



Leicester
City Council

At a meeting of the LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL held at the Town Hall at FIVE O'CLOCK in the afternoon on Thursday, 6 JULY 2023 duly convened for the business hereunder mentioned.

=====

BUSINESS

=====

1. **LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**
2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**
3. **MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting of Council held on 22 February 2023 (Budget Council meeting), 22 February 2023, 9 March 2023 (Special Council meeting) and 18 May 2023 Annual Council are available to view at

<https://cabinet.leicester.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?CId=81&Year=0>

Copies are also available from Democratic Support on 0116 454 6350 / committees@leicester.gov.uk

4. **STATEMENTS BY THE CITY MAYOR / EXECUTIVE**
5. **PETITIONS**
 - Presented by Members of the Public
 - Presented by Councillors
6. **QUESTIONS**
 - From Members of the Public
 - From Councillors
7. **MATTERS RESERVED TO FULL COUNCIL**

7.1 Independent Remuneration Panel - Process

8 EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEES

8.1 Establishment of Scrutiny Committees and Commissions, Regulatory and Council Committees

To note any changes to the Executive. To vary the composition and fill any vacancies of any Committee of Council.

9. DATE OF ADDITIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

10. NOTICES OF MOTION

a) Leicester City Council Divestment Motion

b) Green Open Space at Beaumont Park and the former Western Park Golf Course Motion

c) Local Government Pay to Council: A fully funded, proper pay rise for Council and School Workers Motion

13. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

PRESENT:

DOCTOR SUSAN BARTON, LORD MAYOR
CHAIRMAN

SIR PETER SOULSBY – CITY MAYOR

Abbey Ward

NAGS AGATH
CHARLEIGH BARNES

North Evington Ward

DILIP JOSHI
RAVI MAHESH
SANJAY MODHWADIA

Aylestone Ward

SCOTT KENNEDY LOUNT
NIGEL CARL PORTER

Rushey Mead Ward

BHUPEN DAVE
GEETA KARAVADRA
DEVI SINGH PATEL

Beaumont Leys Ward

HEMANT RAE BHATIA
HAZEL ORTON
PAUL THOMAS WESTLEY

Saffron Ward

TED CASSIDY
ELLY CUTKELVIN

Belgrave Ward

SHITAL ADATIA
YOGESH CHAUHAN
JAIANTILAL GOPAL

Spinney Hills Ward

MISBAH BATOOL
MUSTAFA MALIK

Braunstone Park and Rowley Fields

ELAINE HALFORD
KULWINDER SINGH JOHAL

Stoneygate Ward

RAFIQ MOHAMMED
MANJULA SOOD
YASMIN SURTI

Castle Ward

MICK GREGG
PATRICK JOSEPH KITTERICK
LIZ SAHU

Thurncourt Ward

TERESA ALDRED
ABDUL OSMAN

Evington Ward

DEEPAK BAJAJ
ZUFFAR HAQ
JENNY JOANNOU

Troon Ward

MOHINDER SINGH SANGHA

Eyres Monsell Ward

ELAINE PANTLING
KAREN PICKERING

Westcotes Ward

ADAM CLARKE
SARAH RUSSELL

Fosse Ward

SUE WADDINGTON
SYED ZAMAN

Humberstone and Hamilton Ward

STEPHEN BONHAM
MANJIT KAUR SAINI

Knighton Ward

MELLISA MARCH
DR LYNN MOORE
GEOFF WHITTLE

Western Ward

GEORGE COLE
VI DEMPSTER
MOLLY O'NEIL

Wycliffe Ward

HANIF AQBANY

16. LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

There were no Lord Mayor's announcements.

17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Lord Mayor invited Members to declare any interests they might have in the business on the agenda not already declared on their register of interests.

The following members all declared an ordinary disclosable interest in the item 'Notice of Motion: Leicester City Council Divestment Motion', as either they or a family member were or would be beneficiaries of the Local Government pension scheme:

Councillors Whittle, Kennedy-Lount, Osman, Moore, Waddington, Dave, Clarke, Dempster, Westley, Surti, Russell and the City Mayor.

18. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Moved by the Lord Mayor, seconded by the Deputy Lord Mayor and carried:

That the minutes of the meetings held on 22 February 2023 (Budget Council meeting), 22 February 2023, 9 March 2023 (Special Council meeting) and Annual Council on 18 May 2023 having been circulated to each Member of the Council, be taken as read and are approved as a correct record.

19. STATEMENTS BY THE CITY MAYOR/EXECUTIVE

City Mayor – Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas Matters) Bill.
The City Mayor referred to this Bill which was currently going through parliament. He noted that he had previously taken a visit to the Palestine in 2014, following which the Council took a decision resolving to boycott goods from the occupied territories and condemned the government of Israel for ignoring international law. He further noted that the court of appeal said that the Council's decision was temperate and legitimate, and in common with well known gestures of solidarity undertaken by many councils.

The City Mayor noted that the Bill going through parliament was a means of the government trying to silence Councils and not allow them to undertake their wider political role, and democratic responsibility to speak up on matters which affect people within the city. He noted that the City's Members of Parliament had criticised the Bill and he encouraged them to speak against it on behalf of the city.

Deputy City Mayor – Councillor Clarke – Flooding in the city
The Deputy City Mayor referred to a recent flooding event which took place on 22nd June. He thanked Council teams that worked through the night, and visiting residents to provide support where possible. He noted that infrastructure relating to flooding was maintained by different agencies including the Council, Severn Trent Water and the Environment Agency, and the interactions between the agencies was complex and depended on the issue at hand. Following the flood, officers had investigated and prepared a report under Section 19 of the Flood and Water Act 2010 looking at mitigations which would be presented to Councillors. He noted that the Council continued to invest in improvements, such as on the John Ellis site. He

further noted that there had been an increase in extreme weather events due to climate change and it was necessary to continue to adapt to changing circumstances. All Councillors would receive a guide to flooding in the near future.

20. PETITIONS

There were no petitions.

21. QUESTIONS

The following questions were asked by Members of the Public.

- 1. This question was not asked.**
- 2. This question was not asked.**
- 3. Brenda Worrall**

“The city council voted unanimously to back the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons on 22 February 2023. joining towns and cities across the world, including many in the UK. This was a wonderful and courageous thing to do.

We, as members of Leicester CND, make two requests for that to be followed by action.

Could the city council now make sure that the citizens of Leicester are aware of that decision, by publicising it widely and by making it prominent on its website, thus explaining to the public that we now belong to a community of towns and cities that support the UN treaty to ban nuclear weapons?

Could the city council join with all the other local authorities in the UK, who have passed similar resolutions, to jointly urge our Government to accord with the treaty?”

