



Leicester  
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the  
OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE

Held: THURSDAY, 2 FEBRUARY 2017 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T :

Councillor Singh (Chair)  
Councillor Malik (Vice Chair)

Councillor Bajaj  
Councillor Cleaver  
Councillor Cutkelvin

Councillor Dempster  
Councillor Grant  
Councillor Khote

Councillor Dr Moore  
Councillor Newcombe  
Councillor Porter

Also present:

Sir Peter Soulsby  
Councillor Kirk Master

City Mayor  
Assistant City Mayor - Neighbourhood  
Services

\* \* \* \* \*

**72. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

There were no apologies for absence.

**73. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

No declarations of interest were made.

**74. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS**

The Chair made no announcements.

**75. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

AGREED:

that the minutes of the meeting of the Overview Select Committee held 13 December 2016 be confirmed as a correct record.

Councillor Porter entered the meeting during Item 9, Questions for the City Mayor, and requested an amendment to the above minutes. The Chair stated that although the minutes had been agreed, an amendment could be made as follows:

Minute item 57: The Police and Crime Commissioner

To add the following text to the minute:

*Councillor Porter asked a question about the decriminalisation of drugs and Lord Bach responded that he thought the possession of cannabis was now effectively decriminalised.*

## **76. PROGRESS ON ACTIONS AGREED AT THE LAST MEETING**

The Chair updated Members on progress on the actions agreed at the previous meeting of the Overview Select Committee. Updates included the following:

- For the Chair to write to the Police and Crime Commissioner setting out the views of the Committee on his policing plan proposals – this had been actioned.
- For the City Mayor to talk to the Assistant City Mayor for Jobs and Skills about the Council's procurement process – The Chair believed that the City Mayor's office would facilitate this.
- For the City Mayor's Office to ask for mobile CCTV Pod Cameras to be included in the general review of the City's CCTV Cameras – the City Mayor confirmed that these would be included in that review.

## **77. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE**

The Monitoring Officer reported that no Questions, Representations or Statements of Case had been received.

## **78. PETITIONS**

The Monitoring Officer reported that no petitions had been received.

## **79. TRACKING OF PETITIONS - MONITORING REPORT**

Members were asked to consider the Tracking of Petitions Monitoring Report and agree to remove those petitions marked 'Petitions Process Complete from the report.

Members noted the current position and Councillor Dempster thanked officers from Transport and Highways for the progress they had made on the petitions that had been submitted to their department.

AGREED:

- 1) that the report be noted; and
- 2) that those petitions marked 'Petitions Process Complete' namely 11/07/2016, 13/08/2016, 16/09/2016, 03/10/2016, 03/10/2016, 17/11/2016 and 22/09/2016 be removed from the Monitoring Report.

Action	By
To remove those petitions marked 'Petitions Process Complete' namely 11/07/2016, 13/08/2016, 16/09/2016, 03/10/2016, 03/10/2016, 17/11/2016 and 22/09/2016 from the Monitoring Report.	The Democratic Support Officer

## 80. QUESTIONS FOR THE CITY MAYOR

Members of the Committee were invited to raise questions for the City Mayor:

### **Rutland Street / Granby Street Junction**

Councillor Newcombe said that he had expressed concerns at the previous meeting of the Committee about road safety at the Rutland Street / Granby Street junction. He asked for an update on the issue.

The City Mayor responded that some Give Way markings had been put on the street which appeared to be effective. The initial response was therefore positive, but the situation would be kept under review and further signage would be added if necessary.

### **Sports Services Review**

Councillor Newcombe stated that he had previously asked for updates on the review of the Sports Services and he questioned the current position. The City Mayor said that the review was underway and officers were looking at the underlying costs and usage figures of the sports centres. The City Mayor hoped that the findings of the review would be published within the next few months.

### **Leicester Market**

Councillor Newcombe asked how the market development was progressing and what action was being taken to address the issue of empty stalls in the market.

The City Mayor responded that there were arrangements in place to enable discussions with market traders about future developments. He suggested that

the Chairs of the appropriate Scrutiny Commissions might wish to meet with him and the Assistant Mayors to discuss the market proposals. Councillor Newcombe asked to be kept informed on the market developments.

Councillor Khote, Chair of the Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission said that in respect of the number of empty market stalls, a recommendation had been made for stalls to be rented out on a daily basis.

