



**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, 7 JULY 2022 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 held below are available to view at the links shown.

23 February 2022 – Special Council Meeting

<https://cabinet.leicester.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=81&MId=11717&Ver=4>

23 February 2022 – Budget Council Meeting

<https://cabinet.leicester.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=81&MId=10905&Ver=4>

23 February 2022 – Council Meeting

<https://cabinet.leicester.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=81&MId=10943&Ver=4>

19 February 2022 – Annual Council Meeting

<https://cabinet.leicester.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=81&MId=10906&Ver=4>

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
  - Petitions to be debated
- 5.1 Requesting safeguards including a 20 mph zone, barriers and speed cameras along Hungarton Boulevard.

**6. QUESTIONS**

- From Members of the Public
- From Councillors

**7. MATTERS RESERVED TO FULL COUNCIL**

7a Discretionary Licensing Policy

**8. REPORTS OF THE MONITORING OFFICER**

8a Members Code of Conduct

**11. EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEES**

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

**12. NOTICES OF MOTION**

**Deputy City Mayor Councillor Russell, seconded by the Deputy City Mayor Councillor Clarke to move:**

“As a major employer, and investor in local, regional, and national supply chains, this council recognises that, far too often, exploitative, unscrupulous, and abusive employment practices exist. This Council condemns those practices and is committed to rooting them out.

As part of its determination to tackle modern day slavery, this Council adopts the following cooperative charter which sets out strategies for more rigorous supply chain management and reporting processes.

Whilst recognising the action already being taken, Leicester City Council will:-

1. Train its corporate procurement team to understand modern slavery through the Chartered Institute of Procurement and Supply’s (CIPS) online course on Ethical Procurement and Supply.
2. Require its contractors to comply fully with the Modern Slavery Act 2015, wherever it applies, with contract termination as a potential sanction for non-compliance.
3. Challenge any abnormally low-cost tenders to ensure they do not rely upon the potential contractor practising modern slavery.
4. Highlight to its suppliers that contracted workers are free to join a trade union and are not to be treated unfairly for belonging to one.
5. Publicise its whistle-blowing system for staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
6. Require its tendered contractors to adopt a whistle-blowing policy which enables their staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
7. Review its contractual spending regularly to identify any potential issues with modern slavery.
8. Highlight for its suppliers any risks identified concerning modern slavery and refer them to the relevant agencies to be addressed.

9. Refer for investigation via the National Crime Agency's national referral mechanism any of its contractors identified as a cause for concern regarding modern slavery.
10. Report publicly on the implementation of this policy annually.

13. **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

**PRESENT:**

**GEORGE COLE, LORD MAYOR**  
**CHAIRMAN**

SIR PETER SOULSBY – CITY MAYOR

**Abbey Ward**

MANJIT KAUR SAINI  
VIJAY SINGH RIYAIT

**North Evington Ward**

LUIS FONSECA  
RASHMIKANT JOSHI  
VANDEVJI PANDYA

**Aylestone Ward**

ADAM CLARKE  
NIGEL CARL PORTER

**Rushey Mead Ward**

PIARA SINGH CLAIR  
ROSS WILLMOTT

**Beaumont Leys Ward**

HEMANT RAE BHATIA  
VI DEMPSTER  
PAUL THOMAS WESTLEY

**Saffron Ward**

ELLY CUTKELVIN  
WILLIAM SHELTON

**Belgrave Ward**

MAHENDRA VALAND

**Spinney Hills Ward**

MISBAH BATOOL  
MUSTAFA MALIK

**Braunstone Park and Rowley Fields**

SUE BARTON  
ELAINE HALFORD  
KULWINDER SINGH JOHAL

**Stoneygate Ward**

KIRK MASTER  
SHARMEN RAHMAN  
AMINUR THALUKDAR

**Castle Ward**

PATRICK JOSEPH KITTERICK

**Thurncourt Ward**

STEPHAN GEE

**Evington Ward**

DEEPAK BAJAJ  
SUE HUNTER  
SHAHID KHAN

**Troon Ward**

DIANE CANK

**Eyres Monsell Ward**

ELAINE PANTLING

**Westcotes Ward**

JACKY NANGREAVE  
SARAH RUSSELL

Fosse Ward

TED CASSIDY  
SUE WADDINGTON

Humberstone and Hamilton Ward

RUMA ALI  
DANIEL CREWE  
GURINDER SINGH SANDHU

Knighton Ward

MELLISA MARCH  
DR LYNN MOORE  
GEOFF WHITTLE

Western Ward

Wycliffe Ward

HANIF AQBANY

## **12. LORD MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

### Anniversary of Windrush

The Lord Mayor noted that it was Windrush day on 22<sup>nd</sup> June, which was an opportunity to recognise British Caribbean communities and acknowledge both the sacrifices and contributions the Windrush generation and their descendants had made to British society. He further noted that only in recent years, injustices which had been suffered by this community had been acknowledged with many perishing before they received justice.

The Lord Mayor asked those present to stand for a minute's silence in memory of those who have sadly passed from this community.

### Civic Events

The Lord Mayor noted that in the short time he had become Lord Mayor, he had been fortunate to attend a number of engagements.