The City Mayor in response stated that he was pleased to have this question asked. He noted that the Council had passed the resolution and details of this had been placed on the Council’s website, but agreed that more could always be done. He was happy to look at ways in which this could be publicised, focussing on the impact it could have.

Brenda asked a supplementary question. She offered to provide details of other authorities who had also approved a similar motion.

The City Mayor in response felt that the Council may have this information, but he was happy to receive it.

QUESTIONS FROM COUNCILLORS

- 1. Councillor Pantling**

“Would the City Mayor update Council on the ongoing concerns brought to him, regarding the activities of a Leicester based company, relating to its advertising, sale and fitting of heating products; concerns that have also come to the attention of Leicester City Council Trading Standards?”

The City Mayor in response said that this had been a very serious case, one that Trading Standards had prosecuted and pressed very hard to support affected consumers. He couldn't name the company involved, but a settlement had been agreed in 2022 and a commitment was given by the company that breaches would be put right and they paid compensation and prosecution costs. He noted that further issues had been raised with the Council and these were being investigated to see if they were in breach of the original agreement. Trading Standards would act robustly and proportionately for consumers if breaches were continuing.

2. Councillor Mohammed

"Proposed "Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas Matters) Bill"

The above bill has been tabled in Parliament and is most likely to pass. This bill will "prevent public bodies from being influenced by political or moral disapproval of foreign states when taking certain economic decisions".

If passed it may prevent Councils from showing solidarity for oppressed minorities like this Council did in 2014, an act that not only reflected the accurate state of international law but was also upheld as legitimate by both the High Court and the Court of Appeal

The Bill contradicts the Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights published by the United Nations. The bill will also undermine the government's own risk advice to businesses on trading with Israeli settlements that states: "Settlements are illegal under international law ... [there are] clear risks related to economic and financial activities [there], and we do not encourage or offer support to such activity."

Crucially, the bill will eliminate the right of the Council to make ethical and moral financial decisions. This is a breach of the freedom to exercise moral judgment and democratic rights.

As the bill contravenes UN Resolutions, governments' previous advice and interferes in local government financial decision making, will Leicester City Council challenge the 'undemocratic' decision.

It should also be noted that this week, the government dictates regarding expelling refugees to Rwanda have been successfully legally challenged.

Therefore, will Leicester City Council call for this bill to be challenged in the Court of Law."

The Lord Mayor requested that questions be submitted in a shorter form than this one in future.

The City Mayor in response welcomed the question and noted that it was an issue of concern for a significant number of councillors. He referred to the previous judgement made by the High Court of the Council's previous resolution was proportionate and legitimate. He felt that the government was now having a major impact on the Council's ability to speak out on major issues. He further commented that there would be considerable opposition to this bill in parliament and he hoped it would be withdrawn. He undertook to work with other Councils to address this issue.

3. Councillor Surti

“Councillor Dempster and I were both honoured to invited by UHL to the graduation ceremony for the seven Project Search interns a few weeks ago.

For those that don't know about Project Search, it is a programme first adopted in the UK from America by Leicester City Council back in 2010 before becoming a nationally supported programme. I'm proud to say I was part of the team that developed the programme in Leicester.

Project Search is a one year internship programme aimed at supporting young people with special educational needs to gain the skills and experience to go onto meaningful employment, usually within the organisation where they have received the training.

Of the seven UHL interns, 5 have secured paid work in the trust which has been fully supported by the Chief Executive Officer.

So, my question is what if anything is the city council doing to support young people with additional needs into employment given we were the first site to pilot Project Search which is now operating across 70 NHS trusts nationally and we were also the first council to employ people with a learning disability and autistic people, some of whom still work here to this day?”

Assistant City Mayor, Councillor Dempster in response thanked Councillor Surti for bringing Council's attention to this project. She took the opportunity to praise University Hospitals of Leicester for their delivery of this project. The young people and their families were very grateful for having taken part, as an opportunity to develop as they moved into adulthood, particularly as those taking part had additional needs.

Councillor Dempster also noted that the Council supported internships and work experience for some of the most vulnerable young people, including looked after children. There had also been a bid for funding in 2022 for a local supported employment initiative, which had worked with Project Search, and engaged with families right from the beginning of the process. The Council's Corporate Management Team would discuss this matter in the near future, about developing it further within the Council, looking to benefit young people in the city.

4. Councillor Joannou

“Why are council service general enquires only available to the public from 10 30 am until 3 30pm.”

Assistant City Mayor, Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that people got in touch with the Council in relation to many matters, using a wide range of channels to do so, and contacting the large number of service teams within the Council. Evidence had been shown that residents liked to have a variety of means by which to contact the Council, using different methods such as phone, digital, self service, via community centres, as well using the face to face offer in the Customer Service Centre on Granby Street. The general contact phone number was only one of 11 lines which to contact the Council, and there were five out of hours lines to deal with emergency issues. Customer Services were under constant review to ensure that it met the constantly changing needs of residents.

Councillor Joannou made a further comment that when she was canvassing during the local elections that she met 20 people aged 90 plus and couldn't get through on the general enquiries line, and these people couldn't use IT access.

5. Councillor Joannou

"How many Council staff are working from home and why?"

The City Mayor in response said that the Council had a very small number of 12 staff who worked permanently from home. The Council had embraced a flexible and agile ways of working which had enabled the Council to remove 4 buildings from the corporate estate which provide a saving of £1m and £300k in terms of travel cost savings as well environmental benefits. There had also been no detriment to performance.

6. Councillor Osman

"Can the City Mayor outline the time table for the recent disturbances inquiry that bought this City's harmony into disrepute."

The City Mayor in response stated that he couldn't provide a timetable. He noted that the Secretary of State had introduced the enquiry and he was intensely frustrated that there was no urgency being shown. He felt that there was a need to look a what happened and why, as well as lessons for other local authority areas and the wider public sector.

Councillor Osman asked a supplementary question, enquiring whether the City Mayor would condemn the current appointment of the chair as he did with the previous one.

The City Mayor in response stated that he didn't condemn the previous chair. He noted that it was a Conservative Secretary of State which which appointed the current chair. He felt that the previous chair was a good one, but following the Twitter storm after his appointment, he decided to withdraw, which was understandable. The City Mayor suggested the Conservative group talk to the government if they had concerns about the review chair.

7. Councillor Osman

"What was the reasons for including the two sites in Thurncourt ward despite the local opposition against development by the local community written into the Local Plan"

Assistant City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response stated that the city had a housing crisis and a serious lack of land supply to accommodate new build houses. The process of consultation never gave the commitment that any objections would mean that sites would be taken out of the Local Plan. Four consultations had taken place since 2014, where initially 270 sites were included for housing and this had been taken down to 58, including a significant number of brownfield sites. There were detailed reasons for any sites inclusion within the evidence documents.

