

**RECORD OF DECISION BY CITY MAYOR OR INDIVIDUAL  
EXECUTIVE MEMBER**

<b>1.</b>	<b>Decision title</b>	LGSCO Maladministration Report
<b>2.</b>	<b>Declarations of interest</b>	
<b>3.</b>	<b>Date of decision</b>	21 <sup>st</sup> May 2025
<b>4.</b>	<b>Decision maker</b>	Deputy City Mayor
<b>5.</b>	<b>Decision taken</b>	To decline to comply with two of the seven recommendations of the LGSCO regarding payment of compensation to Ms X

## RECORD OF DECISION BY CITY MAYOR OR INDIVIDUAL EXECUTIVE MEMBER

<b>6.</b>	<b>Reason for decision</b>	<p>The recommendations set out at 4.3 and 4.4 of the report are not to be complied with for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The issue that is the subject of recommendations 4.3 and 4.4 are not of the Council’s making. They are a product of international forces well beyond one Council’s control, together with policy made by multiple Government agencies including the Home Office. To seek to penalise a Council for a national and international crisis is grossly unfair to the Council and the taxpayers of Leicester. The Regulations regarding “unsuitability” were made by Parliament in 2003, over 20 years ago. The geopolitical context has changed unrecognisably since then.</li> <li>• It is impossible to see that the LGSCO have not set a clear precedent here that they will be bound to follow in other complaints. We calculate this exposure to be £500k for Leicester City Council, and tens of millions of pounds nationally. This could bring Councils closer to the prospect of an unbalanced General Fund leading to significant and detrimental loss of local services for local people.</li> <li>• The principle of awarding a remedy is predicated upon the public body who is at fault being able to put-right that error. This is not the case here. There will be no salutary effect from this compensatory exposure, because we (like just about every other Council in the country) have no power to immediately create extra housing that would avert the need to keep families in B&amp;B for more than six weeks.</li> <li>• We are spending tens of millions of pounds to respond to the situation, and exposing us to paying hundreds of thousands of pounds of compensation will only serve to significantly set-back our plans to strategically address it. The Council has continued its strategy of acquiring accommodation to meet homelessness need. We have invested over £350m in new Affordable Housing over the last 6 years We are planning the delivery of 1,650 new affordable homes for the city by 2027 plus an additional £1m to increase our Private Rented Sector</li> </ul>
-----------	----------------------------	---

**RECORD OF DECISION BY CITY MAYOR OR INDIVIDUAL  
EXECUTIVE MEMBER**

		<p>accommodation opportunities to double the number of outcomes for homeless households from 240 to 500. We have delivered an extra 125 leases offering our homeless households Assured Shorthold Tenancies. We have fully committed the £45m to provide better quality self-contained temporary accommodation. Overall, there are 275 new Council owned self-contained Temporary Accommodation units (134 single/ 141 family) going to be brought online by Summer 25, which should help us to significantly reduce the use of B&amp;B accommodation.</p>
7.	<p><b>A) KEY DECISION Yes/No?</b></p> <p>b) If yes, was it published 5 clear days in advance? Yes/no</p>	No
8.	<b>Options considered</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Compliance with all seven recommendations</li> <li>2. Compliance with five of the seven recommendations</li> </ol>
9.	<p><b>Deadline for call-in</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 members of a scrutiny commission or any 5 councillors can ask for the decision to be called-in.</li> <li>• Notification of call-in with reasons must be made to the monitoring officer</li> </ul>	
10.	<p><b>Signature of decision maker</b> (City Mayor or where delegated by the City Mayor, name of executive member)</p>	