Initially he had attended a number of events across the city to celebrate the Queen's Platinum Jubilee, including the lighting of the Jubilee Beacon held at the Space Centre, a celebration at the Seventh Day Adventist Church, jubilee tea parties and a special service at St Mary de Castro.

He noted he had been part of some interesting and unusual events, including the 100th anniversary flower show at St Edward the Confessor Catholic Church, he had collected the peppercorn rent from O'Neill's Public House at the Damask Rose Ceremony and enjoyed cultural celebrations with the Nepalese and Polish communities.

He noted it had been a privilege to join together with family, colleagues and friends to celebrate the life of former Chief Constable, Simon Cole.

On 19th June he had been present at the Town Hall when it was lit in red to mark World Sickle Cell Day.

Finally on 20 June he was honoured to mark the start of Armed Forces Week with the raising of the armed forces flag, followed by a very successful Armed Forces Day, which saw a parade of military personnel march through the city centre followed by the first open air service in Green Dragon Square.

### Honoured Citizen Scheme

The Lord Mayor commented that there were many people throughout the city who made a real difference to their local communities and the lives of others. He reminded Council of the Honoured Citizen Award Scheme. He explained that the scheme provided an opportunity to acknowledge significant contributions. He encouraged Council members to make a nomination for anyone who it was felt worthy of recognition and that information and nomination forms were available from the Member & Civic Team.

### Fire and Emergency Evacuation Procedure

The Lord Mayor reminded all those present of the fire evacuation procedures detailed on the agenda.

### **13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Lord Mayor invited Members to declare any interests they might have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Porter declared that he had signed a petition against the traffic measures in Evington.

### **14. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

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

That the minutes of the meetings of Council held, 23 February 2022 (Special Council Meeting), 23 February 2022 (Budget Council Meeting), 23 February 2022 (Council Meeting) and 19 May 2022 (Annual Council Meeting), copies having been circulated to each member of the council, be taken as read and that they each be approved as a correct record.

### **15. STATEMENTS BY THE CITY MAYOR/EXECUTIVE**

Queens Award for Voluntary Services

The City Mayor encouraged Members of Council to champion the work of voluntary groups in each of their wards. Outstanding examples of the work of these groups was celebrated through the Queen's Award for Voluntary Service. These awards were started in 2002 around the time of the Golden Jubilee and were said to be the equivalent of MBEs and were the highest awards given to voluntary groups. He noted that many voluntary groups in the city did fantastic work and members were encouraged to put them forward for a nomination. It was suggested that Members email the City Mayor's Office with any suggestions for nominations they may have.

### **16. PETITIONS**

#### **Petitions from members of the public**

Mr Shah Ali, presented a petition with 535 valid signatures in the following terms:-

"The Safer Streets Healthier Neighbourhood's scheme for Evington will reduce access to and from residents homes on Davenport Road, Greystone Avenue, Newhaven Road & Mickelton Road and force them to take longer journeys using busier, frequently congested and more dangerous roads/junctions which will greatly affect the families, elderly and working populace of the area while doing almost nothing to meet the schemes desired goals.

It will also force local traffic onto already congested/dangerous main roads. As well making the situation worse and putting the lives of these and other Leicester residents, many of who are likely to be friends and family of Evington / Goodwood residents, at risk and in the end actually lead to an increase in pollution.

All cars on the school run now will also be forced to find somewhere to turn around as they complete their drop off/pick up, putting pedestrians further at risk, in order to make their way back out of the schools area via the same route they arrived on. This will also again lead to their journeys being longer, more dangerous and polluting if they actually need to reach a different side of Evington / Goodwood.

The scheme will also restrict certain residents from using vehicles on their road completely during suggested peak times which will unfairly limit their way of life greatly, unless an agreement is reached with them that provides compensation.

To resolve school rat runs that occur twice a day on weekdays only local residents will be penalised 24 hours a day / 7 days a week.

The scheme does not appear to take into account the large number of essential workers (such as school teachers, medical centre employees, pharmacists, care home workers, domiciliary carers and grocery/takeaway shop staff) that need to travel in and out of Evington / Goodwood to perform their already difficult roles and who will experience significant problems due to the planned barriers being put in place on their regular journeys, making their roles even more challenging and untenable.

The scheme also stated it aimed to put the detailed measures in place every day of the week for the entire year despite schools being closed over weekends/holidays and residents having no serious issues with traffic at those times. The scheme was also designed without the input of the community, its implementation decided with no prior notice of the plans to the public and its communication was only supplied in English despite this being a second language for many of the local residents who would therefore struggle to understand the document and changes that would be severely impacting them.

In summary, the suggested road changes detailed in the scheme will actually cause an increase in pollution, lead to greater risks in public safety and needlessly cause great difficulties to Evington/Goodwood and Leicester residents in general if they are implemented so we urge the council not to proceed with them and instead look at discussing alternative options with the community.”

Mr Stephen Cooper, presented a petition with 560 valid signatures in the following terms:-

“WE, THE UNDERSIGNED, PETITION LEICESTER CITY COUNCIL to rescind IMMEDIATELY the traffic management measures that were introduced on 8<sup>th</sup> May 2022 and consult the residents openly about their objectives, the evidence that supported them, the impacts of those measures on residents and alternatives that may be equally or more effective.