Councillor Osman asked a supplementary question. He referred to the 58 brownfield sites for housing, but felt that this included greenfield sites in Thurncourt. He asked that the Assistant City Mayor write the planning inspector to take out the

greenfield sites in Thurncourt.

The Assistant City Mayor in response stated that of the 58 housing sites, approximately 70% of them were brownfield sites, not all of them. All consultation feedback, petitions and documents would be submitted to the government inspector, but the final decision would be taken at full Council.

8. Councillor Osman

“Can the deputy mayor give a full explanation why our council tenants on district heating are having to pay above the average bills of standing charges for their energy bills”

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that all tenants on the district heating network had been written to with plans to install meters. She commented that the reference to a standing charge was incorrect. This was not a new charge and had always been paid as a fixed charge which was an extrapolation of the costs to support the system. A review of these charges has been undertaken, and there couldn't be a direct comparison with standing charges on a typical domestic system as the charges covered different costs.

Councillor Osman asked a supplementary question. He felt that the standing charge was high and was punishing residents in deprived areas.

The Assistant City Mayor in response stated that it was incorrect to describe the charge as a standing charge and it wasn't punishing residents. The charge was to cover the costs of running the system, it wasn't new and has existed since the system has been in place.

9. Councillor Osman

“How many vacancies do we currently have in our Planning department?”

Assistant City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that there were 7 full time vacancies out of 67 staff, about 10% of the workforce. This should however be seen in context of the wider crisis in local government recruitment which was a national issue. In the past 13 years, the council had lost 75% of planners to retirement or to the private sector, which it wasn't possible to compete with. She felt it would help if the government let the council increase charges in order to invest in the workforce.

Councillor Osman asked a supplementary question. He said that if there was a known problem, what exactly was the problem with getting planning applications considered.

The Assistant City Mayor in response said that the supplementary question didn't relate to the question asked and that question should have been asked if that was the answer which was wanted.

10. Councillor Haq

“How many food banks are currently being supported financially by the council in the following wards Stoneygate, Spinney Hills, Wycliffe, Evington and Goodwood, North Evington, Troon, Belgrave and Rushey Mead.”

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Russell in response said the Council didn't support foodbanks from its general funding, but it did support and emergency food partnership and coordinators for that. This was funded through the Household Support Fund, which had overall supported 17 foodbanks, with 6 in the wards mentioned in the question. The Deputy City Mayor cautioned against using wards to measure foodbank use as foodbanks supported people from a general part of the city, rather than a specific ward.

Councillor Haq asked a supplementary question. He commented that some of the foodbanks in those wards mentioned were turning people away and there was a problem dealing with poverty and it disproportionately affected ethnic minorities. He also noted that textiles industries were struggling which was having a further impact. He asked if there were extra resources to target areas where poverty was particularly bad?

The Deputy City Mayor in response said that the Council was looking at the foodbank plus model which as well as providing food, would help people to find employment, access to benefits, support for housing and other costs to provide a wraparound service, with advisors based in foodbanks.

11. Councillor Haq

"How much 106 Money has been given to the ICB for improvements to GP surgeries in Leicester and what outstanding 106 monies are left to be handed over to the ICB."

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Russell in response said that £94,000 had been received, but unfortunately the whole amount remained unclaimed as legally acceptable schemes had not come forward. There were potentially £200,000 of proposals for schemes and it was intended to work with the Integrated Care Board (ICB) to make best use of the money.

Councillor Haq asked a supplementary question querying how much money there was, if £200,000 worth of schemes had been put forward. He also commented that terraced houses weren't appropriate buildings for doctor's surgeries.

The Deputy City Mayor in response confirmed that there was £94,000 available for compliant requests, and the Council was working with the ICB to develop these. There was also a challenge in that the ICB didn't directly provide GP surgeries and there needed to be engagement with NHS estates to ensure delivery.

12. Councillor Haq

"How many SEND children from Leicester City are currently in school's outside of the city? And what is the current cost of Taxi service for children both travel inside and outside of the city"

Assistant City Mayor Councillor Dempster in response said that there were 390 SEND children from the city in schools outside the city, out of a total of 3700 who had an Educational Health and Care Plan. The reason for these children going outside of the city was to access specialist provision, such as one child who attended a school for hearing impairment. The annual cost of taxis for 2023 was £9.6m, but it wasn't possible to differentiate between travel inside and outside the city. Taxis weren't used as an automatic option as there was a policy which determined legal eligibility for the service, and a school bus would always be offered

in the first instance where possible. It was also the case that when a young person was transitioning into adulthood, they were trained to become more independent in the use of their transport.

Councillor Haq asked a supplementary question. He noted the evidence from the Search Project had shown that independent travel was crucial so young people could access work opportunities. He also felt that approximately 10% of the cohort travelling outside of the city created extra costs and environmental issues. He said that provision should be designed correctly to enable children to not have to travel so far, get up so early and be better for the environment, and queried whether this was going to happen?

The Assistant City Mayor in response said that this planning was happening involving Ash Field, Millgate and the Children's Hospital School. She felt there was a worrying shortfall of provision in the city, but this was being looked at and this wasn't just for money saving reasons, but also the benefits to families and shorter journeys for young people.

13. Councillor Rae Bhatia

"Sunday Parking Charges will be detrimental to whatever remaining footfall we have in the city centre. In addition to the businesses suffering even further, people using places of worship and community events will also be badly impacted. Can the City Mayor confirm if this scheme will be scrapped? Also, why were the councillors not consulted on it?"

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke in response said that there were sophisticated systems to measure footfall, which was now at 96% of pre-covid levels. An Executive decision was taken in November 2022 to increase charges, but this was not called in. The increases were advertised to the public and there were 25 objectors. Disabled parking was remaining free. Sunday charging was developed as part of a wider review of parking and it was felt necessary in order to generate funding to support businesses. He further commented that parking charges compared well to comparator cities. He also noted that much of the free parking was used by businesses, so a small charge was likely to mean that more parking spaces would be available for shoppers.

Councillor Rae Bhatia asked a supplementary question. He queried the footfall figures, feeling that they didn't reflect the reality on the ground, particularly with the Highcross Centre going into administration. He asked that they be reviewed and correct facts and figures be brought back to the Council and Scrutiny for further review.

The Deputy City Mayor in response noted that it wasn't the Highcross that had gone into administration, but it's owner, Hammersons had. He further commented that car parking prices were under constant review and he was confident that work which had been done had a neutral impact, if not beneficial.

14. Councillor Orton

"What are the councils plans with regards to the pop up cycle lane on Beaumont Leys Lane and why have they not been removed despite five ward councillors from Beaumont Leys and Abbey wards jointly objecting to it as well as numerous residents constantly complaining about how dangerous they are?"

