sup>th</sup> February which involves current Patrols talking to the media (Leicester Mercury, weekly papers, Radio Leicester) about why they love their job, what attracted them to the post and why they think people should apply. School children are also to be involved in directly appealing for Patrols to keep them safe. It is anticipated that the campaign will run until Easter with the assistance of the media and the School Crossing Patrol website which goes live on the 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2008, featuring on the Leicestershire County Council home page for the first 2 weeks. All vacancies are to be advertised both on the website and in the Leicester Mercury and in the weeks following the launch date of the 26<sup>th</sup>, all sites are to receive banners to display on the school gates together with leaflets. In addition, the School Crossing Patrol Service is to write to all parents at those schools appealing for their help. Leicestershire police have also agreed to advertise all patrol vacancies in their in-house magazine "In touch".

The school crossing patrol service has now been transferred to Highways, Transportation & Waste Management and has been amalgamated with the road safety and school travel planning

team. This should enable a more integrated approach and may also aid recruitment and retention."

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

"The 6Cs Congestion Management Study has just published a survey which measures the extent of congestion across the Greater Nottingham, Leicester and Derby conurbations. This survey found that the slowest route into Leicester is the three mile stretch of the A426 from Blaby, via Leicester Road Glen Parva. This has been dubbed by the Leicester Mercury as "the worst stretch of road into Leicester."

In the light of the 6Cs Study does the Leader agree with me that:-

1. Improvements to the County Arms road junction, the re-opening of the Blaby Railway Station and improved bus services would help to alleviate traffic congestion in the southern approaches into Leicester?
2. The residents who live along these congested routes should have safe places to cross and that therefore the many residents who have been asking for a safe crossing place at the north end of Leicester Road (A426), Glen Parva, near the junction with Red House Road, should be granted their wish?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. Our priorities for capital transport investment in the County are set out in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and we prioritise our expenditure against these objectives and targets.

Tackling congestion is one of the LTP objectives and as such the A426 is identified as a bus corridor for investment. Funding provision for advanced design of a scheme on this corridor is included in the 2008/09 programme.

In terms of carrying out a study at the County Arms junction, we will soon complete an exercise where we will look at congestion at junctions in the County to prioritise junction improvements expenditure in later LTP years. However, treating the County Arms junction in isolation is unlikely to solve all the problems on this route and we are working with the City Council as they explore capacity problems at the A426/A563 junction with the outer ring road.

Reopening Blaby station is a longer term aspiration and is dependent on securing land, funds, agreement from Network Rail and a detailed study of the potential implications for train stopping patterns. The existing timetable does not allow for extra stops and the implications for services to Narborough and South Wigston would have to be worked out. We are starting work with Blaby District Council to ensure that future planning policies allow for the possible reopening of Blaby station, so that future opportunities do not get lost.



2. In response to the petition received at the Blaby Highways Forum in February, we are presently assessing the potential for a pedestrian crossing in this area, in accordance with the agreed system. A report on the results will be taken to the Blaby Highways Forum, once they are known."

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

- "1. Could the Leader provide the distances (in miles), delays, times, and speeds (in mph) as measured between 8am and 9am in the 6Cs *Congestion Management Study, Jan 2008* for the following arterial routes from these locations into Leicester City Centre:

Anstey: A5630  
 Birstall: A6(N)  
 Thurmaston: A607  
 Thurnby: A47 (East)  
 Oadby: A6 (S)  
 Wigston: A5199  
 South Wigston: B5366  
 Blaby: A426  
 Narborough: A4114/5460  
 Leicester Forest East: A47(W)  
 Groby: A50 ?

2. What is the estimated total loss of time and cost of such delays for motorists?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. I had understood that the Labour Group had agreed not to use the questions procedure to solicit detailed information of this nature which could be obtained in other ways. However, the table below gives the results from the congestion management study for routes into Leicester city centre

**Traffic delay, by route section, on routes into Leicester in the AM peak (8am – 9am)**

Route	Section	Distance (miles)	Total delay	Journey time 8am to 9am	Reference journey time	Average delay per mile
A5199	Wigston to A563 Outer Ring Road	1.9	3min 6secs			1min 37secs
A5199	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	1.7	5min 0secs			3min 1sec
<b>A5199</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>3.6</b>	<b>8min 6secs</b>	<b>16min 34secs</b>	<b>8min 28secs</b>	<b>2min 15secs</b>

A5630	Anstey to A563 Outer Ring Road	1.3	3min 43secs			2min 58secs
A5630	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	1.8	2min 45secs			1min 34secs
<b>A5630</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>6min 28secs</b>	<b>12min 54secs</b>	<b>6min 26secs</b>	<b>2min 5secs</b>
A607	Thurmaston to A563 Outer Ring Road	0.5	4min 51secs			6min 12secs
A607	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	2.0	5min 6secs			2min 31secs
<b>A607</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>9min 57secs</b>	<b>15min 34secs</b>	<b>5min 37secs</b>	<b>3min 59secs</b>
A6 North	Birstall to A563 Outer Ring Road	1.1	0min 47secs			0min 45secs
A6 North	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	1.3	2min 42secs			2min 6secs
<b>A6 North</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>3min 29secs</b>	<b>11min 59secs</b>	<b>8min 30secs</b>	<b>1min 27secs</b>
B5366	South Wigston to A563 Outer Ring Road	0.5	5min 51secs			12min 32secs
B5366	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	1.6	3min 17secs			2min 7secs
<b>B5366</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>9min 8secs</b>	<b>13min 41secs</b>	<b>4min 33secs</b>	<b>4min 41secs</b>
A47 East	Thurnby to A563 Outer Ring Road	0.6	No delay			No delay
A47 East	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	2.3	4min 18secs			1min 54secs

