

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE LEICESTERSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL HELD  
AT COUNTY HALL, GLENFIELD ON WEDNESDAY, 26 MARCH 2003.**

**Present**

Mrs. A. C. M. Pullen CC (in the Chair)

Mr. H. Barber CC, Mr. D. C. Bill CC, Mrs. V. P. Bill CC, Mr. P. D. Boulton TD, CC, Mr. G. A. Boulton CC, Mr. D. R. Bown CC, Mr. N. J. Brown CC, Mrs. R. Cammille CC, Mr. B. Chapman AE, 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. P. A. Hyde CC, Mr. R. Jenkins CC, Mr. D. Jennings CC, Mr. Mike Jones CC, Mr. A. M. Kershaw CC, Mr. D. J. Knaggs CC, Mr. O. D. Lucas CC, Mr. C. H. G. MacLeod CC, Mr. R. Mason CC, Mr. R. Miller CC, Dr. M. O'Callaghan CC, Mr. P. C. Osborne CC, Mr. I. D. Ould CC, Mr. M. B. Page CC, Mr. E. Palmer CC, Mr. D. R. Parsons CC, Mrs. L. A. S. Pendleton CC, Mr. G. H. Perkins JP, CC, Dr. D. Pollard CC, Prof. M. E. Preston CC, Mr. J. B. Rhodes CC, Mr. J. W. Royce CC, Mr. N. J. Rushton CC, Mr. S. D. Sheahan CC, Mrs. M. L. Sherwin CC, Mrs. A. U. Smith JP, CC, Mr. D. A. Sprason CC, Mr. C. A. Stanley CC, Mr. E. F. White CC, Mr. R. M. Wilson CC and Mr. P. G. Winkless CC.

**97 -CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

Mr. C.J. Payne BEM

The Chairman referred to the sad death of former County Councillor, Mr. Cecil James Payne BEM who had died on 7 March. He had been elected to the new Leicestershire County Council in April 1973 and served, representing the Melton Mowbray (South) Electoral Division, until May 1989. He had served mainly on the Education and Environment Committees and their Subcommittees.

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

Health and Safety Award

The Chairman reported with pleasure that the County Council had been the Regional Winner in the European Week of Health and Safety 2002 organised by the Health and Safety Executive. The award certificate had been displayed in the Members' Lounge. She felt sure that members would wish to join her in conveying congratulations to everyone involved with this success.

Newcroft Primary School

The Chairman announced that Newcroft Primary School in Shepshed had been named in the Annual Report of Her Majesty's Chief Inspector as being a "particularly successful school". This meant that it had received an outstanding inspection report and had performed well in tests. The Chairman felt sure that members would wish to join her in congratulating the staff, governors and the pupils on their performance and on the contribution that the school made to the quality of the education service in the County.

Visitors

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

## **98 -MINUTES.**

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

“That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 19 February 2003 copies of which have been circulated to members, be taken as read, confirmed and signed.”

## **99 -DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS.**

The Chairman invited members who wished to do so to make declarations of personal interests in respect of items on the agenda for this meeting.

The following declarations were made:-

<b><u>Member</u></b>	<b><u>Minute No(s)</u></b>	<b><u>Interest</u></b>
Mrs Pullen	102(C)	Personal non-prejudicial
Mr Jennings	102(C)	“
Mr Parsons	102(C)	“
Mr Garner	102(C)	“
Mr White	102(C)	“

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

**(A) Mr Perkins asked the following question of the Spokesman of the Police Authority:**

- “1. Could the Spokesman of the Police Authority please indicate how many of the positions of Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Police Authority and its Committees are held by members in the following categories of membership:-  
  
     Elected Members?  
     Magistrate Members?  
     Independent Members?
2. If such positions were allocated in proportion to the size of each of these groups on the Authority as a whole what would be the position?”