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke in response agreed that some of the pop up lanes had become untidy, but the 'wands' which marked out the lanes would be replaced with more attractive features in the coming days.

15. Councillor Bajaj

"Taxi AGE Policy - Currently is 11 years, Most vehicles are euro 6 or hybrid in Leicester city . Taxi drivers for the past few years have been going through financial crisis and continue to struggle. As long as the vehicle is mechanically roadworthy and passes the taxi MOT regularly it should be licensed for up to 15 years. Drivers have invested a lot of money in these vehicles and maintained them over the years however they are only given 11 years when the vehicle can easily go on for 15 years under manufacturer's warranty. When will this to be increased to 15 years like all neighbouring councils?"

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response said she was grateful for the question, noting that she had met with representatives from taxi firms in the past couple of weeks, where these issues were raised. She noted that there was clear evidence from MOTs that some vehicles were complete failures from year 9 and significant issues were emerging when spot checks were undertaken. She further noted that there were better figures emerging on emissions, and standards were constantly being checked to see if they were at the right level. The most recent strategy for taxi standards was launched on 2022, but the consultation on this took place pre-pandemic and trade circumstances were different at that time. Dialogue with the taxi trade was being reopened as it was recognised they played an important role in the city's economy. She further noted that only 2 local authorities had moved to a 15 year age policy, and there were no plans to do this in the city at the current time. A balance needed to be made between service standards and environmental goals, but the taxi age policy would be looked at to see if it was set at an appropriate level.

16. Councillor Bajaj

"Currently there is only 1 taxi MOT station for Leicester City council. There are approximately 2500 private hires and 200 plus hackney's (black cabs), and MOT dates are not given within a week time frame. There should be 2 MOT stations to accommodate nearly 2700 vehicles. Why is it the council only have one MOT station and are charging £60 for MOT and retest is £15. The new council policy is that if you fail your retest then you would need to pay another £60 for a fresh MOT test. MOTs are currently being failed with minor issues such as Interior led lights, council stickers fading, no smoking sign stickers. These are minor faults and should be given as advisory rather than failing to make money!!!. If the vehicle fails on mechanical and major issues this is understandable.

Then when booking the retest, it takes 1 week due to lack of resources and shortage of ramps! When will the council look at opening another MOT station to accommodate the 2700 plus taxi drivers in Leicester city?"

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response firstly queried the accuracy of the question, noting that there were 1500 private hire vehicles registered with the City Council. It was correct that there was only 1 MOT station in order to ensure that there high quality checks were undertaken. There were 4 ramps at the centre and there had been anecdotal evidence of excessive wait time and the Deputy City Mayor undertook to look for further evidence around this, and capacity to be maximised if there were problems. With regard to second / re-tests, it was the DVLA

that dictated that these needed to be done. In respect of failures on small matters, these were felt to be straightforward matters to resolve so the taxi drivers should be getting them right.

17. Councillor Bajaj

“Penalty points system is flooded. Should be scrapped as drivers have been given points for being in their vehicle on a double yellow line waiting for a customer. There is no space to park and there is a shortage of ranking spaces however driver can easily rack up 12 points for waiting on a double yellow line and risk being call to the licensing committee and having is license suspended/revoked. Will the city mayor look at increasing taxi ranks and allow minimum sufficient time for taxi drivers to pick passengers without having to worry about getting points specially when picking elderly and disable passangers?”

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that parking on double yellow lines was an offence and it wasn't possible to just allow taxi drivers to park on them. Fines were issued on an evidence basis and not issued for minor infringements, but persistent offenders will receive fines and this would be where rules had been broken.

18. Question withdrawn

19. Councillor Bajaj

“Will the City Mayor confirm how much extra money the council have/ will receive from the Conservative government to improv school buildings in Leicester and weather he has decided which schools will receive that funding for warm and energy efficient classrooms?”

Assistant City Mayor Councillor Dempster in response said that the last time there was substantial investment in city schools was the Building Schools for the Future programme, where over £300m was spent and every single school in the city was re-built and the vast majority of the special school estate was rebuilt. Feedback from teachers had shown that learning had improved as a result of this investment. Since that programme there had been a lack of investment and requests for investment had been turned down, despite rising needs. She felt the city had received hardly any money from the government in the past 10 years for investment in schools. She suggested Councillor Bajaj ask the government for further investment.

Councillor Bajaj asked a supplementary question. He suggested that the Assistant City Mayor should check with the City Mayor as there was money due to be coming to the city. He would ask this question again in September.

The Assistant City Mayor in response queried whether Councillor Bajaj was referring to the capital grant of £1.35m, which she felt would not nearly be enough to deal with the building issues for the city's schools. She suggested Councillor Bajaj raise the matter with the government to provide further funding.

20. Councillor Gopal

“I believe that new projects are integral for the development of any city, but I think maintaining the city itself should be further prioritised. Currently, potholes, bad roads, flooding, traffic jams, overgrowing trees, and bushes of roadside in park are

the main issues in the city. Why does the council not fixate on these problems?"

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke in response agreed that maintaining the highway was important, and investment in green infrastructure sat alongside highway investments. The Council had been incredibly successful in achieving grant funding for capital projects to improve highways, but revenue funding to maintain assets was an increasing challenge because of the reduction in revenue funding in recent years and this meant less money for street maintenance. Despite this, the Deputy City Mayor felt that the Council did do well with the resources it had, such as the response rate to fix highway problems.

Councillor Gopal asked a supplementary question. He noted that the public had elected members to make improvements and it wasn't good enough to just blame the Conservative Party.

The Deputy City Mayor in response said that the current government had been in power for successive election victories, therefore was responsible for funding decisions. He further commented that the City was doing the best it could under the circumstances.

21. Councillor Gopal

"Unemployment and high living costs are part of the major issues in this city. Food banks are being flooded with people. How does the council intend to tackle these issues?"

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Russell in response said that she was bemused by the question as she didn't expect to be asked about foodbanks by a member of the Conservative party. She felt that changes made to the benefits system were a major contributing factor to the use of foodbanks. These changes had also led to a lack of ability for the Council to deal with child poverty. She noted that lots of people used foodbanks where they were waiting for their Universal Credit to come through. The Council was doing what it could to provide support to clients across the city through child welfare, welfare advice programmes, getting debts written off, training the voluntary sector and working to ensure people have access to good jobs. She felt that her side of the Chamber believed in supporting people.

22. Councillor Westley

"When will Beaumont Leys get a dedicated parking warden as the situation at various hotspots like the Beaumont Football club, Boswells Lodge School and Bennion Road/Croft Road ect is already out of hand. Without enforcement these double yellows or other forms of restrictions are of no use and have no impact."