<b>A47 East</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>4min 18secs</b>	<b>10min 48secs</b>	<b>6min 30secs</b>	<b>1min 29secs</b>
A426	Blaby to A563 Outer Ring Road	1.2	8min 55secs			7min 16secs
A426	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	1.8	5min 38secs			3min 4secs
<b>A426</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>14min 33secs</b>	<b>21min 6 secs</b>	<b>6min 33secs</b>	<b>4min 51secs</b>
A50	Groby to A563 Outer Ring Road	3.1	5min 46secs			1min 52secs
A50	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	2.1	4min 37secs			2min 15secs
<b>A50</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>10min 23secs</b>	<b>19min 32secs</b>	<b>9min 9secs</b>	<b>2min 0secs</b>
A47 West	Leicester Forest East to A563 Outer Ring Road	1.9	7min 43secs	3min 58secs		
A47 West	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	2.2	2min 57secs			1min 22secs
<b>A47 West</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>10min 40secs</b>	<b>21min 31secs</b>	<b>10min 51secs</b>	<b>2min 36secs</b>
B4114/A5460	Narborough to A563 Outer Ring Road	0.9	No delay			No delay
B4114/A5460	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	3.1	7min 46secs			2min 27secs
<b>B4114/A5460</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>4.0</b>	<b>7min 46secs</b>	<b>15min 1sec</b>	<b>7min 15secs</b>	<b>1min 57secs</b>
A6 South	Oadby to A563	0.5	2min 11secs			4min 46secs

	Outer Ring Road					
A6 South	A563 Ring Road to City Centre	2.3	7min 39secs			3min 22secs
<b>A6 South</b>	<b>All sections</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>9min 50secs</b>	<b>16min 48secs</b>	<b>6min 48secs</b>	<b>3min 31secs</b>

2. On a daily basis, using traffic flow figures from the Central Leicestershire Transport Model, this amounts to around 950 hours of time lost, in total, between 8am and 9am.

Using a generalised value of time per hour, this amounts to around £29,000 worth of lost time, which scales up to about £7¼ million per year, taking into account all morning peaks and the fact that they last longer than 8am to 9am.

These hours lost and prices are for these lengths of road only, and the prices are the economic impact and do not represent cashable losses."

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

"My supplementary question concerns the speed at which traffic is moving from the radial towns in the County into the City of Leicester. Thank you very much for the copious responses but they don't contain the speeds. Would Mr Rushton confirm that the average speed for vehicles going from our radial towns around the City into the City of Leicester is 15 miles per hour between the hours of 8am and 9am in the morning, on average?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"I honestly don't know the answer to that but I will let Mr Hunt know as soon as I do."

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

"A recent report by Sir Paul Kennedy, the Interception of Communications Commissioner states that 'Councils, police and intelligence services are tapping and intercepting the phone calls, e-mails and letters of hundreds of thousands of people every year'.

Could the Leader please indicate whether the County Council is involved in such activities and, if so, in what way and for what purposes?"

**Mr Page replied as follows:**

"The County Council cannot bug people's telephones or intercept people's e-mails or letters. All the County Council can do is to apply to see telephone subscriber and billing information, but not the contents of any calls, for the purpose of investigating a crime.

The only staff authorised to make such applications are two senior members of staff in the Community Services Department within Regulatory Services. They have had to undertake specialist training before being so authorised, and all requests are subject to a strict process to ensure they are in line with the law and the County Council's policy relating to the application of the Regulation of Investigatory Powers Act 2000.

The majority of the cases when applications have been made involved investigations into car clocking and the counterfeiting of goods. There have been 7 applications made in the period from January 2006 to the present time."

**(J) Mr Bown asked the following question of the Chairman of the Police Authority:**

- "1. Could the Chairman of the Leicestershire Police Authority inform me of the total number of crimes in the Force Area which were recorded in 2006 and how many of these were detected?
2. During the debate in the House of Commons on the Police Grant Report Motion the Minister stated that in some areas savings had been made by collaborating with neighbouring forces. Were the Leicestershire Police involved in any venture with other Police Authorities? If they were – what savings were made?
3. Does the Chairman of the Leicestershire Police Authority agree with the Leader of the LGA Sir Simon Milton that County Councils should take over responsibility of the Police Forces in their area, including the power to dismiss the Chief Constable?"

**Mr Rhodes replied as follows:**

- "1. From January to December 2006 there were 92,717 crimes recorded of which 25,951 were detected.
2. Since July 2006 when the Home Office announced it was not proceeding with plans to merge the five police forces in the East Midlands, the region's Police Authorities have continued to work together in areas where cooperation can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of policing.

A Joint Committee has been established made up of representatives of the five authorities being Derbyshire, Lincolnshire, Nottinghamshire, Northamptonshire and Leicestershire and advised by the region's Chief Constables. This is an historic development for policing in the East Midlands. Whilst each Police Authority and the five Chief Constables retain ultimate responsibility for policing in their respective force areas the Joint Committee provides the framework through which improved quality of policing can be delivered for all the communities within the region. In order to aid transparency the Joint Committee has dedicated twenty minutes at the start of each of its public meetings to 'Question Time' when people can ask questions about the work of the Committee and its aims. The Joint Committee will meet next on 25 February 2008.

Further to this the East Midlands region has been successful in obtaining Home Office funding to be a demonstrator site for work within the area of witness protection. Other areas of work being taken forward for collaboration are covert technical support, tape summarising, telecoms single point of contact, forensics and identification, prisoner processing and file preparation, workforce modernisation, demand management, resource management, regional policy and procedure alignment and ICT provisions across the region for which the Chairman of the Leicestershire Police Authority is the lead member.

The Policing Minister, Tony McNulty has acknowledged the collaborative work being undertaken in the East Midlands and has announced that the approach being taken here is to be commended as a beacon for other areas to follow.

It is difficult at this stage to identify savings from the current work being undertaken as all the projects identified for regional collaboration are long term issues, however these projects have been chosen as they are expected to produce both cashable and non-cashable savings as well as resulting in increased efficiency and effectiveness for all forces concerned.