Mr Bill replied as follows:

- “1. The answer to question 1 can be gleaned from the Police Authority website. The Police Act 1996 requires that 9 are elected members, 5 are independent and 3 are magistrates. It is for the Police Authority as a whole to elect its Chairman and Vice Chairman by simple majority. Currently the Police Authority has decided to appoint as its Chairman a person who is an independent member and as its Vice Chairman a person who is a magistrate member.

It is for the Police Authority as a whole, by simple majority, to choose its committees and decide which members sit on such committees. It is for each committee, by simple majority, to elect its own Chairman for that committee. There is no Vice-Chairman position for any of the Authority's committees or working parties.

- the Best Value Committee has elected as its Chairman a person who is a magistrate member
- the Community Consultation Committee has elected as its Chairman a person who is an elected member
- the Complaints and Discipline Committee has elected as its Chairman a person who is an independent member
- the Corporate Planning and Audit Committee has elected as its Chairman a person who is an independent member
- the Personnel Committee has elected as its Chairman a person who is an elected member.

The Standards Committee is slightly different as statutory rules require that a lay member be appointed to it. In this Authority's case the lay member has been elected as Chairman of the Standards Committee.

The Authority also has 4 working parties (Diversity, Information Management, Audit Panel and Property). 2 of these are chaired by elected members, and 2 by independent members.

2. Assuming there are 7 positions – (5 main committees and Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Authority).

Elected 4	Independent 2	Magistrates 1
-----------	---------------	---------------

Assuming there are 11 positions (5 main committees, Chairman and Vice-Chairman of the Authority and 4 working parties).

Elected 6	Independent 3	Magistrates 2."
-----------	---------------	-----------------

Mr Perkins asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question no 1:

"Would the Spokesperson agree me that there is a serious imbalance in the appointments between the three categories of members?"

Mr Bill replied as follows:

"I could not have given a fuller answer than the one in front of you. You can see there it designates the description of the Chairman, Vice Chairman of the Police Authority and it gives the designation of the Chairman of the Best Value Committee, Community Consultation Committee, Complaints and Discipline Committee, the Corporate Planning and Audit Committee and the Personnel Committee. As far as those Committees are concerned you will see that two of them are headed up by elected members, two by independent members and one by a magistrate member. It is up to each committee on that Police Authority to decide its own chairman and that in fact is what has happened."

Mr Perkins asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question no 2:

"Would the Spokesperson agree with me that the elected members are not

prepared to question this imbalance?"

Mr Bill replied as follows:

"The Police Authority works as a team. People do not question where you come from. It is the contribution you can make to that Authority which is of benefit to everybody. I think, that the Police now face such a difficult job in this County, as elsewhere. There are so many calls on their time. There are so many calls on the limited resources. It is essential that we do work together as a team, not only on the Authority, but between the Authority and the Force. I think it is up to us, all of us, to speak with one voice and give full support to the difficult work now being undertaken in all names across the County of Leicestershire, Rutland and the City of Leicester."

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

"With regard to the District Audit report dated 30<sup>th</sup> April 2002, on Occupational Therapy Services in Leicestershire, and the recommendations in the action plan attached thereto, can the Leader or his nominee please advise:

- 1) What "clear target size for the waiting list" has now been set? (R1)
- 2) What "waiting time targets for each priority category" have been set? (R2)
- 3) Do "management information systems" now allow the accurate recording of referrals, assessments and waiting times by priority category? (R4).
- 4) What progress has been made toward bringing the "skill mix ratio" between Occupational Therapists and Community Care Workers closer to the 1:1 national ratio, and to use the resources released to fund support staff? (R7).
- 5) In respect of individuals, what progress has been made toward "increasing the current target of 6/7 assessments per month – building on the good practice examples within the county and nationally"? (R9).
- 6) What are the latest available figures, for Occupational Therapy waiting times and waiting lists in Leicestershire, for each district office area?"