We support the global need to reduce atmospheric pollution and reduce risks to local pedestrians and cyclists but argue that forcing non-ambulant residents to drive up to two miles further on each journey along already-busier roads is not appropriate, particularly in this period of high inflation.

We reported the “school run” traffic to and from the Harringworth Road entrance to Whitehall Primary School to the Council’s then Head of Traffic in about 1992. The new one-way traffic order on Gamel Road between its Davenport Road and Skampton Road junctions has forced all those vehicles to try to emerge onto Goodwood Road, which is already heavily congested at those times. This leads to substantial queues that also delay the Centrebus 54A services.

We know and have notified the Council’s Transport Strategy staff that Davenport Road has been used by Centrebus as an impromptu diversion route by both 54A and 22A service buses when their assigned routes have been obstructed. The proposed blockade on Davenport Road (withheld after residents’ protests on 8<sup>th</sup>



May) would preclude that option. We are concerned that its later introduction is likely to lead to the withdrawal of the 54A bus service from the Goodwood estate to the permanent detriment of alternative travel options for non-driving, infirm and elderly residents.

We are concerned that some of the historical traffic complaints received by the City Council may have been prompted by complainants' personal biases against the recently-opened Gamel Road Mosque and its congregations. We deprecate such attitudes and request that the Council's designs are focussed solely on effective, beneficial traffic measures."

Hannah Wakley, presented a petition with 214 valid signatures on a paper petition and supported by an electronic petition with 476 signatures in the following terms:-

"We ask that the City Council changes their policy and stops using pesticides in parks and green spaces. Pesticides such as glyphosate are known to be hazardous to human health. They persist in the soil for years and affect all wildlife, including bees. Weedkiller is currently being sprayed around trees, fence posts and rocks in Leicester's parks and green spaces. This is not necessary. Stopping this spraying would protect the people who use and maintain the parks and allow more wildlife habitat to develop."

#### **Petitions from Councillors**

No petitions were received from Councillors.

Under Council Procedure Rule 13a the aforementioned petitions will be referred to the Monitoring Officer for consideration and action as appropriate.

#### **Petitions to be debated**

The Monitoring Officer noted that under the terms of the Council's Petitions Scheme each petitioner had been invited to speak on their petition for a maximum of five minutes. This would be followed by a debate on the issues raised by the petition for a maximum of 15 minutes.

A petition was presented by Mr Rashid Thathyala with 1854 valid signatures and an e-petition with 22 signatures in the following terms:

"We the undersigned petition the Council to Residents demand the following safeguards before someone is killed: 1. A 20 mph speed limit along Hungarton Boulevard (LE5 1DF and 1HT) – in line with the amended speed limit in Humberstone Village; 2. Barriers along the bend to protect homes and keep residents safe when vehicles leave the road; and 3. Speed cameras to issue penalties to speeding drivers, acting as a deterrent and enforcing the speed limit."

Moved by Councillor Clarke, seconded by Councillor Russell and carried:-

That the petitioners be thanked for raising their concerns and ask that the Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission receive a report on the issues raised by the petition to consider what further safety measures can be put in place.

## **17. QUESTIONS**

The following questions were asked by Members of the Public.

### **1. Mr Alarakha Alimahomed**

“Regarding the program of safer healthier street, the council chose Devonport Road closure, one way system on Gamel Road, and Greystone Avenue, why did they not call a consultation meeting with presently residents effected instead posting letters and leaflet in letterboxes without the official channels in taking account the diversity of various racial residents who do not have the understanding of English language? This decision causes major disruption to the majority access just to satisfy few residents.”

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response noted that there were 11 questions in relation to the Evington Safer Streets Healthy Neighbourhood scheme and he would cover some details in the first response relevant to all questions. He noted that the Evington and other schemes were not chosen by accident, but had a history of concerns about rat running, speeding, poor air quality and health deprivation. The schemes were the result of an evidence based bid for government funding. The schemes were also experimental and based on feedback, they could be kept, amended or rejected.

The Council had gone above its legal obligations to consult on the scheme and had been comprehensive in doing so. Examples of the consultation included face to face, not simply letters or leaflets. There had been opinion surveys, a Traffic Regulation Order letter, 3 on-street roadshows, a residents meeting at City Hall and a commitment to having a resident’s forum as the experiment proceeded.

The Deputy City Mayor also noted that he was pleased that the Transport Team was diverse and could engage with residents in a range of languages at on-street consultation road shows. He also noted that leaflets were pictorial in nature in order to communicate with a wide range of people.

Mr Alimahomed asked a supplementary question. He felt health was the most important factor. He asked to consider the implications for a 96 year old woman who had to travel on a longer journey to her destination and he felt this was a health issue.

The Deputy City Mayor responded that all eventualities were considered as part of the scheme, particularly whether the benefits, health or otherwise, outweighed the disbenefits and this would be taken into account as a result of the experiment.

### **2. Mr Mohamed Osman**

“Can the council assure residents of Goodwood that they will stop implementing the unwanted road closures until a full consultation is carried out?”