### **Admission Policy at Beauchamp College**

Councillor Grant said that he had earlier that day written to the Secretary of State at the Department of Education about the admissions process at Beauchamp College. He understood that they were breaking the national admissions code by requesting parents to provide certain information and operating selectively. Children from Leicester schools attended Beauchamp College and he requested that officers in Children’s Services inform parents of the situation. Councillor Grant added that the Lionheart Trust, of which Beauchamp College was a part, was looking to operate in Leicester City.

The City Mayor said he was grateful to Councillor Grant for the information. He needed to make some enquiries to look into this further, but would be very concerned if this was happening. He was aware that the Lionheart Trust was looking to expand its operation in the City and there was a need for a good understanding of their intentions and how they managed their admissions procedure. He would ask officers to look into this and feedback to Councillor Grant.

Action	By
For the City Mayor to ask officers to look into the concerns expressed relating to Beauchamp College’s admission process and the Lionheart Trust and feedback to Councillor Grant	City Mayor’s Office / Strategic Director Children’s Services.

### **Knighton Library**

Councillor Grant asked the City Mayor if he could allay residents’ concerns about the future of Knighton Library. He had been contacted by residents who had received information from Councillors in the Castle Ward advising that the library was under the threat of closure.

The City Mayor stated that the Transforming Neighbourhood Services Review was looking at all buildings across the City where the Council operated, but he knew of no proposals to close the Knighton Library.

### **Feedback from the Ward Walk around Knighton**

Councillor Grant asked the City Mayor if he could provide an update on the Knighton Ward walk he participated in last year, as no feedback had been received.

The City Mayor expressed some disappointment at this but said that a number of issues had emerged from the walk and actions may have already been taken. He would look into this and ensure that Councillor Grant received a progress report.

Councillor Dr Moore commented that she understood that two of the issues raised at the time were being put into action. These related to traffic lights on Chapel Lane and also schemes to help pedestrians cross the Welford Road.

Action	By
For Councillor Grant to receive a progress report on issues raised during the Knighton Ward Walk.	City Mayor's Office

### **Council loans to businesses and organisations**

Councillor Porter stated that proposals had been announced for the Council to lend money to businesses and organisations and asked for details of how much had been lent and repaid.

The City Mayor said that information was in the public domain. The Council were obliged to set aside money to repay its capital debt and were penalised for repaying this early. It was therefore more productive to use cash balances in ways that would benefit the economy rather than earn a low rate of interest in a bank account. There was an item relating to this on that evening's agenda. Councillor Porter expressed concerns that a business or organisation receiving a loan at a preferential rate would have an unfair advantage over others.

### **Haymarket Theatre**

Councillor Porter asked the City Mayor how the £3.5m spend on the old Haymarket Theatre could be justified. The City Mayor responded that the justification for this was set out in the report on Investment Opportunities in the agenda. He added that when he became City Mayor he inherited a building which was a very considerable liability and continued to cost the Council significant sums of money. However it had the potential to become a significant asset for the City instead of a liability, and one which would complement the Curve Theatre. However investment was needed in the Haymarket Theatre in order to make long term revenue savings.

Councillor Porter asked the City Mayor if he knew of any other similar facilities in the country that had demonstrated that they were assets rather than liabilities. The City Mayor responded that such arts and cultural facilities brought people into the city and money into the economy and for example, there were public supported artistic facilities in Derby, Nottingham, Coventry

and Birmingham that operated as major assets within the community they served.

### **Housing Repair Service**

Councillor Cutkelvin expressed concerns that she had received an increase in the number of complaints since the Housing Repair Service had moved from individual areas around the City to a central office on Blackbird Road. She believed that the level of service had deteriorated since the move and she asked the City Mayor to look into this.

The City Mayor responded that the purpose of centralising the service was to make it more efficient and he would raise this issue with the Director of Housing and the Assistant Mayor for Housing. Councillor Newcombe, Chair of the Housing Scrutiny Commission added that the Commission were aware of those issues and were looking into them.