Mr Miller replied as follows:

- "1. The target size for 2003/04 has been set at 160. This refers to priority two and three cases waiting in excess of one month for an assessment.
2. The waiting time target for 2003/04 for priority one (high risk, hospital discharge and terminal illness) cases is one week. For all other cases the target is one month.
3. The development of management information systems to provide the level of information regarding referrals, assessments and waiting times identified in the report is scheduled for completion during 2003/04.
4. The national skill mix ratio referred to in the report reflects the average position across local authorities. Locally the development of intermediate care and rehabilitation schemes will result in the need for additional occupational therapy resources, but this will be matched by an increase in Community Care Workers. The current restructuring in the Social Services Department is specifically addressing skill mix issues.

5. The target has now been revised to 8 per month, and current average performance across the County is 8.25 which represents a significant improvement.
6. The latest figures are as follows:

Coalville	46
Melton	32
Loughborough	54
Oadby/Wigston/Blaby	70
Hinckley	41
Market Harborough	<u>58</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b><u>301</u></b>

The average waiting time is in the region of 10-12 weeks, but high priority cases are responded to within one week."

Mr Jones asked the following supplementary question:

"Does the Leader's nominee agree that the improvements achieved since the time when non urgent cases had to wait up to six months for an assessment are most welcome. Further, is he able to clarify the answer to question 6 to indicate the average waiting times for each district office area, as requested?"

Mr Miller replied as follows:

"I thank Mr Jones for his comments and certainly agree with him that the situation has improved and I am sure he will agree with me that this is due to the quite intensive efforts made by both officers and staff to address what was quite a serious problem in the past. Before I answer his question, I would like to point out that part of this intensive work was actually to invite the District Audit to come and look at the situation and see how they could both assist and evaluate what the Department was already doing.

I had in fact picked up this morning that perhaps the response to question 6 doesn't really answer his question. I have made some enquiries this morning, and the difficulty is that waiting times do vary quite considerably, almost on a day to day basis because of the way the situation is now actively monitored. If he would like to talk to me later on I will actually endeavour to get officers to present him with information which more closely answers his question. I think I can see what he is trying to get at. To see if there is any geographical differences across the County. I presume this is what he is trying to get at and I will ask officers to look at the information they have and see if we can provide him with an answer to that question if that is acceptable to him."

**(C) Mrs Camamile asked the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

- "1. With regard to the decision taken by the Cabinet on 17 December, 2002, to dispose of The Cedars, Shilton Road, Barwell and to reinvest the proceeds in the Barwell area to provide improved community facilities and improvements to public access to services, could the Leader, or his nominee, please comment on whether the necessary procedures are progressing satisfactorily and, if not, indicate the cause of the delay?

2. When can the people of Barwell expect to see some direct benefit from the Cabinet's decision?
3. Will that benefit be substantially affected by any delays?"

Mr Ould replied as follows:

- "1. There has been a delay while Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council decided whether to surrender its lease on part of the site. The Borough Council has written to confirm by letter dated 10 March 2003 that it is prepared to surrender the lease in respect of the Lodge and the grounds to the Cedars. This matter is now being dealt with by the County Solicitor. Arrangements by the County Council to dispose of the site are proceeding.
2. A process has begun to consult local service providers about the type of services that could be provided in new/improved community facilities in the Barwell area. The Hinckley and Bosworth Local Strategic Partnership is involved in this process and local County and Borough Council members will be consulted. I hope that decisions on the location and type of facilities can be taken during the summer. The timing of their actual provision will depend on the availability of suitable premises and the extent of the building works required.
3. I have no evidence which suggests so."

Mrs Camamile asked the following supplementary questions:

- "1. Please could I have some clarification as to what you define as new or improved community facilities?
2. Which particular local service providers are being consulted and to what extent will the people of Barwell be consulted?
3. There is evidence to suggest that property prices are bottoming out or even reducing. Also, it is not a good thing for property to remain empty for long periods of time, as it will inevitably deteriorate and this would be reflected in the value should there be a prospective buyer who wishes to develop the building. Can I have comment on that please?"