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke in response said that Civil Enforcement Officers worked a varied pattern which was not ward specific in order to ensure fairness across the city. Work to introduce new restrictions was continuing in the area and consultation with the football club and other organisations was part of this. Members of the public were encouraged to phone in instances of parking infringements.

Councillor Westley asked a supplementary question. He felt that double yellow lines weren't being enforced, particularly outside schools and the council wasn't listening to residents. He felt that more enforcement officers should be recruited and enquired when this would happen.

The Deputy City Mayor in response said that he'd had no contact from Councillor Westley before now regarding enforcement, but would now go back to the enforcement team on Beaumont Leys to make them aware of the issues.

23. Councillor Kennedy-Lount

"Can the Cabinet Lead for Transport advise how many bus stops are no longer in use along Aylestone Drive, Burnaston Road and Milligan Road in Aylestone Ward?"

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke in response said that six bus stops on Aylestone Drive and 2 on Burnaston Road were no longer in use. He had been raising concerns with Arriva on this matter. He did however note that the bus companies had been struggling, but he would like to see this service return and was happy to work with Councillor Kennedy-Lount on this matter.

Councillor Kennedy-Lount asked a supplementary question, noting that Aylestone Drive and Wigston Lane had suffered and he suggested that bus services be supported rather than money spent on things like painted crossings.

The Deputy City Mayor in response said that the council worked with bus companies through the bus partnership and the council now had more control over bus services and could provide improvements such as electric buses which which ran on time and for a good price. Other developments had been improvements such as tap on, tap off payments, free bus services, new totems and bus shelters. The Deputy City Mayor said he wanted to see services return, but this was a decision for the bus companies.

24. Councillor Gregg

"With the Community Services and Library Needs Assessment due to commence on 3rd July can we have the cabinet member's assurance that the council will not use this as a basis to cut Leicester's libraries or community services?"

Assistant City Mayor Councillor Dempster in response gave assurance this piece of work was not driven by the need to make savings. She commented further that local libraries had evolved and people engaged with them in a different way and now was an opportune time to look at the service. There would be focus groups taking place as part of the consultation and she encouraged members and the public to take the opportunity to get involved in the consultation. Proposals would be drawn up on the basis of the consultation and then further consultation would be undertaken on those in early 2024.

Councillor Gregg asked a supplement question, seeking clarification whether services would be cut back?

The Assistant City Mayor in response stated that this consultation was about engagement and it wouldn't be right to rule things in or rule things out at this stage.

25. Councillor Gregg

"Following the collapse of the parent company running the Leicester E-Bike Scheme, what are the plans regarding the remaining charges & bikes and what plans does the Council have to implement a new scheme?"

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke in response said that he agreed that it was sad that the company had folded and was now in the hands of the liquidator to get the stock removed, which would take place in the coming weeks. Any future scheme would be informed by the experience of this scheme and from other areas. He felt that the use of investment companies to provide these services were not appropriate and funding from the government was needed.

Councillor Gregg asked a supplementary question enquiring whether students, when they returned in September?

The Deputy City Mayor in response said that this wouldn't be possible as the equipment couldn't be transferred. There were other schemes developed with Cycling UK where people could try electric cycles and he felt that the city had excellent cycling infrastructure to help people move around.

26. Councillor Sahu

"What are the council's plans for the refurbishment of Victoria Park Pavilion and is there a schedule for its long-awaited re-opening?"

The City Mayor in response said that he agreed that this had been underused for far too long and the building deserved to be brought into the 21st century. He noted the work of the former Councillor Myers pushing for this work to be done. The plans were currently at the design and conceptual stage and refurbishment to take place, as well as determine the use of the building. The City Mayor was happy to discuss further with Cllr Sahu what had been done and the plans for the future.

Councillor Sahu asked a supplementary question, commenting that this was good news and queried what the timescale would be?

The City Mayor in response said that officers had informed him that the next stage would be in the new year, which he agreed seemed like a long time, but was happy to talk to ward Councillors about how to bring plans forward.

27. Councillor Sahu

"How is the council's roll out of its Selective Landlord Licensing scheme proceeding?"

Assistant City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that the scheme started 9 months ago, and to date, 2464 applications had been received which equated to 29% of the rental properties in the selective landlord licensing area. There had been 1746 inspections with 1231 licences issued and 82 properties with category 1 hazards which required resolution before the licence could be issued. She further noted that the premise of the scheme wasn't to sanction private landlords, but raise standards across the sector. Most landlords were welcoming of the advice and then often implemented measures in their other properties.

Councillor Sahu asked a supplementary question noted that the scheme seemed successful and provided a good argument to roll it out across the city.

The Assistant City Mayor in response said that the consultation on the scheme had considered licensing across the city, but evidence from other cities was that they had found it hard to justify and in some cases, needed to roll back the scheme

which led to difficult relationships with the sector. Officers were however making plans for additional licensing which was similar but different to selective landlord licensing, but there needed to be up to date evidence to bring this in.

28. Councillor Sahu

“What are the council’s plans for the refurbishment for Clarendon Park Play Area?”

Assistant City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that officers had been working with residents on refurbishment plans which were now well developed, but the project faced limited budgets and resources. Residents views were welcomed by the Assistant City Mayor about what could be achieved within the available budget.

Councillor Sahu was keen to invite the Assistant City Mayor to discuss this matter with residents.

29. Councillor Kitterick

“What progress has been made with the installation of Heat Meters into Leicester’s District Heating Properties, specifically

How many domestic properties are charged under Leicester District Heating system?

How many of those properties have been assessed as viable to have a heater meter installed?

How many of those properties have had heat meters installed as of 6th July 2023?

What is the target for the number of properties to have heat meters installed by 1st October 2023?

What is the progress on heating solutions for domestic properties where heater meters are not possible such as the Aikman Avenue flats?”

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that 3000 properties had been identified as being connected to the district heating network, and it had been determined that it was feasible to install meters in 2500 of them, but not possible in 500. A contractor had been identified to undertake the installations and 8 pilot installations had been undertaken and these would act as show homes to demonstrate that there would only be minimal disruption. It was planned to install all meters installed by the end of October, but this was based on access being provided which could delay installations. It was noted that meters couldn’t be installed in the Aikman Avenue flats, but a detailed study was being undertaken to identify feasible options.

Councillor Kitterick asked a supplementary question, in relation to the standing or fixed charge noting that it was far higher than regular standing charges and queried what action was being taken regarding the grossly exaggerated fees and excessive profits being taken by the supplier?

The Assistant City Mayor noted that the charge was not a new one. She did however agree that the network was a cash generator for the operator and they did receive high profits from the charge. Verbal updates had been received from the operator, but they didn’t appear to be sympathetic, but nothing further could be said at this point.

30. Councillor Kitterick

“What representations has the City Mayor made on behalf of Leicester City Council in relation to the Economic Activity of Public Bodies Bill?”