Action	By
For the City Mayor to talk to the Director of Housing and the Assistant Mayor for Housing regarding complaints about Housing repairs	City Mayor's Office / Director of Housing

### **Planning and Development Control Meetings**

Councillor Dempster questioned whether the City Mayor could look at how agendas at Planning and Development Control meetings could be managed differently. The meeting held the previous night, which she had attended to represent a constituent, had lasted five hours. Councillor Dempster had heard that it was not that uncommon for meetings to last that long and she expressed concerns that it might be difficult for Members to concentrate for that length of time. She added that shorter meetings would lead to better decision making. Councillor Dempster also asked the City Mayor if there could be a drinks machine, as there were members of the public present who had not had an opportunity to get a hot drink although they would have been happy to pay.

The City Mayor agreed that it could be difficult to concentrate during meetings of that length. A suggestion might be to split the agenda and arrange a special meeting or defer some of the applications. The City Mayor added that he thought it would be possible to provide refreshments in a cost effective way by providing flasks of hot water with sachets of tea, coffee and some milk, particularly where members of the public and elected Members were likely to be there for some hours. Discussions were taking place in relation to a similar request for refreshments at Appeal Hearings and he would raise this issue as well as part of those discussions.

Councillor Dempster expressed concerns that at Planning and Development Control Committee meetings, Members were restricted in the decision making process by central government legislation.

The City Mayor responded that Government Planning Policy Guidance had made a lot of development difficult to refuse, but where appropriate the Committee could go against officer recommendation where there were valid planning reasons to do so. The Committee should be helped by officers to formulate those planning grounds.

Action	By
For the City Mayor to raise the issue of the request for refreshments at Planning and Development Control Committee meetings.	City Mayor's Office.

## 81. GENERAL FUND REVENUE BUDGET 2017/18 TO 2019/20

Members were asked to comment on the draft General Fund Revenue budget 2017/18 to 2019/20 prior to its consideration at the meeting of the Council on 22 February 2017.

The Chair commented on the seriousness of the situation following the cuts in the Government's Revenue Support Grant to Local Authorities. He said that it was fortunate that the Council had embarked early on a strategy of managed reserves to help with the budgetary situation, but these were now being drawn upon and it was forecast that they would be used up before 2020. The budget report gave details of all of the different service areas and each Scrutiny Commission had been given the opportunity to consider and comment.

Draft budget minute extracts from a number of different Scrutiny Commissions had been circulated and Members were invited to add any further comments to those in the minutes of their meetings.

Councillor Cleaver, Chair of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission asked the City Mayor about the Better Care Fund. Concerns were expressed that this was said by the Government to be extra money given to the Local Authorities, but this had previously not been the case. Councillor Cleaver added that the Council had experienced delays in receiving the money and asked if any action could be taken to improve the situation. The City Mayor agreed that the fund had not provided new money and only provided a small portion of what was required to meet demand. The Director of Finance added that the Council had lost money from the New Homes Bonus and gained some through the New Social Care Grant but overall the total loss and gain in unitary authorities such as Leicester, in balance remained about equal in 2017/18.

Councillor Cleaver asked that the Council lobbied the Government further on funding for adult social care. The City Mayor agreed and stated that they would add their voice to the voices of the Local Government Association and Councils of all political parties because the financial burden on providing Adult Social

Care was such that other services were being put in jeopardy.

Councillor Dempster, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Scrutiny Commission commented that it was recognised that the budget had to be managed in a different way because of the reduction in the Government's Revenue Support Grant. Timeliness was important to enable meaningful scrutiny to take place and she requested earlier work in future between the Executive and Scrutiny.

Councillor Dempster made reference to the Council's reserves and stated that she hoped that the Council would be cautious and only use them where no other option was available. The City Mayor confirmed the need for caution and added that the budget was now amended throughout the year (rather than just once a year) and the review process needed to be transparent. Scrutiny did therefore need to be aware of what was happening, so subject to checking with Members of the Executive, he intended to make a pro-forma based document available to Scrutiny Chairs, with details of reviews including timings, required savings etc. This would be put in the public domain on the Council's website. This would be kept up to date so that people would know what reviews were happening and when.

Councillor Porter stated that there was under £10m in reserves when the City Mayor was elected, but these had increased to £50m. He said that there were people in the public gallery who would be interested to know how the reserves had been built up and why the reserves had not been used to avoid cutting public services.

The City Mayor responded that the managed reserves policy had been debated many times over the last four or five years and there were details of the reserves on page 22 of the draft Revenue budget. It had been agreed that efficiencies would be implemented at the earliest possible moment, in order to smooth the situation arising from the cuts in the Revenue Support Grant. The strategy had been very successful, but the reserves were being used at a significant rate and would be depleted by 2018/19.