Mr Ould replied as follows:

"The answer that I have given in part 2 is basically as it says we will be liaising with a number of community facility providers in the Barwell area to get the best possible deal for all of the people at Barwell, irrespective of their age. In particular, the Hinckley and Bosworth Local Strategic Partnership, where I represent the Cabinet, is actively involved in that. I have to thank David Bill, and I will thank David Bill for his prompt action in rectifying the delay in the surrender of the lease which had appeared to have been some sort of informal local agreement. People in the Barwell area will be asked clearly to approve the facilities that we want to put in. It would make a nonsense for us to make a design which was not accepted by local people. So there will be the usual consultative facilities that will take place and I will undertake to keep the County Councillor for that area

well informed as this develops over the forthcoming months.

Now in response to the last point about evidence, I have not any evidence at the moment, otherwise I would produce it. I have an opinion, which is not evidence, and I have read the newspapers which indicate that there is a 15% fall away in property prices in the south east which may be repeated here in the Midlands. Clearly any delay in selling a property can affect the income receipt and I have previously advised Council that the scale of facilities we can put in depends upon the size of the capital receipt we can gather at the sale of the property. I cannot give any more information than that at this point in time and I am pleased that the delay has now been sorted out."

**(D) Dr Pollard asked the following question of the Leader of his nominee:**

"As the Administration of the County Council is committed to moving ahead quickly to form a Health Scrutiny Committee once the final guidance has been received from the Department of Health, could the Leader list the NHS organisations and other organisations which have been approached specifically with respect to whether or not the County Council forms a Health Scrutiny Committee? Could the list identify which approaches were verbal and which were in writing?"

Mr Barber replied as follows:

"The matter of scrutiny of NHS bodies has been considered by the "Leicestershire Executive Group" (LEG) of Chief Officers of Social Services Departments and the respective NHS Trusts whose responsibilities cover all or part of Leicestershire, Leicester and Rutland, together with the Strategic Health Authority. Dr. Pollard has previously been advised of this information on more than one occasion. It is not a question of one organisation approaching another, by whatever means; it is a question of all the relevant organisations acting together in order to consider a way forward which is appropriate for all parties.

For the record, the Administration has not said that it "is committed to moving ahead quickly to form a Health Scrutiny Committee." It has been pointed out to Dr. Pollard, again on more than one occasion, that such a Committee already exists within the County Council, but that whether it might undertake the new power of scrutinising NHS bodies will require further consideration when Government guidance is finally received.

I regret that Dr. Pollard has taken the time of the Council to discover what has already been explained to him."

Dr Pollard asked the following supplementary question:

"With regard to the statement in the second paragraph, for the record the administration has not said that it is committed to moving ahead quickly to form a Health Scrutiny Committee. Does Mr Barber stand by or doesn't he stand by what he said in public on Radio Leicester in answer to a question by an interviewer which was the point of my question? When being asked about the guidance from the Department of Health he said when that arrived that we are committed to moving ahead quickly to form a Health Scrutiny Committee, and I

am afraid I wrote that down as he said it.”

Mr Barber replied as follows:

“I am astonished that Dr Pollard takes such good care to listen to my radio broadcasts. What the question talks about here is a Health Scrutiny Committee. We have one. Dr Pollard knows we have one. Members of his group sit on one. Mr Gamble and Mr Griffiths sit on one. What he is talking about is something entirely different, and if he wishes to express his questions a little bit more carefully then he might get the answer that he seems to want. What the question says and what I have said here, and which I will repeat is this. As soon as we get proper guidance from the Government we will move ahead towards satisfying that guidance. We have already had informal consultations with Leaders of District Councils and with members of the Primary Care Trust Forums who are involved. There is no point in having a pseudo scrutiny exercise which does not satisfy the Government’s requirements, which one party is perfectly able to say, because it does not satisfy the requirements, we are not going to have any part of it. Nor is there any point in having one which does not satisfy the relationship posed by what I hope will be in the guidance which clarifies the situation with regard to District and County Councils, and that is the issue that we are waiting for.”