3. Leicestershire Police Authority have not taken a view on this issue."

**Mr Bown asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question 1:**

"Does the Chairman agree that the answer indicates that this is a 28% detection rate. So that indicates that 72% of all crimes are not detected. In the early 90's that was 30% with 1,700 Police approximately. Today there is 2,300 Police approximately plus Community Support Officers and yet their detection rate is down 2%."

**Mr Rhodes replied as follows:**

"I understand the point that Mr Bown is making and I am happy to talk to him about it after the meeting."

**Mr Bown asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question 2:**

"When will the Police Authority indicate any types of savings which they should have indicated. I mean, if you are talking about efficiency in the answer, efficiency means savings. What were they or weren't there any efficiencies after all?"

**Mr Rhodes replied as follows:**

"The point is that the savings for these will accrue from the joint work with our four neighbouring authorities and forces and they will emerge as these projects develop. I haven't got any detailed figures, but they will emerge and I am very happy to publicise those in due course."

**Mr Bown asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question 3:**

"The question, is when will the Police Authority take a view?"

**Mr Rhodes replied as follows:**

Mr Bown asks me to look into the future. What I can tell him is that the Authority will be discussing the matter tomorrow, at an informal session, and at a subsequent meeting no doubt we shall take a view."

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

- "1. The Local Transport Today Journal dated 6th-19th December 2007 reported that the East Midlands Regional Assembly had been told to re-write the Region's Draft Transport strategy. The target for zero traffic growth by the end of the planned period 2026 is unrealistic. Were any members of the County Council part of this decision process which arrived at this unrealistic forecast?
2. If any members were involved could they explain the reason that enabled them to make this amazing calculation?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. The Regional Transport Strategy was agreed by the Joint Housing, Planning and Transport Board of the Regional Assembly in September 2006, at which there were no Leicestershire members present. It was then approved as a basis for public consultation by the Assembly at a meeting on the same day, with cross-party support including members of this Authority.
2. The County Council was consulted on the Regional Transport Strategy, which forms part of the draft East Midlands Regional Plan. The Report of the Chief Executive in response to the consultation was considered by the Scrutiny Commission on 14 December 2006 and by Cabinet on 19 December 2006.

Para 84 of the Chief Executive's report responds thus to the target of zero traffic growth:

"Whilst a laudable aspiration, traffic has been growing at about 2% for many years and there is no evidence in the RTS to demonstrate how zero growth will be achieved. Traffic growth is linked very closely to economic growth and this is expected to be substantial in the East Midlands through to 2026, particularly given the level of housing proposed. Much of the traffic growth occurs outside the peak congested periods and the current TIF proposals are focused primarily on road congestion charging, as opposed to general traffic reduction. In this respect, the RTS needs to be clearer in the focus to be attached to tackling congestion, and the much wider measures needed to tackle the more general growth in traffic and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions." "

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

"I understand that Tarmac Ltd will be responsible for the cutting of grass verges. Can the Leader name the sub-contractor who will carry out the work and confirm when the first cuts will take place?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"Tarmac's sub-contractor for the cutting of grass verges will be County Grass Cutting Services (Midlands) Limited. Subject to weather conditions, the intention is to start the grass cutting operation during week commencing 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2008."

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

"Is Mr Rushton aware that this company was advertising recently in the Leicester Mercury for operators? Is he still confident that the work will start on time as stated in his reply?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"We have looked into County Grass Cutting Services (Midlands) Limited. They are a highly reputable firm. I have got every confidence that they will start on time and actually they will do a far superior job to the previous people because they are going to buy lots and lots of new equipment. So yes, I am completely confident in them."

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

- "1. On 24 January 2008, the Chair of Environment Scrutiny Committee told members that Borough officers were providing information to County officers regarding the County's responsibility for grounds maintenance on specific sites across Loughborough and although this list was not complete, enquiries regarding specific individual locations will be replied to by County officers as quickly as possible. Is the list of the areas, within Loughborough, covered by Highways environmental maintenance which I requested on 24 January now available?
2. If so could the Leader send me a copy without delay?
3. Could the Leader assure Council that when the full list is available, the County's responsibilities will be met in full, inclusive of floral displays previously admired in the town?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. & 2. A copy of the current grass cutting schedule will be provided for Mr Hunt this week. This is the operational information for undertaking the grass cutting and so does not detail precise boundaries. These, and any anomalies or omissions, may of course be confirmed by enquiry for specific locations.



3. I can assure Members that the County Council will meet its local highway authority responsibilities in full for the maintenance of highway verges. In addition, planting has already been completed along Epinal Way, funded and maintained by the County Council, with several other areas in the town planned to be planted over the next few weeks. All of the roundabouts along Epinal Way have been sponsored and planted, and the sponsorship scheme continues to be promoted to include other roundabouts within the town".

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

- "1. Is the Leader aware of the recent research published by Napier and Loughborough University (Rye, Young, and Prof Stephen Ison) highlighting some of the inadequacies of Workplace Travel Plans?
2. Could the Leader provide a list of Workplace Travel Plans known to the County Council which are the result of planning conditions or planning obligations, rather than voluntarily?
3. Which of those is the County Council involved in monitoring or actively overseeing in conjunction with our District colleagues?
4. In which cases has enforcement taken place over the last three years?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

- "1. We are aware of the research and in fact County Council staff contributed to the survey in January 2006 which was part of an MSc course project.
2. We can provide a list of planning applications where we have requested that the Local Planning Authority impose a condition requiring a Workplace Travel Plan (WTP). (There have been 172 since August 2004). We would, however, need to contact our District colleagues to identify those planning applications that were actually approved with a requirement for a WTP.
3. We assist our District colleagues where required to monitor and oversee WTPs subject to resources.
4. We are not aware of any enforcement taking place over the last three years, but this would be a matter for the District Councils as responsible authority for planning enforcement."