Councillor Bajaj, Chair of the Heritage, Leisure and Sport Scrutiny Commission said that the investment to the New Walk and Jewry Wall Museum and the Abbey Pumping Station was welcomed and these improvements would encourage more tourists to Leicester.

Councillor Cutkelvin, Chair of the Neighbourhood Services and Community Involvement Scrutiny Commission thanked officers for their support to the Commission during the year. Information on service reviews were coming to the Commission in a timely manner. She welcomed the pro-forma that the City Mayor had referred to which would provide information, such as dates and savings on reviews, as this was something that the Commission had talked about. Councillor Cutkelvin also thanked officers for the comprehensive information given to the Commission on the welfare reform agenda. She said that this subject had been explored alongside the Government spending cuts and it was good to hear that the Council were maintaining support for the most vulnerable residents in the city.



Councillor Dr Moore, Chair of the Children's, Young People and Schools Scrutiny Commission stated that it had been difficult to scrutinise the budget in this particular service area, because of the serious position arising from the cuts in the Government Revenue Support Grant. Scrutiny of the budget would continue until March because there was a special meeting to consider the outcome of Early Help Re-modelling and there was also be a review of the Youth Services.

There were concerns about the budget because children, particularly those in need of safeguarding were one of the most vulnerable groups and those numbers were growing. Innovative measures were being implemented to tackle this issue. There was a concern that the budget did not prioritise children's needs as much as it should and the Commission would like an opportunity to compare, like for like, the situation in other service areas. Councillor Dr Moore then drew Members' attention to the recommendations that the Scrutiny Commission had made during their budget discussion.

The Director of Finance responded that during 2016/17, £10.1m of new money had been made available to Education and Children's Services. This figure was in response to the pressures of the service, partially in relation to the use of agency staff however that injection of new money would decline over the next three years. By comparison therefore, the revenue budget for social care services in children's and adults services had seen growth, whilst other services had seen a reduction in their revenue budget.

The Director of Finance also referred Members to the Spending Review Programme and stated that there were savings of £19.4m on that programme still to be delivered, but even after that, the budget would still be short by £25m in 2020.

Councillor Khote, Chair of the Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission stated that there were no issues to report on.

Councillor Newcombe, Chair of the Housing Scrutiny Commission informed the Committee that that the Commission had been very busy and had been dealing with sensitive issues around homelessness.

Councillor Cutkelvin referred to the issue around changing terms and conditions for staff and asked how this work was progressing. The Committee was advised that the Director of Delivery, Communications and Political Governance was currently involved in discussions with the trade unions.

The Chair asked if Members would note the recommendations within the report, which would then go to Council to be ratified. Councillor Dempster asked for an additional recommendation regarding the scrutiny review process, to ensure the Commissions were engaged with meaningfully, in time for them to make a difference. The City Mayor commented that Councillor Dempster had a valid point as it was the job of Scrutiny to review the process but this was not always straightforward if the timetable was not made known to them as early as

it could be. Councillor Dempster reiterated that in relation to the process, it was important that there was the opportunity for meaningful scrutiny.

The City Mayor confirmed that he had taken on board the points made by Councillor Dempster and he gave his assurance that when the report came to Council, he would seek to add something that incorporated the spirit of what had been discussed relating to timely and meaningful scrutiny.

AGREED:

that the Overview Select Committee endorse the recommendations set out in the General Fund Revenue Budget 2017/18 to 2019/20

## **82. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS**

The Chair announced that under Scrutiny Procedure Rule 4E Rule 14, he had agreed to accept the following item on the Call-in of the decision on Transforming Neighbourhood Services (North East Area) on the grounds that it needed to be referred to a relevant Scrutiny Commission prior to its consideration at Council which was due to meet on 22 February 2017.

## **83. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS: CALL IN OF EXECUTIVE DECISION - TRANSFORMING NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES - NORTH EAST AREA**

The Monitoring Officer submitted a report relating to the Call-In of Executive Decision: Transforming Neighbourhood Services, North East Area. The Committee were recommended to:

- a) Note the report, which would have the effect of rolling the call-in forward to Council without comment; or
- b) Comment on the specific issues raised by the call-in for forwarding to the next meeting of Council; or
- c) Resolve that the call-in be withdrawn.