It was noted that Mr Osman was not present at the meeting, but a response was still provided to the question.

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response said that details of the scheme had been widely promoted as noted in the answer to the previous question.

The Deputy City Mayor also however noted that there had been positive responses to the consultation and outlined some of these responses; one said that it will cause inconvenience but will cut out rat runs and make the streets safer; another said that they and other residents supported the scheme; another said that were pleased with what was being done to stop rat running; a further one said that they hoped it went ahead and lives would be improved.

### **3. Mr John Grimley**

“If the Davenport Road closure is implemented, it would result in one exit and entrance point; Spencefield Lane, for all those living at the top of Davenport Road, Oakside Close, Oakside Crescent, Beechwood Close and Sunnyfield Close.

Has the Council assessed the increased time it would take emergency services to have to access the area, due to this one exit/entry route and how residents and emergency services would access their homes, if works or an incident at the Spencefield Lane junction blocked that entrance/exit?”

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response stated that emergency services were consulted and did not object. The impact on other services such as waste was also considered.

Mr. Grimley asked a supplementary question. He noted the planters sited on Davenport Road and Spencefield Lane impacted residents who could be locked in or out and not accessible by the emergency services. He queried what the timescales would be for obtaining such access and whether the Council had taken this into account?

The Deputy City Mayor commented that he didn't have an answer on the specific detail but noted that there had been wide consultation on the scheme including speaking to emergency services who recognised the benefits outweighed the disbenefits. He also noted that this was an experiment at the current time and that strong research nationally backed up the claim that the benefits outweigh the disbenefits.

### **4. Mr Paul Brown**

“As many of you will already know, the Trades Council campaign to scrap the Workplace Parking Levy of which I am a part of, as been gaining more and more support over recent months. I am here to ask why a Labour City Council is proposing to tax workers £550 a year to park at work so they can give this money to private bus companies? It has now been four months since the second consultation on the proposed tax levy closed. During our campaign we have heard from a few Labour City Councillors that the decision as to whether the City Council goes ahead with taxing working class people to drive to work or whether they decide to scrap the regressive levy will take place after a forthcoming internal debate within the Labour Group. I therefore wanted to ask the date when this meeting is scheduled to take place, so that the public and the trade union movement can encourage our local Councillors to back the dominant view held by the city's trade union movement in calling for the City Council to scrap the proposed levy?”

The City Mayor in response stated that the Labour Party manifesto for the last local elections, which was agreed with the wider Labour Party, committed to consulting on a Workplace Parking Levy. This commitment on which Labour members were elected had been kept. The issues which Mr Brown raised along with other

respondents, both for and against were being analysed by officers. There were approximately 4,000 responses which raised 20,000 separate points. It was intended to publish the outcome of the consultation in early Autumn and there would be consultation with unions and stakeholders at that point.

Mr Brown asked a supplementary question. He asked the City Mayor if he would meet with unions to discuss their concerns.

The City Mayor responded that he would meet with trade unions, as he had done already and had given a firm commitment to do so before any final decision was taken.

## **5. Mr Sam Randfield**

“When (i.e. on which date) will the Council formally report the outcome of the public consultation on the Workplace Parking Levy, and the associated decision on whether the scheme will proceed?”

The City Mayor in response said that officers were hoping to bring a report forward on the consultation in late Summer / early Autumn. He further noted that there were many stages to go through such as full Council and Secretary of State approval before a levy could be introduced, so there would be at least a further 12 months if was to be introduced. There would be plenty of time for full discussion of the consultation report.

Mr Randfield asked a supplementary question. Could the City Mayor explain what was taking so long?

The City Mayor in response stated that 4,000 responses which raised over 20,000 points would take officers, some of whom were union members, some to analyse the responses, particularly to do it properly and be seen to do it properly and not rush to judgement.

## **6. Mr Nizamuddin Patel**

“Since the Safer safety road measures were put in place in the Goodwood estate, it has led to an uncontrollable amount of traffic at the Gamel Road/Skampton Road intersection. This traffic happens usually around the school rush times i.e. 8am-8:45am and 2:45pm-3:30pm. Skampton Road from the Bungalows till Goodwood Crescent is extremely dangerous to drive on, even at 10mph, due to the curves of the roads and the parked cars. It is very hard to see oncoming cars let alone school children crossing. The increase in traffic due to the new traffic measures only adds to this problem of child road safety.

Did the council take into account the traffic of Whitehall School and the school children when they developed their new traffic measures?”

It was noted that Mr Patel was not present at the meeting, but a response was still provided to the question.

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response said that schools were a key factor in developing the proposals for the scheme. The observations in the question were welcomed and the situation would be monitored. It was noted that as with any change, there was likely to be displacement, but it would take time to settle down. The purpose of the experimental phase was to make judgements about what

elements of the scheme would work and adjust accordingly.

#### **7. Mr Stephen Cooper**

“Please supply a complete list of the Council’s performance criteria for the Goodwood Safer Streets, Healthier Neighbourhood scheme, including background reports (such as EIA’s, TIA’s, Traffic Impact Reports, Flow data, Telematics data, Speed data, Accident data) and all supporting evidence that prompted the measures, their technical and social objectives, including the procedural and financial standards that the Council must fulfil to qualify for the Government funding?”