The City Mayor in response said that he had seen for himself the plight of those living in the occupied territories and the attitude of the Israeli government. The City Mayor assured Councillor Kitterick that what he'd said in this chamber, he was also saying at a national level. He was committed to doing whatever was possible to reflect what people in the city wanted to see their elected representatives doing and would continue to support them regardless of legislation.

Councillor Kitterick asked a supplementary question noting that boycotts had a long history as a peaceful means of demonstration and resolving conflict. He asked the City Mayor to bring back a more formal statement to the Council meeting in September.

The City Mayor in response said he was happy to come back to the chamber with a further statement when it was appropriate to say more in the chamber.

31. Councillor Kitterick

“When was the City Mayor first aware of the proposal by the Secretary of State for Levelling Up as to the identity of the chair the Government's Inquiry into the disturbances in east Leicester in Autumn 2022?”

The City Mayor in response stated that he was only notified at the last stage and wasn't consulted about the person who had been chosen to the inquiry. He wasn't immediately aware of who the person was, but after finding out more details it was felt that he didn't appear to be an impartial appointment.

Councillor Kitterick asked a supplementary question. He commented that impartiality was not an attribute that the appointee had. He asked if the City Mayor would consider not cooperating with the review.

The City Mayor in response stated that he'd asked for a review over a short timescale to find out what happened, why it happened and what could be learnt from it. The City Mayor was of the view that the way the review was being approached would not give the required answers. There needed to be more involvement of the communities of Leicester. He further said that it wasn't a question of him not engaging as he'd not been asked to take part in the review.

32. Councillor Kitterick

“Does the City Council have any plans to put forward proposals to reduce the Pay & Conditions of Council Workers in the next 12 months?”

The City Mayor in response said that most pay and conditions for staff were set at a national level. There was some scope for local level changes and minor changes are made on a fairly frequent basis. If there were any changes taking place, initial engagement would be with trade unions to ensure good working relations.

Councillor Kitterick asked a supplementary question. He asked if there was plans for changes to sick pay, shift allowances or changes for individual groups of workers.

The City Mayor in response confirmed that some of those were under local control, but any changes would be discussed with trade unions in the first instance, and not announce them in the Council Chamber.

33. Councillor Kitterick

“Following the recent celebrations of Eid al-Adha and Rathayatra in the city, will the city council consider increasing the support available to organisers of occasions such as this that take place in the city?”

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke in response said that it was to the city’s credit that they had been able to maintain a wide programme of events despite considerable cost pressures. Over 100 events were supported from a range of different cultures and these needed to be continually funded. He wished to be able to fund festivals more and have greater equity in funding agreements. He noted that current commitments would come to an end this year and suggested that scrutiny may wish to look into the matter.

Councillor Kitterick asked a supplementary question, noting that the Castle ward councillors had been asked to support such festivals from the Ward Community Meeting budget. The councillors were happy to do so for relatively small amounts of money, but he would welcome further discussions about how such festivals could be supported on a more fixed basis.

The Deputy City Mayor in response stated that he’d held similar conversations with organisers of Eid events. He also noted the inequity that the Castle ward faced due to it’s central location. He felt that there were other funding pots which could be accessed to support smaller cultural festivals.

34. Councillor Kitterick

“Which cabinet member made the decision for the City Council to grant Haymarket Consortium Ltd loans amounting to £600,000?”

Cllr Kitterick put questions 34 – 37 to the City Mayor together for a single response.

The City Mayor in response stated that the Haymarket Theatre was almost exactly 50 years old and had the potential to be an enormous asset to the city. He further explained that in 2007 the Theatre Trust and the Council left the building with no plan for it’s future, but with a major bill to be paid for maintenance of £180,000 per annum. The opening of the Curve Theatre had overspent by £30m, and the Haymarket was left without a specific purpose. The interior of the Haymarket had been cleared to remove asbestos, therefore it required substantial refurbishment. An agreement was made with a consortium with some financial support to reopen the theatre, but the pandemic meant it was not feasible to continue. In terms of the building’s future, it was noted that more investment would be needed, to make the most of the major asset, but it wasn’t clear how much, but it was very much the intention to bring it back into use.

Councillor Kitterick asked a supplementary question. He referred to the £600,000 loan provided to the consortium, asked for details of which Cabinet member took the decision to provide the loan? When the council was informed of the collapse after Covid came along? What was the date that the Cabinet member was consulted? What had happened to the technical equipment that the Council had funded, as there was a concern that this had been lost?

The City Mayor in response commented that if those were the answers that Councillor Kitterick wanted then he should have asked those questions. He was happy for him to have written answers as these details had been made public previously. It was the Monitoring Officer who had decided that the loan was unrecoverable in May 2021. The City Mayor confirmed that he had authorised the loan. He further commented that he inherited a major headache when he entered office and had tried to solve the issue by bringing the venue back to life working with a start up company. He acknowledged that £600,000 was a great deal of money but this was a small percentage of the overspend on the Curve Theatre.

35. Councillor Kitterick

“On what date was Leicester City Council informed that the Haymarket Consortium Ltd could not repay its £600,000 loan?”

See response to question 34.

36. Councillor Kitterick

“On what date and which cabinet member was consulted on the decision to write off the £600000 loan to Haymarket Consortium Ltd?”

See response to question 34.

37. Councillor Kitterick

“What is the current state and location of the technical infrastructure and equipment installed in the Haymarket Theatre as part of its fit out, prior to its closure in 2020?”

See response to question 34.

38. Councillor Porter

“There have been a number of complaints about people living rough on Aylestone Meadows and around the Great Central Way, some people who use the Meadows and the Great Central Way for recreation find these people intimidating. So can the council provide the date when these matters will be addressed?”

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Russell in response said that the people concerned were in the Westcotes ward, but had moved on 4th July to somewhere not on Council land. Support from the Council’s Outreach Team had been put in place and offers of support were regularly made to the people concerned.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question, noting that he had raised this as a complaint in May but had not had a response.

The Deputy City Mayor in response stated that there were protocols to be followed about appropriate ward Councillors being informed. The Deputy City Mayor noted that she had visited the site with Police and the City Wardens, offering alternative accommodation. Complaints had been taken on board, help had been offered to the individuals and alternative accommodation had also been offered.

39. Councillor Porter to say:

“How many people objected to the draft Local Plan?”

Deputy City Mayor Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that whilst that appeared to be a straightforward question, it wasn't so easy to respond to. There had been various consultations taking place on the Local Plan since 2014, and also the feedback wasn't separated into objections or support. In the last consultation phase, the Regulation 19 consultation, there were 500 representations and 12 petitions to be provided to the Planning Inspector and the majority of those were objections.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question, noting that a previous draft of the local plan included a plan to demolish a community centre and shop in the Gilmorton area which was supported by Councillor Clarke but received over 560 objections and these objections were ignored, he queried why this happened?