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

- “1. Could I please be given an update on the National Gas Museum Project and its chances of coming to Snibston?
2. Has any up date or further correspondence come to County Hall from the Heritage Lottery Fund regarding (i) Snibston and (ii) lottery funding applications elsewhere?”

Mr Barber replied as follows:

- “1. I suggest that this is a question better addressed to the Gas Museum Trustees, whose project this is and who have submitted a bid for funding to the Heritage Lottery Fund.
2. There is nothing further to report since the information provided at Mr. Lucas’ request to the Community Services Scrutiny Committee at its last meeting.”

Mr Lucas asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question 2:

“Is your thinking on the HLF letter of 2 December the same, and has a reply been sent from us since 2 December?”

Mr Barber replied as follows:

“I really do not know to what Mr Lucas is referring, I assume he does and he is trying to make some particular point. As far as I am concerned he is totally failing to do so.”

**(F) MR MILLER will ask the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

- “1. Is the Leader aware that a Focus Team leaflet edited by three District Councillors, circulating in the Hinckley area in early March, under the heading “itinerants on Burbage Common”, contains the statement “The Borough Council has been working to move travellers on as quickly as possible but this was held up by the Tory controlled County Council?”
2. Would the Leader care to comment on the truth of this statement?”

Mr Barber replied as follows:

- “1. Yes. Since the kindest description which might be used about the statement in the leaflet is misleading, I am pleased to have the opportunity to set out the true position.
2. The travellers moved on to the car park at Burbage Common on 23 February 2003. The land concerned is in the ownership of Hinckley & Bosworth Borough Council and any action, therefore, to secure the removal of this unauthorised encampment was the responsibility of the Borough Council and not Leicestershire County Council.

The County Council's Travellers Sites and Liaison Officer received a telephone call on 24 February 2003, from the Borough Council's Leisure Services Department, asking if she was in a position to assist the Borough Council with this incident. The Travellers Sites and Liaison Officer is employed by the County Council to deal with unauthorised encampments on County Council land and is only able to assist District Councils when her workload permits.

At the outset of this particular incident, the Officer was already dealing with a large encampment on County Council land at Gilmorton and was unable to provide the service requested. She did, however, give the Borough Council the benefit of her advice as to how best to proceed.

On 26 February 2003, with matters at Gilmorton sufficiently progressed and under control, the Travellers Sites and Liaison Officer contacted the Borough Council to inform them that she would now be able to provide assistance, if they still required it. At that point she accepted the Borough Council's request for her to undertake a site visit and prepare a Social Assessment Report, on their behalf. She also arranged for the Education and Health Reports, which form part of the Assessment, to be provided by the relevant agencies. The Assessment Report was provided to the Borough Council on 6 March 2003, in order that they could seek a Possession Order for the site. Without such a Report, an Order cannot be sought. Assessment reports, which are based on a number of site visits, can take in excess of two weeks to complete. The Report for Burbage Common was provided, to the Borough Council, within six working days from receipt of instructions.

This leaflet was drawn to the attention of the County Solicitor, who has subsequently written to the publishers asking for acknowledgement of errors in the leaflet, referring to the County Council, and for them to be rectified at an early date.

At election times, all politicians accept that a certain amount of licence is

used in leaflets and addresses but there are limits and regrettably 'Focus' leaflets have a bad name in this respect. I hope that the publishers and others responsible will accept that they have really stepped over the line when the local authority itself, rather than another political party, formally complains, and that a lesson will be learnt."

Mr Miller asked the following supplementary question:

"I thank the Leader for setting out the true position in some detail and I would like to know if he is aware if the County Solicitor has actually had any acknowledgement or response to her letter?"

Mr Barber replied as follows:

"I do not have any specific information, but I would hope that the response is received properly and as quickly and speedily as possible."