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response said that the Council would respond to any appropriate request for information. Key information would be included in the post experiment report.

Mr Cooper asked a supplementary question. What criteria would the Council use to determine that the project had failed?

The Deputy City Mayor responded that public opinion would be key. However, he felt that concerns were usually allayed and examples from other parts of the country showed that residents were happy for schemes to continue.

#### **8. Mr Asif Mitha**

“Please provide the Council’s evidence of public support for the traffic restrictions in the Goodwood estate; including the numbers of individual complainants for each problem that the scheme is intended to address set out chronologically within either calendar or financial years?”

The City Mayor in response said that there had been a number of pressures put on the Council to make changes in the area, some from ward councillors particularly in 2017, and petitions in 2014 and 2015 demanding that issues be addressed. He was also aware that bus services on Gamel road had been impacted. There had generally been a consistent message over a number of years. The City Mayor also noted that historically, low traffic neighbourhood schemes had been introduced in other parts of the city, such as Clarendon Park and South Highfields where no one was now mentioning removing these measures now due to the rat running which had been prevented.

Mr Mitha asked a supplementary question. He asked that the numbers of complaints be provided? He commented that it was said that people supported the change but petitions against the scheme had measured 1200 in total and there was only evidence that 61 houses supported the scheme.

The City Mayor in response stated that the views of residents put forward via ward councillors in 2017 and 2014/15 were not un-representative. There would be an opportunity for residents to express their views at the end of the experiment. Examples from other areas had shown that the changes were appreciated due to the improvements in safety.

#### **9. Mr Shah Hussain Ali**

“The Council has used the term consultation and engagement interchangeably- Could the Council explain how they consider the consultation/engagement related

to the Goodwood SSHN scheme to be effective and accurate when they have overlooked entire roads and areas, failed to provide communication in alternative languages, had a very low response rate to online survey, are referring to consultation with residents from 7-8 years ago and are now failing to respond to feedback emails to the address they are promoting to residents?”

The Lord Mayor intervened to ask Mr Ali to ask to his submitted question and not deviate.

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response said that he had already given details about the various elements of consultation, such as 6000 items delivered to over 1000 houses, opinion surveys and officers speaking to residents in non-English languages. The Deputy City Mayor also described how he had visited shops, talked to residents, attended a community meeting where people had been urging him to take action. He also reflected upon the efforts of former Councillor Ratilal Govind who had campaigned to take these measures forward on behalf of residents. The Deputy City Mayor asked residents to work with the Council to make the community as safe and healthy as possible.

Mr Ali asked a supplementary question. He commented that he felt it was disrespectful to bring up the name of a deceased Councillor. He noted that within the last 7 years, 2000 houses within the area had been sold within a mile of Davenport Road and he felt it was wrong to refer to statistics from 7 years ago.

The Deputy City Mayor in response stated that he reached out to residents at this meeting, reached out in email and had attended meetings.

#### **10. Mr Mohamed Salim Laher**

“As the main organisations impacted by both the one-way system and revised location of the planters on Davenport Road, how did the Council consult with the businesses on Gamel Road, the Mosque and Whitehall Primary School users, and how were the outcomes of this consultation and subsequent feedback used to inform the traffic measures?”

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response confirmed that officers did engage businesses, the Mosque and Whitehall Primary school. Ward Councillors had visited shops and talked people through the trial. He further noted that the consultation had not ended and there was a commitment to make improvements.

Mr Laher asked a supplementary question. He referred to multiple references to consultation with residents, but asked what the Deputy City Mayor defined as consultation? He felt that there had only been a letter written to Whitehall primary school and only a letter sent to the mosque. He didn't feel that this represented consultation, as consultation was speaking to people.

The Deputy City Mayor responded that the Council had gone over and above what was legally required.

At this point Mr Laher questioned the validity of the responses he received. The Lord Mayor intervened to advise Mr Laher of the process regarding questions, which guaranteed a response, but not necessarily the one which was liked.

#### **11. Mr Grahame White**

“In this period of high inflation, particularly of retail fuel prices, does the Council still believe that residents wilfully drive if they can use cheaper alternatives? Has the Council considered the impact on non-ambulant residents, deliveries, essential services and emergency services of having to travel, on average, 1½ miles further on each journey to and from the same location?”

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response stated that impacts have been considered and would be better understood after the trial period. The changes would improve facilities for walking, cycling and there should be less traffic.

Mr Whike asked a supplementary question. He said there were reasons why residents didn't want Davenport Road blocked, and he felt the restrictions were put on at 5am in the morning. He asked if the Council agreed that current restrictions were not suitable and that alternative measures should be found which didn't impose walking and cycling on residents?

The Deputy City Mayor in response stated that it was not the universal view of the community that the measures were wrong. He noted that it was an experimental Traffic Regulation Order which could be amended if necessary.