The Deputy City Mayor in response stated that Councillor Porter should have asked this question if that was the answer he wanted. She further commented that the assertions being made regarding Councillor Clarke were a mistruth. She would answer the question in full if Councillor Porter emailed her with details.

Councillor Porter commented that he raised a point of order as he had documentary evidence to back up his claim regarding Councillor Clarke.

The Deputy City Mayor continued, said that any representations made on the Local Plan were received and logged and incorporated in submissions to the Planning Inspector. She further commented that Councillor Porter's assertion that Councillor Clarke wanted to close the community centre was not true. The Local Plan would be submitted to the government but consultation would still take place at a local level, and the government would be engaged at a strategic level. The Planning Committee was the other element of the process and it was important for people not to feel that matters were a 'done deal' and communities needed to be engaged.

40. Councillor Porter to say:

“After spending almost £4 million of taxpayers cash on refurbishing the Haymarket Theatre, can the council explain why the owners of the business didn't apply for government support during the pandemic?”

The City Mayor in response stated that he had set out the position on a previous question. The consortium did apply and received Covid funding, but as a start up wasn't nearly sufficient to keep them as a going concern due to large overheads.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question. He noted that the City Mayor gave the approval for the £600,000 loan, but what guarantees were asked for?

The City Mayor confirmed that a proper process was followed, but nobody could anticipate the pandemic would happen. He felt that he'd inherited an impossible situation following the move of the theatre to Curve, which had overspent by £30m, by comparison the Haymarket loss was considerably smaller.

41. Councillor Porter to say:

“How many shareholders did the Haymarket Consortium have?”

The City Mayor in response said there were 3 individuals.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question, specifically, when the City Mayor became aware that the theatre was going under, what actions did the Council take?

The City Mayor in response said that he asked officers to get in touch with the shareholders and make them aware of their responsibilities. The City Mayor commented further that companies failed all the time and shareholders had their legal duties in such circumstances.

42. Councillor Porter to say:

“How much taxpayers cash did the council lend to the Haymarket Consortium?”

The City Mayor in response said that he had answered this in a previous question.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question, in light of the facts that have been highlighted, there was a genuine concern at the investment of £4m in the failed theatre and potential missing equipment, would he call for a full review into what went wrong so the same mistake wasn't repeated.

The City Mayor in response said that Councillor Porter could recommend that scrutiny investigate the matter.

43. Question withdrawn

44. Councillor Haq

“Is there any part of the SEND children budget where there is an underspend?”

Assistant City Mayor, Councillor Dempster in response said that there was a national issue regarding SEND funding. There were considerable additional needs in the city and no areas of underspend in the high needs block, but an overspend of £4.6m which was considered to be a low amount compared with other authorities. The government were aware of this issue but hadn't shown a willingness to provide further assistance.

Councillor Haq felt that there should be some underspend as there was a mismatch between the allocation and the services needed. He felt that there should be an underspend in respite care as parents were not using it, and this matter had been brought to his attention by schools and parents.

The Assistant City Mayor in response stated she was happy to look into this matter and discuss with officers, but agreed there were definite needs that the budget could fund.

22. INDEPENDENT REMUNERATION PANEL - PROCESS

Moved by Councillor Halford, seconded by Councillor Cassidy:

That Council:-

- a) Approves the appointment and composition of an Independent Remuneration

Panel to consider Members Allowances in Leicester as detailed in the report;

- b) Approves the commencement of a review of the Council's Scheme of Members Allowances by the Independent Remuneration Panel as specified in legislation on the basis defined in the report and taking into account the current financial constraints facing the Council; and
- c) Notes that consideration of the report of the Panel is a matter reserved to Council and that Council in setting a Scheme of Allowances at that point will have the choice to accept in full or in part or reject the findings of the Panel.

AMENDMENT

Moved by Councillor Kitterick and seconded by Councillor Porter, an addition to the recommendations:

That the Council asks the Independent Remuneration Panel to explore the following specific issues: (i) a reduction in the budget for Special Responsibility Allowances for the Executive as there are now seven members compared to ten previously and (ii) a reduction in the budget allocation for Deputy Mayors to allow for one rather than three.

Following the debate, the Lord Mayor put the amendment to a vote.

The Lord Mayor declared that the amendment was lost.

As there were no further amendments, the Lord Mayor put the substantive motion to a vote.

The Lord Mayor declared that the motion was carried.

23. ESTABLISHMENT OF SCRUTINY COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS, REGULATORY AND COUNCIL COMMITTEES

Moved by Councillor Halford and seconded by Councillor Pantling:

"That:-

- a) The Governance and Audit Committee and Standards Committee be established in accordance with the existing Terms of Reference, (except for the Governance and Audit Committee), the size of each being as detailed at Appendix A of the report, and it being noted that:
 - I. the remaining places will be filled in accordance with relevant procedures and in consultation with the relevant Members.
 - II. *The Standards Committee is to comprise five Elected Members.*
 - III. *The Monitoring Officer be granted delegated power to amend the Terms of Reference (Standards Committee) and Article 10 of the Constitution to reflect the increase in the size of the Standards Committee from four Elected Members to Five Elected Members.*
- b) The amended Terms of Reference for the Governance and Audit Committee (formerly Audit and Risk Committee), as attached at Appendix B of the report, be approved.

- c) The Chairs and Vice-Chairs (as appropriate) of the bodies listed in part (i) above be in accordance with the lists at Appendix A of the report.
- d) The Employees Committee be established with the Terms of Reference and size as specified within the Council's Constitution, with the process for the appointment of Chair and membership being in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution.
- e) The decision of Council taken on 18th May 2023 to fix the size of the Licensing and Public Safety Committee comprise 16 Councillors be superseded with a decision that it comprises 15 Councillors.
- f) The calendar of meetings, as attached at Appendix C of the report be approved.
- g) The Scrutiny Terms of Reference as detailed at part 3 of the Council's Constitution be confirmed and the Scrutiny Configuration as circulated prior to the meeting and attached to these minutes, be approved.

Councillor Halford moved, seconded by Councillor Elaine Pantling, a friendly amendment, detailed above in italics at a) ii & iii. The Lord Mayor put the friendly amendment to a vote without debate and it was carried.

Following the debate, the Lord Mayor put the substantive motion to a vote and it was carried.

24. DATE OF ADDITIONAL COUNCIL MEETING

Moved by Councillor Halford, seconded by the City Mayor and carried:

That an additional Council meeting be held on 21st March 2024 and remove the ordinary meeting due to take place on 22nd February 2024.