**(G) MRS SHERWIN will ask the following question of the Leader or his nominee:**

1. Would the Leader agree that some regrettably ill-judged comments made by the Leader of Hinckley & Bosworth District Council, which were printed as direct quotations in the Hinckley Times, where the County Council's Travellers Liaison Officer was named, threaten to undermine the spirit of co-operation between local authorities which is at the heart of the Code of Practice for Travellers?
2. Would the Leader also agree that this is particularly unfortunate, since
  - (a) I understood that the ignorance demonstrated by the Leader of the District Council of the Code of Practice, signed and approved by his Council, at the time of the incidents last year at Clarendon Park had been corrected, and
  - (b) I am aware that his Council's Scrutiny Commission in December last year expressly resolved to support the Code of Practice and formally to thank the County Council's Travellers Liaison Officer for her assistance in respect of the Clarendon Park incident?
3. Will the Leader confirm that officers have indicated categorically that no assurances were given by any County Council employees as to when a group of travellers might leave Burbage Common and therefore the following quotation directly attributed to the Leader of the District Council:

*"Hardly surprising, there had been no sign of movement to leave the site, despite the assurances given to us by officials from county hall," ...  
 "They said not to worry as they would be gone by Sunday."*

is at best inaccurate?

4. Would the Leader agree that it was the primary responsibility of the District Council as the landowner in this case to take action to remove the travellers and that seeking to shift blame to the County Council who had agreed, although under no obligation to do so, to carry out the necessary

assessment of the travellers' needs in order to expedite an eviction, would appear to constitute deceit?

5. Would the Leader agree that the Leader of the District Council should have the good grace to apologise to the County Council and the officer concerned, assuming, of course, that he has been quoted correctly by the Hinckley Times?"

Mr Barber replied as follows:

- "1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Yes, and do so promptly."

Mrs Sherwin asked the following supplementary question on the reply to Questions 1 and 2:

"Would the Leader agree that in the first place the Leader of Hinckley and Bosworth District Council appears not to know what is going on inside his own Council, and in the second place, that his behaviour is good reason for the County Council to consider seriously if we should continue to help his Council when he cannot get his facts right and, in spite of what he says in this Chamber, seems to take comfort in criticising the County Council when it suits him locally?"

Mr Barber replied as follows:

"I am sorry to disappoint Mrs Sherwin, and indeed the rest of the Council, the answer to the question is Yes".

Mrs Sherwin asked the following supplementary question on the reply to Questions 3 and 4:

"Would the Leader agree that what we have seen here is a pretty transparent and nothing more than the sort of cheap and nasty politics which the Liberal Democrats indulge in, which I hasten to say appear to have no respect for the truth and to seek to blame everyone but themselves for their own shortcomings?"

Mr Barber replied as follows:

"Yes I am afraid so, is the best answer I can give."

Mrs Sherwin asked the following supplementary question on the reply to question 5.

"In the case of an apology from Mr Bill to Mrs Athey would the Leader agree that it should most appropriately be in writing?"

Mr Barber replied as follows:

“Yes I would, and that it should be done as promptly as is feasible.”

### **101 - POSITION STATEMENTS.**

The Leader presented a position statement on the following matters:

Local Public Service Agreement (PSA)  
Leicestershire Community Strategy  
Concessionary Travel  
Meeting with National Farmers' Union  
Review of County's Citizens Advice Bureaux

Dr. Feltham and Mr. Wilson declared personal non-prejudicial interests in the items on the Review of Citizens Advice Bureaux and Concessionary Travel respectively.

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

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Bill  
Regional Assemblies  
Education Funding - F40 Update  
Yellow School Buses

Copies of the Position Statements are attached.

### **102 - REPORTS OF THE CABINET, SCRUTINY COMMISSION, SCRUTINY COMMITTEES AND OTHER BODIES:**

#### **102 - REPORT OF THE CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE.**

##### **(A) REPORT OF THE INDEPENDENT PANEL ON MEMBERS' ALLOWANCES**

It was moved by Mr Barber, seconded by Prof Preston and carried:

- “(a) That the report of the Independent Panel on Members' Allowances, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report of the Constitution Committee, be received and that the recommendations contained therein be approved;
- (b) That the present scheme of allowances be revoked on 31<sup>st</sup> March 2003 and that the scheme of allowances set out in Appendix 2 to the report of the Constitution Committee be adopted with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2003.”