## **12. Mr Ismail Patel**

“Several residents on the estate distinguish between "rat-run" motorists and those on school runs. There are definite traffic peaks along Westmeath Avenue, Withcote Avenue and Davenport Road on term-time weekdays between about 08:15 and 08:45 and in the reverse direction from about 15:15 to 15:45. Outside those brief surges, those roads are usually quiet. These observations tend to negate the claim that Davenport Road is used as a "rat-run" between Spencefield Lane and Goodwood Road in either direction. We think the installation of the speed cushions along Davenport Road in 2018 and the blanket 20mph speed limit on the estate have already stopped satnav systems recommending it as a time-saving route. "On 24th June 2022, the City Council deployed pneumatic traffic counters on Davenport Road outside 98/105 and Westmeath Avenue where its width reduces, with what appear to be vehicle speed recorders. There was a similar installation on the same section of Davenport Road during the last week of July and early August 2021. That was during the schools' summer holidays: now is term-time. What were the results of those traffic surveys and what was the original reason for choosing to close the Greystone Avenue/Uppingham Road junction?”

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response firstly stated that there was an error in the question as Greystone Road was not closed. He then stated that this package of measures had arisen following complaints by residents. Some residents may distinguish between rat-running and the school run, but many don't. Data would be collated and analysed and there would be a report after the trial.

Mr Patel asked a supplementary question regarding additional travel for residents of Westmeath Avenue who had to travel to Highfields out of the area, there was lots of waiting time on Wicklow Drive which he felt was a dangerous situation. He queried what was being done for the safety of the junction at Greystone Avenue / Uppingham Road.

The Deputy City Mayor responded by stating that the removal of the roundabout had helped safety. He appreciated that there would be some inconvenience but felt that there needed to be a balanced judgement between the improvements and the

disbenefits, but noted that residents had been asking for these changes, up until the current time.

### **13. Mr Anthony Groom**

“Re Experimental Traffic Order 2022 (TME 2979) Modification (No. 1) Order 2022, can you please advise if in the planning to block Davenport Road, restrict access to Greystone Avenue and make Gamel Road one way for traffic from Davenport Road to Skampton Road that the impact on the increased distances that will need to be travelled by the emergency services, refuse collectors, care workers, delivery drivers, postal workers and residents who need to travel in the area has been considered fully.”

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response stated that all emergency services were consulted on the scheme and there were no objections. He also stated that one of the aims of the scheme was to remove unnecessary traffic. He noted that when such schemes were brought forward there tended to be objections at the time, but after time, people didn't want to remove the changes. He noted examples such as there being no requests for Jubilee Square to be returned to a car park and no requests for the return of the Belgrave Flyover. He felt that decisions were being taken now for the good of the economy and meeting the challenge of the climate emergency.

Mr Groom asked a supplementary question about impacts being considered, particularly on Uppingham Road and others.

The Deputy City Mayor responded that all impacts would be considered.

### **The following questions were asked by Councillors**

#### **1. Councillor Waddington**

“In March 2022 I asked if the Woodgate Foodbank could use one of the Fosse Neighbourhood Centre's two annexes which have both stood vacant for several years, as a base for the foodbank activities, which are now serving hundreds of City residents, but I have not yet received an answer. Could you please tell me how and when this matter will be resolved?”

The City Mayor in response stated that he was very impressed by the work being done at the foodbank but noted that the current premises were not appropriate and had issues like broken windows and poor heating. He noted that discussions would take place with the foodbank organisers and ward councillors about other venues and the way forward, and it may be possible to use one of the annexes at the Fosse Neighbourhood Centre, but minor works would be needed.

Councillor Waddington asked a supplementary question. She thanked the City Mayor for his appreciation of the work done by the food bank. She was unsure of the answer given in relation to alternative accommodation, but noted that the foodbank wanted to move to the Fosse Neighbourhood Centre annex and felt it would be helpful to know if this could happen and when?

The City Mayor in response stated that it was understandable that the foodbank was unhappy where they were as it was not suitable. It may be possible to make improvements to that building, but they may want to move. He stressed that it was imperative that they move before winter if doing so and he would seek to make this



happen in a prompt manner.

## **2. Councillor Waddington**

“The Fosse Neighbourhood Centre has the potential to meet a range of community needs and be an asset to the neighbourhood. However almost the only part of the spacious building that being used by residents is the library. Does the Mayor agree that the Council should draw up a plan as soon as possible, to revitalise the building with the aim that it fulfils its potential to be an asset to the community in an area of the City which has few other Council amenities?”

The City Mayor in response said he agreed and that he had asked the Estates and Building Services section of the Council to undertake an Asset Development Review to see what the constraints / opportunities were for the building. He noted it was a classic ‘board’ school style with a big hall in the middle and it would be a shame to partition this up. He noted that there had been some community uses in the building and other uses could be considered. He felt that the Linwood workshops in the Saffron area of the city could provide a model to follow. He undertook to discuss the review with ward councillors.

Councillor Waddington asked a supplementary question. She was pleased that a report was being commissioned on the building and looked forward to discussions. She did however express concern that the report would take time and feared that the building was being run down. She noted that a request from Remit to undertake music lessons in the building was turned down. She asked that the City Mayor give assurance that the building would stay open?

The City Mayor in response gave assurance that the building would stay open. He asked officers about the situation regarding Remit and it was their view that they were well established elsewhere, but was happy for it to be explored for them to use an annex if needed.