**(O) Dr Hill asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

- "1. How many active Community Associations exist alongside schools in the County today?
2. How many schools have been built in the County where Community contributions were used to fund Community/school facilities?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

- "1. The County Council does not keep this information. Community Associations are independent organisations and not the responsibility of the County Council.
2. This is not entirely clear. There were a total of 54 community designated schools and of these approximately 10 may have been developed with funding from the local community."

**(P) Ms Newton asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

"Residents of Haydon Road, Loughborough are suffering from students and others excessively using the road as a convenient and free car park. This is causing concern to residents, especially the elderly, as well as access problems for emergency services. Will the Leader inform me when residential parking will become available for Haydon Road?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"The County Council's Highway Forum for Charnwood receives a report at every meeting detailing current progress on Traffic Regulation Orders, including those related to Residents Parking schemes. As Members are aware, the legal and consultation process required to progress each individual scheme typically takes almost 2 years to ensure the arrangements implemented are acceptable to the local community directly affected. It is important, therefore, to establish priorities clearly and that Residents Parking provides the most appropriate solution for each site. In recognising this, a Member Group is meeting regularly to consider the specific parking concerns in Loughborough and is expected to report to the next meeting of the Highways Forum. I shall ask that the report includes Haydon Road."

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

- "1. Would the Leader or his nominee give a copy of the section of the Joint Area Review titled 'Main Findings' to all members of the County Council, including the grades awarded?
2. Would he explain what the priorities for the Service are over the next 12 months?
3. How will he ensure that all frontline staff and partners, who have delivered such commitment and professionalism are enabled to celebrate the outcome?
4. Can he advise how the Joint Area Review Inspection Report published yesterday differs from the written submission made by the Labour Group to the CPA Team and to which reference was made at the last County Council meeting and, since I am sure that it does, how can he reconcile these conflicting views?
5. Would the Leader or his nominee give a copy of the section of the Youth Inspection Report titled 'Main Findings' section of the Youth

Inspection Report, to all members of the County Council, including the grades awarded.

6. How will he further develop the identified strengths, and what is he proposing to do to address the identified areas for development?
7. How will he ensure that all frontline staff and partners, who have delivered such professionalism and commitment to enable the Youth Service to be assessed as good and outstanding, are enabled to celebrate their success?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

- "1. I would be delighted to ask the Director of the Children and Young People's Service to circulate a copy of the 'Main Findings' of the Joint Area Review including the grades awarded. I would ask members to note that the inspectors judged every aspect of the Children and Young People's Service to be 'good' and service management and the capacity to improve to be 'outstanding'.
2. The priorities for the Service were laid before the full County Council at our meeting on 26 September 2007 when the Children & Young People's Plan 2006-2009 was approved. Raising pupil attainment, particularly at GCSE, sustaining our outstanding performance around safeguarding and ensuring the best outcomes for Children in Public Care are some of the key priorities for 2008/9. It is worth noting that the Joint Area Review and Annual Performance Assessment both endorse the priorities we put forward in the Children and Young People's Plan.
3. Every member of staff and every partnership Group have received a note from the Lead Member personally thanking them for their contribution to the excellent work of the Service. In addition County Council staff have been invited to two celebration conferences to be held on 28 February and 12 March.
4. The Joint Area Review Inspection Report has significant differences from the written submission made by the Labour Group to the CPA Team. For example the Service was described as being in 'turmoil' in the submission made by Dr O'Callaghan in the name of his Group and with the clear implication that the Director was responsible. In contrast, the professional judgement of OfSTED is that the management of the Service is outstanding. One can only draw the conclusion that either Dr O'Callaghan's or the Labour Group's judgements are fundamentally flawed or that he and they were trying to undermine both the Director and the priorities of the Administration to improve educational attainment and the quality of our schools.
5. I would be delighted to ask the Director of Children and Young People's Service to circulate a copy of the 'Main Findings' of the Youth Inspection Report to all members of the County Council including the grades awarded. I would ask members to note that the inspectors judged every aspect of Leicestershire Youth Service to be 'good' and some aspects of the service to be 'outstanding'.

6. The Inspection strengths and weaknesses take the County Council and its partners towards the development of the Integrated Youth Offer. A multi-agency Programme Board has been established to move this work forward and the proposals from that Board will need to be agreed by the constituent partners by December 2008.
7. The Children and Young People's Service will be recognising the success of its staff through a series of events - the Youth Service will feature highly in these events. Additionally, the Youth Service will recognise its own staff through local celebrations."

**Mr Snartt asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question 4:**

"I just wanted to test my understanding about this after the good results we had, when I see words like 'turmoil' and 'undermine'. Is the Labour Group out of touch in what they gave to the CPA people?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

"I can't comment on whether the Labour Group are in touch or out of touch, but the scores show clearly how wrong they were in their prediction."

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

- "1. In view of the outstanding CPA score awarded to the County Council, will the Leader please take this opportunity to put formally on record the County Council's recognition and appreciation of the commitment and professionalism of our staff in bringing about this achievement?
2. Will the Leader also please confirm that appropriate thanks are extended to the County Council's partners for their support in the recent Corporate Assessment and Joint Area Review of children's services?
3. Given the County Council is judged to be "improving strongly" by the Audit Commission, can the Leader explain why the Labour Group have stated that 'currently this is not an improving Council' ?"

**Mr Parsons replied as follows:**

- "1. I am delighted to have the recognition and appreciation of the Council recorded in the minutes of this meeting. I have already conveyed my personal thanks to all members of staff but I will make sure they are also aware of the Council's tribute. It is important to remember that the CPA 4 star rating and the assessment that the Council is "improving strongly" have taken into account all aspects of the Council's work and cover all our services. Every member of staff has the right to feel justifiably proud of what has been achieved.
2. This is something that is already underway. I am particularly grateful to partners who have recognised that the introduction of the new Comprehensive Area Assessment (the CAA) from 2009 needs a greater

emphasis on partnership working, both in terms of service improvement and efficiency savings.