The Chair invited Councillor Willmott to address the Committee. Points made by Councillor Willmott included the following:

- The constituents and fellow Councillors felt strongly about the decision taken on the Rushey Mead Library and the Rushey Mead Recreation Centre under the Transforming Neighbourhood Services (TNS) programme.
- Moving the library into the Recreation Centre would lead to the loss of a well-used facility and would only achieve a very small saving.
- Both buildings were small.
- Local people had not been listened to and other options had not been explored.
- Last year, the library had 27000 users and the centre had 24000 users; however if the number of users decreased, the Council would lose income. It would not be possible for example to have a keep fit class next to a room where children were doing their homework.
- A petition had been raised against the decision which now had 4000

signatures.

- There were alternative options; for example to re-model the library so that the centre and library were on one site. The centre could then be sold, thereby raising £125k. Additional funding would still be needed, but the Council had recently committed £400K for works to the Pork Pie Library. Other options included a Community Asset Transfer or using £14k from another budget to keep the library open.

Councillor Willmott concluded by asking the Committee to review the decision.

The Chair invited local residents Jo Popat and Dixit Chauhan to address the Committee and points raised included the following:

- The community felt very strongly about the decision concerning the library and the Recreation Centre.
- People did not feel the consultation had been adequate or sufficiently robust and they felt they had not been consulted on the impact. People did not understand what options were available.
- People believed that the decision had already been made regardless of the outcome of the consultation.
- The benefits would be outweighed by the negative impact.
- The users of the Recreation Centre included the elderly, the vulnerable and the disabled; they were unable to defend themselves. The Government stated that there should be a focus on mental health, so services such as these should not be closed.
- The saving of just £5k was ludicrous.
- The facilities represented the heart of the community.

Councillor Kirk Master, Assistant City Mayor for Neighbourhood Services then responded to the concerns expressed; his points included the following:

- He had met with some of the campaigners earlier that afternoon and heard concerns that residents had not been part of the consultation. However dates of meetings and focus groups had been produced which demonstrated extensive consultation had taken place. The consultation process had commenced on 6 June 2016.
- The group had said that some people didn't understand the consultation process; however interpreters had been provided and information was given out in different languages.
- The library and the Recreation Centre were only 50 yards apart from each other. The centre could not be moved into the library.
- There would be capital investment in the Recreation Centre.
- Officers had spoken to user groups about the possibility of a Community Asset Transfer. It had been explained that it would need to be an open process in which any group could apply; the view received was that the Council should retain control.

The Chair then opened the discussion to Members of the Committee.

Councillor Porter sought clarity on the targeted savings of the TNS North East programme and the savings already achieved. He expressed a concern that this seemed a drastic measure if the cost of keeping the library open was just £14k. Councillor Porter questioned whether the talk of moving the library to the centre was part of a political game, where in the end, the Council would announce that the library would remain open after all and gain credit for doing so. Councillor Porter also referred to the Labour manifesto in which, he said, there was a promise not to close community centres.

The Assistant City Mayor responded that the ethos behind the TNS programme was to maintain services and this was not part of a political game. The decision had been made in December 2016, but the programme and consultation was about democracy and providing an opportunity for people to put their case forward. The savings of £14k may seem modest, but significant savings were made when that modest sum was multiplied by a number of buildings in the City.

Councillor Grant asked the Assistant City Mayor to clarify the total savings and also asked how this compared to the move of the Aylestone Library to the Aylestone Leisure Centre. He said that he had not supported the move at the time but understood that it had been very successful and usage had subsequently increased.

The Assistant City Mayor responded that the savings would be just under £15k per annum for the running costs of the building. He said that it was difficult to compare like for like, but in Aylestone and elsewhere the programme had worked very well and there was learning from those experiences which had been applied in Rushey Mead.

Councillor Dempster commented that the programme was about doing things differently and about protecting services by reducing the number of buildings. Elsewhere, Councils were closing services as well as buildings, but in Leicester, services were being retained. Councillor Dempster questioned what other actions could be taken by the Council when its budget had been cut by 40%. However, the process of amalgamating buildings needed to be done well to give the best service for the users. The service users should not be given false hope about something that was not sustainable.