25. NOTICES OF MOTION

a) Leicester City Council Divestment Motion

Moved by Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke, seconded by Councillor Singh Johal and carried:

Leicester City Council notes:

It does not have any direct investments in fossil fuels but Leicester City Council, through employer and employee contributions, contributes to around £154 million of investment in fossil fuels as part of the Leicestershire Local Government Pension Fund, according to UK Divest. The Leicester City element of this is estimated to be around 30% (£46.2m).

The United Nations Paris Agreement, reaffirmed at the 2021 Glasgow Climate Summit, commits our governments to keep the global temperature increase to under 2 degrees and aim for 1.5 degrees. Carbon budgets produced by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, United Nations and the International Energy Agency show that preventing two degrees of warming relies on not burning the vast majority of all proven fossil fuels.

The UN International Energy Agency (IEA) predicts that global oil demand will significantly fall by 2030, leading their Executive Director to refer to oil and gas companies as potential 'junk investments.' Action by governments to limit carbon emissions will ultimately leave fossil fuel reserves unburnable. It's been estimated that this asset bubble, known as the 'carbon bubble', may be over €1 trillion in Europe alone.

Former Bank of England Governor Mark Carney warned that fossil fuel investments risk becoming "stranded assets" as investors exit the sector. "A question for every company, every financial institution, every asset manager, pension fund or insurer – what's your plan?"

Pension funds have a fiduciary duty to consider the material risks of continued investment in fossil fuels. Fiduciary duty is defined by the Law Commission as "ensuring that pensions can be paid, ensuring that this is undertaken at the best possible value".

Pension funds have a legal duty to treat members "fairly as between them". That means taking seriously the longer-term interests of younger members who may be affected more by the climate transition.

The city mayor and majority of Councillors committed, through the Labour manifesto, *"to seek to end the Leicestershire pension fund's investment in fossil fuel producing companies, redirecting this investment to support local solutions to climate change and fuel poverty."*

Therefore, this Council commits to:

1. Call on the Leicestershire Local Government Pension Fund to amend its recently adopted Net Zero Climate Strategy and develop a Responsible Investment Policy which explicitly rules out new investments in fossil fuel companies.
2. Call on the Fund to divest from fossil fuels through the development and adoption of responsible investment policies which:
 - a. Immediately freeze any new investment in the top 200 publicly traded fossil fuel companies.
 - b. Divest from direct ownership and any commingled funds that include fossil fuel public equities and corporate bonds.
 - c. Set out an approach to quantify and address climate change risks affecting all other investments.
 - d. Actively seek to invest in companies that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, minimise climate risk and where possible provide local environmental benefits.
3. Recognising that fossil fuel investments should be considered as part of the council's "carbon footprint" and divesting our pension fund is one of the most impactful steps we can take to reduce our impact on our community and the world.

b) Green Open Space at Beaumont Park and the former Western Park Golf Course Motion

Proposed by Councillor Rae Bhatia and seconded by Councillor Kitterick that:

Leicester City Council notes the concerns of people in the west of Leicester at the proposed loss of valuable green open space at Beaumont Park and the former Western Park Golf Course in the city.

This council believes it is not too late to act to save these sites from development and instead focus more effort on bringing forward brownfield sites in Leicester.

This council, therefore, agrees to withdraw Beaumont Park and Western Park Golf Course from the list of proposed sites for development from the Leicester City Local Plan at the earliest possible opportunity.

AMENDMENT

Moved by Councillor Pantling and seconded by Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke:-

Leicester City Council notes the concerns of people in the West of Leicester at the proposed loss of valuable green space at Beaumont Park and the former Western Park Golf Course in the city.

This council notes that the Local Plan has been subject to extensive scrutiny through four public consultation exercises which has provided opportunities at each stage to raise objections.

This council agrees that the objections and petitions relating to the Beaumont Park and Western Park Golf Course sites should rightly and properly be considered in the prescribed way as part of an Examination in Public conducted by an independent Government Inspector, noting that ultimately the final adoption of the Local Plan would be a matter for this Council to determine.

To withdraw these sites at this stage would torpedo the plan which would then need to be withdrawn, re-written and new agreements sought with the districts to take even more of our housing and employment land needs. The council would then need further consultation on the plan proposals. All told this could take years during which time we would be without clear adopted planning policies to guide development in the city.

Following the debate, the Lord Mayor put the amendment to a vote.

The Lord Mayor declared the amendment carried.

Following further debate, the Lord Mayor put the substantive, amended motion to a vote.

Leicester City Council notes the concerns of people in the West of Leicester at the proposed loss of valuable green space at Beaumont Park and the former Western Park Golf Course in the city.

This council notes that the Local Plan has been subject to extensive scrutiny through four public consultation exercises which has provided opportunities at each stage to raise objections.

This council agrees that the objections and petitions relating to the Beaumont Park and Western Park Golf Course sites should rightly and properly be considered in the prescribed way as part of an Examination in Public conducted by an independent Government Inspector, noting that ultimately the final adoption of the Local Plan would be a matter for this Council to determine.

To withdraw these sites at this stage would torpedo the plan which would then need to be withdrawn, re-written and new agreements sought with the districts to take even more of our housing and employment land needs. The council would then need further consultation on the plan proposals. All told this could take years during which time we would be without clear adopted planning policies to guide development in the city.

The Lord Mayor declared the substantive, amended motion carried.

c) Local Government Pay to Council: A fully funded, proper pay rise for Council and School Workers Motion

Moved by the City Mayor, seconded by Deputy City Mayor Russell and carried:

Leicester City Council notes: Local government has endured central government funding cuts of more than 50% since 2010. Between 2010 and 2020, councils lost 60p out of every £1 they have received from central government. The City Council had to make real terms cuts of 50% in services other than social care. New research by UNISON suggests that councils across England, Wales and Scotland are facing a cumulative funding gap of £5bn by next year.

Recent research shows that if the Government were to fully fund the unions' 2023 pay claim, around half of the money would be recouped thanks to increased tax revenue, reduced expenditure on benefits and tax credits, and increased consumer spending in the local economy.

This council believes:

Our workers are public service super-heroes. They keep our communities clean and safe, look after those in need and keep our towns and cities running.

Without the professionalism and dedication of our staff, the council services our residents rely on would not be deliverable.

Local government workers deserve a proper real terms pay increase. The Government needs to take responsibility and fully fund this increase having made it impossible for councils to do so.

This council resolves to:

Call on the Local Government Association to make urgent representations to central government to fund the NJC pay claim of RPI+2%.

Write to the Chancellor and Secretary of State to call for a pay increase for local government workers to be funded with new money from central Government.

Meet with local NJC union representatives to convey support for the pay claim and

consider practical ways in which the council can put pressure on the government.

26. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There being no other business, the Lord Mayor declared the meeting closed at 10.56pm.