The Lead Member for Children and Young People's Service is referring to the Joint Area Review in his answer to a separate question.

3. This Labour Group submission to the CPA team, apparently written by Dr O'Callaghan, is an extraordinary document. Not only does it say the Council is not improving, it also claims that the Council is "complacent and just coasting" and, for example, criticises us for "prevarication and the inability to take decisions" and for "lack of innovation". Furthermore, it contains wholly unjustified criticism of chief officers. Perhaps the only thing it gets right is to say that "the political leadership is astute".

Evidently the Audit Commission and OFSTED – and, indeed, every other Inspectorate – do not agree with Dr O'Callaghan and his Group in their opinion of the Council's services, management and rate of improvement. As to why Dr O'Callaghan made the submission, I find it hard to explain since I recall him saying at a member seminar that he wanted to help in retaining 4 stars and he then e-mailed all members at the end of the inspection to congratulate the officers on a 4 star performance. It is the staff who must feel most let down by Dr O'Callaghan and his Group."

**Dr Feltham asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question 3:**

"Is the Leader able to clarify or perhaps make a comment about how the comments that seem to be made by Dr O'Callaghan in private differ so much now from those made in public. The ones in private are quite clearly deliberately misleading and are bringing this Council into complete disrepute and are duplicitous."

**Mr Parsons replied as follows:**

"I would simply say that Dr O'Callaghan talks of prevarication and lack of innovation. This Authority has been given 'four stars' for, I think, the third year running. Dr O'Callaghan says that this is not an improving Council and we have been given 'improving strongly' which applies to 13 Councils out of 150 in the Country. All I say is that it is a jolly good job that the powers that be and the people that matter don't listen to Dr O'Callaghan."

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

- "1. Would the Leader inform the Council how much was received for the Dedicated Schools Grant this year, how much for the 'Schools Budget' and how much for the Individual Schools Budget?
2. How much is expected for next year for each of these headings?
3. Would the Leader explain what these terms mean and the difference between them?

4. For the first two could the Leader give a rough breakdown of what the money is spent on?
5. Would the Leader list the bottom ten authorities in terms of the DSG?
6. Would the Leader list the bottom ten authorities in terms of the Individual Schools Budget?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

- "1. Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG) is expected to be £324.992m for 2008/09. As DSG is paid on a per pupil basis this figure is provisional and will not be confirmed by the Department for Children, Schools and Families until May 2008.

For 2008/09 the Individual Schools Budget is £291.989m, and for centrally funded items is £33.003m.

2. The level of DSG and then the Schools Budget will be determined by pupil numbers in January 2009 and January 2010. The projected pupil numbers are currently being collated and until this exercise is completed it is not possible to give values.
3. DSG is paid to meet the cost of the Schools Budget. The Schools Budget in turn is split between the Individual Schools Budget, which are the budgets delegated to schools, and centrally managed schools expenditure in accordance with the School Finance (England) Regulations.
4. The Individual Schools Budget is delegated to the governing body of each individual school who determine how that is used.

The centrally retained elements of the Schools Budget meet costs such as special educational needs, nursery education funding, the Pupil Referral Unit and other activities as determined by the School Finance (England) Regulations.

5. The bottom ten authorities for 2007/08 are:

Authority	£ per pupil
Solihull	3,556.48
Wiltshire	3,553.70
Worcestershire	3,552.58
Northumberland	3,552.17
Devon	3,551.33
Shropshire	3,550.86
East Riding of Yorkshire	3,534.93
Herefordshire	3,522.64
South Gloucestershire	3,489.30
Leicestershire	3,429.21

The bottom 10 funded authorities for 2008/09 are:

Authority	£ per pupil
Worcestershire	3,728.79
Poole	3,724.44
East Riding of Yorkshire	3,715.47
Shropshire	3,714.50
Wiltshire	3,713.26
Northumberland	3,711.26
Devon	3,707.09
Herefordshire	3,686.51
South Gloucestershire	3,646.62
Leicestershire	3,595.88

6. Data on the average Individual Schools Budget per pupil for 2008/09 will not be available until late summer. For 2007/08 the bottom 10 authorities are:

Authority	£ per pupil
Bath & North East Somerset	3,209
Solihull	3,207
Leicestershire	3,206
South Gloucestershire	3,199
North Lincolnshire	3,182
Herefordshire	3,178
Wiltshire	3,176
Swindon	3,155
Shropshire	3,153
Somerset	3,153

For many authorities the two elements of the schools budget do not equal DSG because of the effect of carry forwards between years.

I would like to thank Dr O'Callaghan for highlighting the fact that Leicestershire receives the lowest level of Government funding for schools and this situation will continue for the next three years. It is encouraging to note that local decisions on delegation of budgets help to ameliorate some of the effects of the lowest DSG funding. I hope he will continue to take every opportunity to keep the unpalatable fact of our lowest DSG funding in the public eye."

- (T) Dr O'Callaghan asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

"Would the Leader list all those areas in the County with a history of flooding and the nature of the risk posed eg dwellings, businesses etc?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"It would neither be practical nor sensible to list out every area of the county that has at some point experienced flooding as flooding can be caused by something as basic as a blocked road gully or as significant as a river overtopping its banks. Ultimately, the Environment Agency has a "duty to exercise a general supervision over all matters related to flood defence" and further details can be found at <http://www.environment-agency.gov.uk/> .

Under the section called "Find out what happened near you", there is no reference to any incident in Leicestershire in 2007 so clearly greater risk lies elsewhere in the country.