Councillor Cutkelvin stated that she was Chair of the Neighbourhood Services and Community Involvement Scrutiny Commission which had the relevant portfolio for the TNS programme. Consultations on the programme had started in 2013 and the programme was being rolled out slowly across the City to allow residents to be involved. The decision had been made, considered by the Executive and the Scrutiny Commission; the situation was stressful for residents and she therefore felt reluctant to debate further.

Councillor Cutkelvin moved that the call-in be withdrawn. This was seconded by Councillor Dempster.

Councillor Dr Moore questioned whether there were any plans of the re-modelling of the Recreation Centre which might be reassuring to residents. The Assistant City Mayor responded that those plans were part of the next phase. Ward Councillors would be involved in that process and the library would remain open until improvements to the Recreation Centre were made.

The Chair invited Members to vote on the motion to withdraw the call-in, and upon being put to the vote, the motion to withdraw was CARRIED.

The Chair asked the Assistant City Mayor to continue to engage and give support to the local community.

RESOLVED:

that the call-in relating to the Executive Decision: Transforming Neighbourhood Services, North East Area be withdrawn.

#### **84. TREASURY STRATEGY 2017/18**

The Director of Finance submitted a report which proposed a strategy for managing the Council's borrowing and cash balances during 2017/18. The Overview Select Committee was asked to comment on the report prior to its consideration at Council on 22 February 2017.

Members considered the report and the Chair questioned whether other Local Authorities had adopted a similar strategy. The Director of Finance responded that generally most other Local Authorities had adopted a similar approach with being very risk aware and risk averse when looking at investments and cash balances. Returns received were relatively low but investments were safe and secure.

The Director referred to the report on Investment Opportunities, which was the next item on the agenda, and said that base rates were at an all-time low and Leicester like other Local Authorities were looking at how cash could be used to stimulate the economy instead of sitting in a bank account and bringing in a very low return. Instead investment funds could be used to buy assets, such as empty shops, offices or factories which would be put onto the market for rent to bring them back into use. This provided a welcome revenue income stream and also brought in income from business rates. Numerous other Local Authorities were doing this at the moment to develop their city centres in preparation for Business Rates Retention. This strategy had been used successfully in Leicester before with Hastings Direct. Investment for refurbishment had led to growth and had created jobs. The Director added that the Council took a serious approach to risk. The City Mayor commented that historically, Leicester City Council had been active in using investments in similar ways to add income to the revenue budget.

Councillor Grant commented that he recognised that the strategy could be valuable but also carried an element of risk and questioned whether independent advice was sought from commercial experts. The Director confirmed that In the Council consulted relevant expert advisors as part of the

process. Managing risk was the fundamental concern whilst also trying to obtain a good return on the asset and make it work for the City.

AGREED:

that the Overview Select Committee endorse the Treasury Strategy 2017/18.

## **85. INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITIES**

The Director of Finance submitted a report that proposed new ways to invest in local property based projects.

Members considered this report alongside the previous report on the Treasury Strategy. Members agreed to note the report.

AGREED:

that the report on Investment Opportunities be noted.

## **86. SCRUTINY COMMISSIONS' WORK PROGRAMMES**

The City Mayor referred to the plans for the Haymarket Theatre and suggested that while there were aspects of the business plan that needed to be kept private for the time being, the Overview Select Committee and the relevant Scrutiny Commission might wish to learn more about the proposals and hear from the promoters at an informal private briefing. The proposals could then be considered at Scrutiny. Councillor Khote stated that she had asked for that report to be brought to the Economic Development, Transport and Tourism Scrutiny Commission.

Action	By
For an informal briefing session to be set up to consider aspects of the proposals for the Haymarket Theatre, prior to the proposals being considered in a Scrutiny Commission meeting.	City Mayor's Office, Councillor Singh and Councillor Khote.

Councillor Cleaver, Chair of the Adult Social Care Scrutiny Commission thanked the City Mayor for coming to hear the Rap song at the recent meeting of the Commission. The theme of the rap was about raising awareness of autism. Councillor Cleaver also thanked Dan Martin from the Leicester Mercury for the part he had played in raising awareness of the condition.

## **87. OVERVIEW SELECT COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME**

There was no discussion on the Overview Select Committee Work Programme.

## **88. CORPORATE PLAN OF KEY DECISIONS**

Members were asked to note and comment on the Plan of Key Decisions.

AGREED:

that the Plan of Key Decisions be noted.

**89. CLOSE OF MEETING**

The meeting closed at 8.11 pm.