



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, CULTURE AND TOURISM SCRUTINY  
COMMISSION

Held: WEDNESDAY, 16 JANUARY 2013 at 5.30pm

P R E S E N T:

Councillor Waddington (Chair)  
Councillor Bhatti (Vice Chair)

Councillor Bhavsar  
Councillor Chaplin  
Councillor Cassidy  
Councillor Porter  
Councillor Shelton

In attendance:

Sir Peter Soulsby – City Mayor  
Councillor Westley (for item 65)

\* \* \* \* \*

**57. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Dr. Chowdhury and Councillor Naylor.

**58. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members were asked to declare any disclosable pecuniary or other interests they may have in the business on the agenda.

Councillor Cassidy declared an Other Disclosable Interest as he was a Board Member of the Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership.

Councillor Chaplin declared an Other Disclosable Interest as her daughter worked at De Montfort Hall, though no monetary gain was received by Councillor Chaplin.

Councillor Shelton declared an Other Disclosable Interest as he was a Director at Phoenix Square and also a representative for Leicester City Council, though he approached the meeting with an open mind.

In accordance with the Council's new Code of Conduct the interests were not

considered so significant that they were likely to prejudice Councillor's judgement of the public interest. Members were, therefore, not required to withdraw from the meeting during discussion of the business on the agenda.

**59. MINUTES OF THE JOINT HERITAGE, LEISURE AND SPORT / ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT, CULTURE AND TOURISM SCRUTINY COMMISSIONS**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the joint meeting of the Heritage, Leisure and Sport Scrutiny Commission and Economic Development, Culture and Tourism Scrutiny Commission held on 14 November 2012 be agreed as a correct record.

**60. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

This item was deferred.

**61. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS OR STATEMENTS OF CASE**

There were no Questions, Representations or Statements of Case.

**62. PETITIONS**

There were no Petitions.

**63. THE LEICESTER AND LEICESTERSHIRE ENTERPRISE PARTNERSHIP - ECONOMIC GROWTH PLAN 2012 - 2020**

Mr Andrew Bacon, Chair of LLEP (Leicester and Leicestershire Enterprise Partnership) and Mr Mandip Rai, Head of LLEP were welcomed to the meeting.

Mr Rai gave a presentation on the Economic Growth Plan, copies of which had been circulated to Commission members.

The presentation included the background to LLEP and it was noted that LEPs had been introduced by Government through the Localism Act and that the LLEP was one of 39 national LEPs formally recognised by the Government.

The Commission were informed of the partnership roles between business, local authorities, higher education and further education. And the role of the LEP to lead economic growth was highlighted. It was noted that this was achieved by engaging with business, local authorities, and the voluntary sector with a view to influencing Government economic policy including national contracts and facilitating local partnership working and relations with Government. The investing of LLEP funding and aligning partner resources to achieve economic growth was discussed and the Commission were informed of the following key achievements

- Significant private sector engagement (7,000 businesses)
- Successful EZ bid for MIRA Technology Park

- £25m RGF secured through Rounds 1 & 2
- £8m RGF Round 3 – SME Support Programme
- Growing Places Fund - £13.4m
- Pinch Point Programme funding Tranche 1 and 2 (M1 / A50)
- Asset Assisted Purchase Scheme - £5.5m lending and 75 direct jobs
- LEP Start Up, Capacity Fund, Core Funding and GTF
- Better Business for All (BBfA) - national pilot
- Higher Apprenticeship Fund – 140 apprenticeships
- UK Skills Show – over 2,500 visitors
- Inward Investment – Open for Business / UKTI / MIPIM 2013

Mr Rai drew the Commission's attention to the importance of joint working and referred to a venn diagram showing the links between City, District and County leadership with private sector leadership. In this regard the area based priorities, sector based priorities and LLEP priorities were described and the requirement for a co-ordinated approach was highlighted.

In respect of the future ambition of the LLEP it was reported that by 2020 it was envisaged that 25,000 private sector jobs would be created, £2b of private sector investment would be secured and the GVA would be increased by £4b to £23b.

The strategic objectives to match skills supply with demand, increase availability of employment land & infrastructure, promote enterprise growth and investment, and to match available capital to enterprise growth were referred to and the aims of the LLEP were listed, which described how each of these four strategic objectives would be met.

Mr Rai was thanked for his presentation and for addressing the Commission.

Mr Rai and Mr Bacon invited questions and comments from Commission members.

Commission members referred to the joint working arrangements and it was considered that a clearer understanding of the role in building partnerships was required. The City Mayor's Action Plan and the link to the City Deal initiative was referred to as examples of the need for such greater clarity, it being noted that the method and process for feeding in information, initiatives and ideas to the work of the LLEP were not always clear, particularly relating to property and land negotiations.

The requirement to develop intelligence around skills was highlighted as a principle area of work by Commission members and the LLEP were encouraged to increase their work in developing this area of their strategy. Having regard to the design skills sector it was reported that there had been a significant increase in design and manufacturing opportunities and the Commission welcomed the LLEP's approach in this area.

Having regard to the equal working opportunity statements within the Growth Plan, the Commission referred to the omission of women workers and further to

the engagement of young people, particularly those aged 19 to 24 years who were in need of employment opportunities. The Commission expressed a view that the support and advice for those younger people should be increased to ensure their engagement and to increase their opportunity of finding work.