In considering planning applications, the County Council takes flooding into consideration in accordance with PPG25 and further details on this can be found at [http://website/ppg25\\_development\\_and\\_flood\\_risk\\_2001.pdf](http://website/ppg25_development_and_flood_risk_2001.pdf) .

Given the variability and unpredictability of flooding, reference to the flood maps section of the Environment Agency website helps anyone identify the risk of flooding anywhere in the country."

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

"Would the Leader indicate the total sum that the Catholic community contributed in the last financial year to the building and maintenance of Catholic schools in Leicestershire?"

**Mr Ould replied as follows:**

"During 2007/8 building and maintenance work to Catholic Schools in Leicestershire was funded from a number of sources.

- Locally Co-ordinated Voluntary Aided Programme allocation of £647,006 was used to fund capital improvements.
- A total Devolved Formula Capital allocation of £670,635 was used to fund capital and maintenance work.

These sources of funding are provided by the Department for Children, Schools and Families and managed by the Diocese in liaison with them. The Catholic community is required to fund 10% of the cost of any work undertaken.

In addition the schools have an allocation for maintenance work within their revenue budget, the figure allocated for this purpose is determined by the schools governing body.

The local authority cannot answer this question more fully as it does not hold the information."



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

"The Pitt Report into the summer 2007 flooding said " - that preparations and warnings for surface water flooding were not in place." Can the Leader assure me that drainage ditches, dykes and other means of drainage on County Schools property will be regularly maintained, so that in instances of flooding they are capable of draining surface water?"

**Mr Rushton replied as follows:**

"Current drainage ditches, dykes and other means of drainage on school sites are designed to cope with assumed rainfall/precipitation regimes and ground conditions. The responsibility for ensuring that they are regularly maintained rests with individual school governing bodies and is met from delegated revenue budgets. In some cases, the Authority has undertaken to maintain drainage courses immediately outside of a school boundary where a number of school sites drain into the same watercourse. For example, in the case of the Agar Brook in Mr Stanley's constituency, this is inspected twice a year by officers to minimise the risk of flooding. Where incidents of excessive flood water have occurred, they have been resolved by the County Council working in partnership with school governing bodies."

**136. BUDGET REPORT OF THE CABINET:-****(A) MEDIUM TERM FINANCIAL STRATEGY.**

It was moved by Mr Parsons and seconded by Mr Page:

- "(a) That subject to the items below, approval be given to the MTFS which incorporates the recommended revenue budget for 2008/09 totalling £313,756,610, as set out in Appendix A to the report and includes the growth and savings for that year as set out in Appendix D thereto;
- (b) That approval be given to the projected revenue budgets for 2009/10 and 2010/11, set out in Appendix B to the report, including the growth and savings for those years as set out in Appendix D thereto and to the undertaking of such preliminary work, including consultation, as may be necessary towards achieving the savings specified for those years;
- (c) That the level of reserves as set out in Appendix K to the report be noted;
- (d) That the amounts of the County Council's Council Tax for each band of dwelling and the precept payable by each billing authority for 2008/09 be as set out in Appendix M to the report;
- (e) That the Chief Executive be authorised to issue the necessary precepts to billing authorities in accordance with the budget requirement above and the tax base notified by the District Councils, and to take any other action which may be necessary to give effect to the precepts;

- (f) That approval be given to the 2008/09 capital programme as set out in Appendix F to the report;
- (g) That approval be given for planning and design purposes for the 2009/10 and 2010/11 capital programmes as set out in Appendix F to the report subject to arrangements within the Financial Procedure Rules and Standard Financial Instructions to allow commencement before the planned programme year or the adoption of substitute schemes;
- (h) That the financial indicators required under the Prudential Code set out in Appendix G to the report be noted and that the following limits be approved:-

	<u>2008/09</u>	<u>2009/10</u>	<u>2010/11</u>
	<u>£m</u>	<u>£m</u>	<u>£m</u>
Authorised limit for external debt			
i) Borrowing	411.0	434.0	436.0
ii) Other long term liabilities	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.1</u>
TOTAL	<u>411.2</u>	<u>434.2</u>	<u>436.1</u>
Operational boundary for external debt			
i) Borrowing	391.0	414.0	415.0
ii) Other long term liabilities	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>0.1</u>
TOTAL	<u>391.2</u>	<u>414.1</u>	<u>415.1</u>

- (i) That the Director of Corporate Resources be given delegated authority to effect movement within the authorised limit for external debt between borrowing and other long term liabilities;
- (j) That the following borrowing limits be approved for the period 2008/09 to 2010/11:-
  - (i) Upper limit on fixed interest exposures 100%
  - (ii) Upper limit on variable rate exposures 35%
  - (iii) Maturity of borrowing

	<u>Upper Limit</u>	<u>Lower Limit</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Under 12 months	30	0
12 months and within 24 months	30	0
24 months and within 5 years	50	0
5 years and within 10 years	70	0
18 years and above	100	25

- (k) That the Director of Corporate Resources be authorised to enter into such loans or undertake such arrangements as necessary to finance capital payments in 2008/09, subject to the above prudential limits;
- (l) That the Capital Strategy, Risk Management Strategy, Reserves Policy, Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategy and Environment Strategy set out respectively in Appendices H, I, J, N and O to the report be approved."

An amendment was moved by Mr Boulter and seconded by Mr Rushton:

"(i) That paragraph (a) of the motion be amended to read as follows:-

'(a) That subject to the items below, approval be given to the MTFs which incorporates the recommended revenue budget for 2008/09 totalling £313,756,610, as set out in Appendix A to the report and includes the growth and savings for that year as set out in Appendix D thereto; as amended by paragraph (a)(i) below;'

(ii) That the following be inserted immediately after paragraph (a) of the motion:

'(a)(i) That the list of growth and savings proposals set out in Appendix D to the report be amended by the addition of the following growth item, the costs to be met from the underspending in the current year and reserves.