## **3. Councillor Bajaj**

“Weekends in summers are traditionally a time when local parks are very well used for outdoor sports, picnic, walks etc. Sadly, the amount of litter left over afterwards is absolutely horrendous. Food waste, broken glass, plastic everywhere. Making the parks a hazard for other park users.

Can city wardens be allocated to certain parks during summer come on is there any plans of putting extra provision to tackle this problem.”

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Singh Clair in response stated that widespread littering was not a problem suffered year all round, but when parks were well used. He had discussed this matter with Cllr Clarke as it also related to his portfolio. He noted that this time of year, along with freedoms arising from the end of Covid restriction and the return of large events / gatherings meant greater use of the parks and open spaces. Parks Services had significant resources and volunteers to ensure that parks and open spaces were safe to use. Time was also spent on education and work with park users to encourage them to take responsibility for their use of parks. He noted that despite these efforts there were still problems and evidence was collected and prosecutions undertaken where possible. He also noted that the best solution was for people to use bins or their litter home.

Councillor Bajaj asked a supplementary question. He felt that people weren't using bins or taking litter home. He noted that he went out with some volunteers who had collected 14 bags of rubbish. He also noted that dog walkers had problems with dogs picking up chicken bones. He suggested some guidelines for park users, more wardens during the summer and notices be put up.

The Deputy City Mayor commented that the parks and open spaces had good advisory signage, there was cleansing team in operation and Biffa took rubbish away. He noted that he had joined a park neighbourhood group and encouraged others to do that. He further noted that there were over 3000 acres of park which amounted to 22% of the city area. There were 7 full time dedicated cleaners and a Park Rangers team. He urged Councillor Bajaj and other councillors to report any 'hotspot' problem areas to officers and copy him in.

#### **4. Councillor Rae Bhatia**

"Residents of Beaumont Leys ward have been experiencing some severe challenges due to parking issues in and around Beaumont Park Football Club, especially on the busy match days. The site is quite popular and is managed by DMU. Their management team have been engaged and are doing their best within the confines of the area they manage, but it is largely the inappropriate overflow parking on to footpaths blocking access to wheelchair and pushchair users, as well as parking on both sides of Bennion Road and on the grass verges thus making it extremely narrow and dangerous for other road users and local residents living in the vicinity. Highways are fully aware. Therefore, can the Deputy Mayor please advise what action is being considered in this regard, and can he also give an assurance that appropriate traffic management options will be assessed and implemented as necessary to resolve the issue? Thank you."

Deputy City Mayor, Councillor Clarke in response said that he appreciated the issues that were raised and noted that it had been raised with Highways. They visited the location on 4<sup>th</sup> June but there were no cars which required a penalty notice at the time. He felt that there were unlikely to be any issues until the new academic year and it could be considered in more detail at that point, in consultation with Councillor Rae Bhatia.

#### **5. Councillor Porter**

"Over the last four years how many businesses have gone under that had previously received grants or loans from the council?"

The City Mayor in response said that the Council had administered millions of pounds of support grants during this time, which followed relevant government and other funding sources rules. Details weren't retained about which businesses failed, but some clearly did fail and some succeeded.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question. He noted that the Council had previously said that some businesses needed support grants to be viable, but they went bust anyway despite receiving the grant. He felt that it was interesting that Council did not have this data and suggested that the Council had a duty to find out what was going wrong and consider where it was best to provide taxpayers money, to those businesses which would succeed.

The City Mayor in response stated that grants were administered on behalf of central government in accordance with their rules. The grants have propped up

some businesses which succeeded and others failed. He felt that this would be a similar picture across the country.

## **6. Councillor Porter.**

“How many council owned dwellings are unoccupied?”

Assistant City Mayor, Councillor Cutkelvin in response stated that the Council currently owned around 19,000 properties of which 410 were empty which represented 2% of stock.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question. He noted that during the pandemic there were problems getting houses refurbished and there were 500 hundred empty homes which resulted in an average of £2,400 in lost rent per home at a total of £1.2m. He felt that this was a significant loss of income and queried what was being done to reduce the number of unoccupied properties?

The Assistant City Mayor in response stated that regular briefings on this matter were taken to scrutiny. It was felt that loss of rent wasn't the primary concern, but the need to get people living in the homes. It was felt that everything possible was being done to bring homes back into use as soon as possible, but there were some issues around recruitment and the pandemic stopped a number of services.

## **7. Councillor Porter**

“In the local plan adopted in 2006, 3500 dwellings were to be built in Ashton Green- to date how many houses have been built in Ashton Green?”

The City Mayor in response stated that the promise made in 2006 was under the Conservative and Liberal Democrat administration, but felt that there were no realistic plans to be able to deliver that promise. He stated that there were only realistic plans developed after he was elected. It was noted that there were 407 homes now occupied or under construction with a further 380 due to be delivered, with more to be delivered over the years ahead.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question. He felt that it was realistic to deliver the original number of dwellings otherwise it wouldn't have been included in the Local Plan. He felt that the current number of houses delivered was too low as these plans had been in place for 20 years and he felt this was poor. He asked what was being done to deliver the original figure?