#### **102 - REPORT OF THE CABINET**

##### **(A) FOOD STANDARDS ENFORCEMENT SERVICE PLAN 2003/2004.**

It was moved by Prof Preston, seconded by Mr Barber and carried:

“That the Food Standards Enforcement Plan for 2003/04, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report of the Cabinet, be approved.”

##### **(B) YOUTH AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION ADULT LEARNING PLAN**

It was moved by Mr Ould, seconded by Mr White and carried:

“That the Adult Learning Plan 2003/04 as referred to in Section B of the report of the Cabinet, be approved.”

**(C) RESPONSE TO THE FINAL VERSION OF THE BLABY DISTRICT COMMUNITY STRATEGY**

It was moved by Mr Miller, seconded by Mr Barber and carried:

“That the Blaby District Community Strategy, as referred to in Section C of the report of the Cabinet, be approved.”

**(D) BEST VALUE REVIEW OF YOUTH AND COMMUNITY EDUCATION**

It was moved by Mr Ould and seconded by Mr Barber:

“That the action approved by the Cabinet in response to the Best Value Review of Youth and Community Education, as outlined in Section D of the report of the Cabinet, be supported.”

The motion was put and carried.

**103 - NOTICE OF MOTION SUBMITTED UNDER STANDING ORDER 10:-**

**103(A) Notice of Motion by Mr. Sheahan**

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

“That it is the view of this Council that no decisions should be taken on the future of Snibston Discovery Park until:-

- ‘(a) all options relating to improving operational efficiency, enhancing service provision (including improving the attractiveness of the site and thereby increasing visitor numbers) and reducing costs with a view to revitalising the service at Snibston have been explored through the use of external consultants, as appropriate;
- (b) the Cabinet has satisfied itself that there is a good prospect of financial success arising from externalisation of services at Snibston taking into account any risk of the loss of funding from external sources;
- (c) the Cabinet has satisfied itself that the integrity of the whole of the Museums Service and the importance and influence of Snibston within the Museums Service is maintained.’ ”

Mr Sheahan, with the concurrence of his seconder, sought the consent of the Council to amend the motion by the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (b):-

“such as the Heritage Lottery Fund and English Heritage;”

The Council’s consent to amend the motion was not given.

During the course of the discussion Mr. Sheahan declared a personal non prejudicial interest relating to the proposed Gas Museum.

An amendment was moved by Mr Barber and seconded by Prof Preston:

‘That all of the words after the word “that” where it first appears be deleted from the motion and the following inserted in their place:-

“the County Council (i) would wish to see improvements in the attractiveness of the Snibston Discovery Park site in order to increase visitor numbers; and (ii) recognises the importance of the museum at Snibston to its other museum sites and collections, and that therefore no binding decisions should be taken on the future of the Park until:-

- (a) the Cabinet has satisfied itself that there is a good prospect of better outcomes, including better facilities for Leicestershire people, arising from a different approach to the management of Snibston Discovery Park;
- (b) the Cabinet has satisfied itself that any changes in the management of Snibston Discovery Park, which in any event would see registered museum status maintained, would not have a detrimental effect on the remainder of museums and related services operated by the County Council.” ’

The amendment was put and carried:

The substantive motion was put and carried.

### **103(B) Notice of Motion by Mr Rushton**

It was moved by Mr Rushton and seconded by Mr Kershaw:

“That the County Council:-

- ‘a) supports the local campaign to bring about fair and equal support from the Government for children's hospices and adult hospices; and
- b) urges the Government to deal with the current imbalance by providing more core funding for children's hospices and not to leave the Rainbows Children's Hospice overly reliant on lottery and other short-term funding.’ ”

The motion was put and carried, unanimously.

CHAIRMAN

2.30 p.m. – 7.10 p.m.