### Highways and Transport

	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
	£000	£000	£000
Improvements/remedial works to highway drainage systems throughout Leicestershire directed to increase the capacity of systems and alleviate the risk of flooding, priority areas for spending to be determined through a report by the Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management but with an understanding that works will commence as soon as possible.'	250	250	-

(iii) That paragraph (b) of the motion be amended to read as follows:-

'(b) That approval be given to the projected revenue budgets for 2009/10 and 2010/11, set out in Appendix B to the report, including the growth and savings for those years as set out in Appendix D thereto, as now amended, and to the undertaking of such preliminary work, including consultation, as may be necessary towards achieving the savings specified for those years;' "

The amendment was put and carried, unanimously.

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

"(i) That paragraph (a) of the motion be amended to read as follows:-

'(a) That subject to the items below, approval be given to the MTFS which incorporates the recommended revenue budget for 2008/09 totalling £313,756,610, as set out in Appendix A to the report and includes the growth and savings for that year as set out in Appendix D thereto; as amended by paragraph (a)(ii) below;'

(ii) That the following be inserted immediately after paragraph (a)(i) of the motion:

'(a)(ii) That the list of growth and savings proposals set out in Appendix D to the report be amended by the addition of the following growth item, the costs to be met from a reduction from that part of the Chief Executive's revenue budget relating to public relations:-

Children and Young People's Service

	<b>2008/09</b>	<b>2009/10</b>	<b>2010/11</b>
	£000	£000	£000
Reinstatement of saving approved in 2007 relating to denominational home to school transport.'	250	250	250

(iii) That paragraph (b) of the motion be amended to read as follows:-

- '(b) That approval be given to the projected revenue budgets for 2009/10 and 2010/11, set out in Appendix B to the report, including the growth and savings for those years as set out in Appendix D thereto, as now amended, and to the undertaking of such preliminary work, including consultation, as may be necessary towards achieving the savings specified for those years;' "

The amendment was put and not carried, 14 members voting for the motion and 31 against.

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

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

- '(m) That whilst of the view that more money would be welcome, this Council welcomes the additional funding for Leicestershire schools which has been made available by the Government over the next three years.' "

The amendment was put and not carried, 11 members voting for the motion and 29 against.

An amendment was moved by Mr Hunt and seconded by Mr Bown:

"(i) That paragraph (a) of the motion be amended to read as follows:-

- '(a) That subject to the items below, approval be given to the MTFS which incorporates the recommended revenue budget for 2008/09 totalling £313,756,610, as set out in Appendix A to the report and includes the growth and savings for that year as set out in Appendix D thereto; as amended by paragraph (a)(ii) below;'

(ii) That the following be inserted immediately after paragraph (a)(i) of the motion:

- '(a)(ii) That the list of growth and savings proposals set out in Appendix D to the report be amended by the addition of the following growth item, the costs to be met by a withdrawal from balances:-

### Community Services

	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
	£000	£000	£000
Support for Young Leicestershire Athletes.'	15	15	-

(iii) That paragraph (b) of the motion be amended to read as follows:-

- '(b) That approval be given to the projected revenue budgets for 2009/10 and 2010/11, set out in Appendix B to the report, including the growth and savings for those years as set out in Appendix D thereto, as now amended, and to the undertaking of such preliminary work, including consultation, as may be necessary towards achieving the savings specified for those years;' "

In the light of comments by Mr White, the mover of the motion with the concurrence of the seconder and the consent of the Council altered the motion by the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (a)(ii):

"noting that this figure would be in addition to an ongoing budget of £55,000 established by the Administration to support talented children and young people with national and international sporting ambitions and that grant applications are subject to agreed criteria."

The amendment, as altered, was put and carried unanimously.

An amendment moved by Mr Wright and seconded by Mr Wilson:

"That the following be added at the end of the motion.

- '(m) That an additional discretionary fund of £30,000 be established, met from Area Based Grant, to be potentially available to all pupils from low income families regardless of faith, in respect of free travel for children showing signs of disaffection and likely not to find employment or training post 16 and that the fund be administered by the Schools (Funding) Forum advised by Connexions.' "

The amendment was put and carried unanimously.

The substantive motion, as set out below, was put and carried, 31 members voting for the motion and 12 against.

- "(a) That subject to the items below, approval be given to the MTFS which incorporates the recommended revenue budget for 2008/09 totalling £313,756,610, as set out in Appendix A to the report and includes the growth and savings for that year as set out in Appendix D thereto; as amended by paragraph (a)(i) and (a)(ii) below;

- (a)(i) That the list of growth and savings proposals set out in Appendix D to the report be amended by the addition of the following growth item, the costs to be met from the underspending in the current year and reserves:-

Highways and Transport

	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
	£000	£000	£000
Improvements/remedial works to highway drainage systems throughout Leicestershire directed to increase the capacity of systems and alleviate the risk of flooding, priority areas for spending to be determined through a report by the Director of Highways, Transportation and Waste Management but with an understanding that works will commence as soon as possible.'	250	250	-

- (a)(ii) That the list of growth and savings proposals set out in Appendix D to the report be amended by the addition of the following growth item, the costs to be met by a withdrawal from balances:-

Community Services

	2008/09	2009/10	2010/11
	£000	£000	£000
Support for Young Leicestershire Athletes noting that this figure would be in addition to an ongoing budget of £55,000 established by the Administration to support talented children and young people with national and international sporting ambitions and that grant applications are subject to agreed criteria.	15	15	-