The City Mayor in response stated that the Council was delivering homes which were good quality and desperately needed and this was in contrast to what was delivered under the Liberal Democrat and Conservative administration.

## **8. Councillor Porter**

“Since 2017 how many houses has the council purchased in the open market and what's the total cost been?”

Assistant City Mayor, Councillor Cutkelvin in response said that 609 homes had been purchased with a further 33 having had offers accepted. This was at a cost of £78m, an average of £121,000 per home which was half the cost of 2-3 bedroom homes if the Council built them.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question. He doubted the assertion that purchasing homes was half the cost of building them. He queried whether there was any evidence that the Council purchasing homes on the open market at inflated prices.

The Assistant City Mayor in response, felt that the purchase of 609 properties had made no difference to house prices in the city.

**9. Councillor Porter**

“What number of those properties had at some time previously been council properties?”

Assistant City Mayor, Councillor Cutkelvin in response stated that out of the 609 purchased by the Council, 357 had previously been owned by the Council.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question. He felt that this was a large number of properties purchased within the local property market. He said that he had evidence that the price the Council paid for properties was 20% above the market rate. He requested that if the Council continued to buy properties, they should pay the correct market value and not get ripped off.

The Assistant City Mayor in response stated that prices were checked and independent valuations were sought. She stated that the prices paid were reasonable open market prices.

**10. Councillor Porter**

“How much taxpayers cash did the council lend to Haymarket Consortium Ltd and how much of that money is still in the hands of Haymarket Consortium Ltd?”

The City Mayor in response said that he was surprised by this question as these details were reported to the Overview Select Committee last year when Councillor Porter was in attendance. The loan made was £600,000 and the company concerned had now gone into liquidation.

Councillor Porter asked a supplementary question. He felt that the City Mayor should have a keen eye on the Council’s finances and queried whether the consortium had actually gone into liquidation.

The City Mayor in response stated that the consortium had ceased trading and had not published accounts, which they were legally bound to do. It wasn’t clear what residual assets they may have and when they do publish the accounts, officers will closely examine them. The City Mayor also commented, in relation to theatres in the city, that the cost of Curve had risen dramatically under the Liberal Democrat / Conservative administration.

**18. DISCRETIONARY LICENSING POLICY**

Moved by Assistant City Mayor, Councillor Cutkelvin, seconded by Councillor Westley and carried:

- a) That Selective Licensing schemes in the targeted areas (Option A in the report, read in conjunction with appendix B, Maps covering selective designations and street names) be supported and should be introduced with effect from 10<sup>th</sup>

October 2022 (See 4.1.10 of the report.) The designated areas were identified both in the business case and during the consultation as the areas most acutely impacted by the proliferation of the private rented sector in Leicester.

- b) As the principle of Additional Licensing citywide (Option B in the report) is favoured, that this be revisited once Option A is embedded and there is further evidence of the success of licensing in raising standards in the sector. This will also allow time for any impact of the potential extension of the Article 4 directive to have been realised.
- c) That the proposed fees, discounts and penalties identified in Section 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3 (and outlined in the report) be approved.

## **19. MEMBERS CODE OF CONDUCT**

Moved by Councillor Barton, seconded by Councillor Cank and carried:

That consideration of the Code of Conduct report be deferred to the September meeting of full Council.

## **20. EXECUTIVE AND COMMITTEES**

There was no Executive or committees business.

## **21. NOTICE OF MOTION**

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

As a major employer, and investor in local, regional, and national supply chains, this council recognises that, far too often, exploitative, unscrupulous, and abusive employment practices exist. This Council condemns those practices and is committed to rooting them out.

As part of its determination to tackle modern day slavery, this Council adopts the following cooperative charter which sets out strategies for more rigorous supply chain management and reporting processes.

Whilst recognising the action already being taken, Leicester City Council will:-

1. Train its corporate procurement team to understand modern slavery through the Chartered Institute of Procurement and Supply's (CIPS) online course on Ethical Procurement and Supply.
2. Require its contractors to comply fully with the Modern Slavery Act 2015, wherever it applies, with contract termination as a potential sanction for non-compliance.
3. Challenge any abnormally low-cost tenders to ensure they do not rely upon the potential contractor practising modern slavery.
4. Highlight to its suppliers that contracted workers are free to join a trade union and are not to be treated unfairly for belonging to one.
5. Publicise its whistle-blowing system for staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
6. Require its tendered contractors to adopt a whistle-blowing policy which enables their staff to blow the whistle on any suspected examples of modern slavery.
7. Review its contractual spending regularly to identify any potential issues with

modern slavery.

8. Highlight for its suppliers any risks identified concerning modern slavery and refer them to the relevant agencies to be addressed.
9. Refer for investigation via the National Crime Agency's national referral mechanism any of its contractors identified as a cause for concern regarding modern slavery.
10. Report publicly on the implementation of this policy annually.

**22. DATE FOR ADDITIONAL COUNCIL MEETING**

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

That Council approve a Council meeting on 22 February 2023 to follow on the from the Budget Council meeting.

**23. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

There being no other business, the Lord Mayor declared the meeting closed at 8:09pm.