The LLEP were encouraged to enhance their contact with the council in view of the opportunities to assist with achieving targets against performance indicators and to increase advocacy arrangements. The possible link to the Leicester to Work initiative was reported and it was suggested that greater joint working could be undertaken to assist the delivery of that initiative.

The Chair thanked Mr Rai and Mr Bacon for their attendance and requested that they attend a future meeting to update the Commission on their achievements in due course.

#### **64. ECONOMIC IMPACT OF AUDIENCE EXPENDITURE BY VENUE**

Mr Chris Maughan, De Montfort University, was welcomed to the meeting.

Mr Maughan gave a presentation on the economic impact of the review of grants to the major city arts venues including the process of measuring economic impact and its application to previous research.

It was reported that the context for the report was to achieve the following overall aims of the research:

- To complement knowledge and understanding evidenced in the scene setting paper following the report by the Director of Culture and Neighbourhood Services dated 12 September 2012
- To engage with each organisation in order to develop an understanding for each of their recent performance – programme and management
- To gauge what levels of support the three organisations enjoy, in particular from the public, the public sector and the private sector, in return for the programmes of work and additional services that they offer.
- To integrate these and other perspectives into an examination of their collective and individual contribution to the cultural life of the city – their ‘value for money’.
- To provide recommendations to the council and to the management of each organisation, based on the outcomes of the research, on how they might deliver increased value for money.

In respect of the research findings, financial charts showing income and expenditure, performance over time, learning & participation data and the leverage of additional income were also submitted.

Mr Maughan also stated that the economic impact of audience expenditure and the audience perspective of spending, together with the business perspective, had been analysed as part of the research. The process for measuring the economic impact was also described within the presentation.

In view of the data collated the following observations were submitted for

comment:

- Audience expenditure had contributed to the local economy.
- Of the 'out of venue' expenditure impact in the city 64% was derived from non-city residents.
- Developing the strength of the 'tourism' offer should increase the long term economic impact.

In discussing the above data the Commission accepted the need to undertake research to identify the nature of the offer to which the non-city audience will respond.

Business leaders had also been asked to provide an assessment of the value and benefit of each venue to the city, and their attitude generally to public expenditure on the arts. Information showing the respective data collected was discussed.

In concluding the presentation Mr Maughan asked the Commission to note that the Corporate Plans for the venues needed to include as part of their strategy for developing audiences, actions that would develop the wider 'tourism' offer for the county and 'non LE' audiences.

It was reported and accepted that that this planning process would need to show how the synergies they share with others in their operations and audience could be exploited as part of developing that offer. It was noted that the relationship with the business sector had great potential but that it required more attention, in order to develop the synergies around tourism packages. In light of the current financial pressures, it was also considered this depth and form of evaluation should be completed by all in the cultural sector in due course.

Mr Maughan was thanked for his presentation.

The Commission noted the detailed information and data submitted in support of the review and the Chair reminded members that the Commission had previously adopted specific recommendations related to this topic.

## **65. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

### **CALL-IN OF CITY MAYOR'S DECISION – GYPSY AND TRAVELLER SITES IN AND AROUND LEICESTER**

The Chair approved the above item as Urgent Business by virtue of Council Procedure Rule 12 (f) under which the call-in required referral to the relevant Scrutiny Commission prior to its onward referral to Council .

The Director Planning, Transportation and Economic Development presented a report advising that the Call-in had been made on the grounds that "the residents of Beaumont Leys and Abbey Wards have raised a number of concerns that leads us to believe that the decision should be reconsidered".

The Commission referred to the report and appendices which included the detailed previous assessments of all sites considered together with a plan of those sites, the previous report to the Commission and the Executive Decision Report and appendices, and the City Mayor's full record of the decision.

The City Mayor was invited to address the Commission. He reminded members of the due process that had been undertaken and particularly referred to options considered to deal with the high number of unauthorised encampments in the city in recent years, and to the identified need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation to comply with Government Guidance.

The City Mayor also referred to the extensive public consultation exercise that had been undertaken between February and July 2012 and the analysis arising from that consultation. He commented that in addition to the Officer recommendations arising from the consultation exercise, it was clear that the views of this Scrutiny Commission had been taken on board.

In order to clarify the reason for the Call-in the City Mayor commented that although the views of the ward members were understood, he did not consider that any new evidence had been forthcoming since the conclusion of the consultation exercise and previous scrutiny undertaken by the Commission.

The Chair invited Councillor Westley to address the Commission as one of the ward members calling in the decision.

Councillor Westley explained that although the need for Gypsy and Traveller accommodation had been identified and realised, residents of Beaumont Leys and Abbey Wards had raised concerns principally on traffic infrastructure grounds. Councillor Westley advised that more information on those concerns would be raised in the debate at Council on 24 January 2013.

In conclusion and in summary the Chair referred to the previous work of the Commission concerning the issue and reminded members of the referral of the report to Council in accordance with Council Procedure Rules.

Councillor Waddington MOVED and Councillor Bhatti SECONDED:  
"that the City Mayor's decision in respect of Gypsy and Traveller sites in and around Leicester be supported".

On being put to the vote the motion was carried.

RESOLVED:

that the City Mayor's decision in respect of Gypsy and Traveller sites in and around Leicester be supported.

## **66. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 7.55 pm.