- (b) That approval be given to the projected revenue budgets for 2009/10 and 2010/11, set out in Appendix B to the report, including the growth and savings for those years as set out in Appendix D thereto, as now amended, and to the undertaking of such preliminary work, including consultation, as may be necessary towards achieving the savings specified for those years;
- (c) That the level of reserves as set out in Appendix K to the report be noted;
- (d) That the amounts of the County Council's Council Tax for each band of dwelling and the precept payable by each billing authority for 2008/09 be as set out in Appendix M to the report;
- (e) That the Chief Executive be authorised to issue the necessary precepts to billing authorities in accordance with the budget requirement above and the tax base notified by the District Councils, and to take any other action which may be necessary to give effect to the precepts;
- (f) That approval be given to the 2008/09 capital programme as set out in Appendix F to the report;
- (g) That approval be given for planning and design purposes for the 2009/10 and 2010/11 capital programmes as set out in Appendix F to the report subject to arrangements within the Financial Procedure Rules and Standard Financial Instructions to allow commencement before the planned programme year or the adoption of substitute schemes;
- (h) That the financial indicators required under the Prudential Code set out in Appendix G to the report be noted and that the following limits be approved:-

	<u>2008/09</u> <u>£m</u>	<u>2009/10</u> <u>£m</u>	<u>2010/11</u> <u>£m</u>
Authorised limit for external debt			
i) Borrowing	411.0	434.0	436.0
ii) Other long term liabilities	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.1</u>
TOTAL	<u>411.2</u>	<u>434.2</u>	<u>436.1</u>
Operational boundary for external debt			
i) Borrowing	391.0	414.0	415.0
ii) Other long term liabilities	<u>0.2</u>	<u>0.1</u>	<u>0.1</u>
TOTAL	<u>391.2</u>	<u>414.1</u>	<u>415.1</u>



- (i) That the Director of Corporate Resources be given delegated authority to effect movement within the authorised limit for external debt between borrowing and other long term liabilities;
- (j) That the following borrowing limits be approved for the period 2008/09 to 2010/11:-
  - (i) Upper limit on fixed interest exposures 100%
  - (ii) Upper limit on variable rate exposures 35%
  - (iii) Maturity of borrowing

	<u>Upper Limit</u>	<u>Lower Limit</u>
	<u>%</u>	<u>%</u>
Under 12 months	30	0
12 months and within 24 months	30	0
24 months and within 5 years	50	0
5 years and within 10 years	70	0
18 years and above	100	25

- (k) That the Director of Corporate Resources be authorised to enter into such loans or undertake such arrangements as necessary to finance capital payments in 2008/09, subject to the above prudential limits;
- (l) That the Capital Strategy, Risk Management Strategy, Reserves Policy, Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategy and Environment Strategy set out respectively in Appendices H, I, J, N and O to the report be approved.
- (m) That an additional discretionary fund of £30,000 be established, met from Area Based Grant, to be potentially available to all pupils from low income families regardless of faith, in respect of free travel for children showing signs of disaffection and likely not to find employment or training post 16 and that the fund be administered by the Schools (Funding) Forum advised by Connexions."

### **137. NOTICE OF MOTION:-**

#### **(A) FLOODING - DR. M. O'CALLAGHAN**

It was moved by Dr O'Callaghan and seconded by Mr Sheahan:

- "(a) That this Council notes:-

- (i) that it has recognised the importance of the environment and climate change in previous debates on these matters;
  - (ii) the Climate Change agenda is likely to force the Council to change its priorities and allocation of resources;
  - (iii) that whilst flooding has always been an issue in localised areas, the perception is that flooding is becoming both more severe and more widespread.
- (b) That the Council recognises:-
- (i) the progress made by the County Council and others to tackle flooding in the County since the Easter 1998 floods and the publication of the Bye Report;
  - (ii) that more needs to be done in the County on flood prevention and alleviation;
  - (iii) that this is best done in partnership within the County involving districts and other agencies;
  - (iv) that solutions have to be cost effective;
- (c) That the Council requests the Cabinet to take steps to ensure that:-
- (i) the County Council not only plays its full part in flood prevention through its work with drains, gullies, bridges and highways work, but takes a leadership role in a campaign on flooding within the County including, if necessary, taking powers under the 1991 Land Drainage Act;
  - (ii) a multi-agency 'Leicestershire Flood Task Force' of limited duration is established comprising the County Council, relevant district councils, the Environment Agency, Severn Trent, the Council's representative on the Regional Flood Defence Committee and others to be chaired by a cabinet member with County Council members drawn from councillors whose areas have been affected by flooding;
  - (iii) the Task Force produces a map of flooding incidents in the County and draws up a prioritised list with actions and timescales for each area, the priorities depending in part on the number of dwellings, businesses, public buildings and others that have been flooded or are at risk;
  - (iv) the Task Force assigns responsibilities for these actions between the relevant members of the Task Force and

where appropriate members support each other in bidding for funding to resolve these issues;

- (v) Riparian land owners are reminded of their responsibilities;
- (vi) In pursuing plans for housing and other development, risk from flooding will be an important factor in assessing suitability for development and that Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) including for example porous pavement technology are included in such plans to ensure they are as near 'water neutral' as is possible."

An amendment was moved by Mr Parsons and seconded by Mr Rushton:

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

- "(a) That a time-limited response, as proposed in the motion proposed by Dr O'Callaghan, is unlikely to have any meaningful or worthwhile impact;
- (b) That in contrast, effective management of flooding and attendant risks can only be achieved through a strategic and co-ordinated approach in line with existing structures at sub-regional and regional levels, on which the County Council and its partners are already represented;
- (c) That, accordingly and in order to assist the ongoing development of such an approach, the report to Cabinet which will identify priorities for immediate expenditure on improvements to highways drainage systems also address the relevant responsibilities of local authorities and public sector agencies; the role of the Local and Regional Resilience Forums in respect of flooding; issues already identified for remedial action and improvement; and the outcomes of the Pitt Report commissioned by the Government following the summer floods of 2006." '

Arising from comments by Mrs Sherwin, the Leader undertook to have regard to the work of the Scrutiny Review Panel on the County Council's Environment Policy and Programmes in taking this matter forward.

The amendment was put and carried, 31 members voting for the motion and 11 against.

The substantive motion was put and carried.