



Leicester
City Council

Minutes of the Meeting of the
CULTURE AND NEIGHBOURHOODS SCRUTINY COMMISSION

Held: THURSDAY, 5 MARCH 2026 at 5:30 pm

P R E S E N T:

Councillor Zaman – Chair
Councillor Halford – Vice Chair

Councillor Dr Barton
Councillor Dave

Councillor Chauhan
Councillor Haq

Deputy City Mayor - Councillor Cutkelvin
Assistant City Mayor – Councillor Dempster
* * * * *

184. WELCOME AND APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

The Chair welcomed those present to the meeting.

Apologies were received from Cllr Waddington.

185. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members were asked to declare any interests they may have had in the business to be discussed.

There were no declarations of interest.

186. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING

AGREED:

That the minutes of the meeting of the Culture and Neighbourhoods Scrutiny Commission held on 22 January 2026 be confirmed as a correct record.

187. CHAIR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Chair suggested that reports be taken as read where possible.

The Chair also made members aware of the first meeting of the Task Group on

Community Asset Transfer would be on 12th March.

188. QUESTIONS, REPRESENTATIONS AND STATEMENTS OF CASE

The Monitoring Officer reported that none had been received.

189. PETITIONS

The Monitoring Officer reported that none had been received.

190. MUSEUMS SERVICE OPERATIONAL CHANGES UPDATE

The Director of Tourism Culture and Economy submitted a report to provide an update on the delivery of the Museums and Galleries Strategy, focusing upon operational changes at Abbey Pumping Station and Newarke Houses Museum.

The Assistant City Mayor for Health, Culture, Libraries and Community Centres introduced the item noting that continued investment into the museums was key. Maintenance and upkeep continued throughout the venues.

The Head of Arts and Museums provided an overview of the report, key points to note were as follows:

- The strategy was implemented nearly a year ago, the vision had been to develop a cost effective, accessible service.
- Significant investment had taken place over the previous decade which included an investment of £1.9m at Newarke Houses Museum. A recent Stage 1 grant had been secured from the National Lottery Heritage Fund for Leicester Museum and Art Gallery. In total £29m would have been invested in the service, upon completion of the development.
- Further Arts Council England National Portfolio Organisation funding had recently been secured. Since 2018 National Portfolio Organisation funding of just over £400K a year has enabled a range of activities, in addition to those provided by the core budget. Further funding of £400k was confirmed for this year and a further application had been submitted for the following year.
- Offsite activities were highlighted and engagement had increased by 12% during the year, it was expected that by the end of the 2025/26 year 110,000 people would have been reached.
- Operational Changes at Abbey Pumping Station and Newarke Houses Museums were made from 1st May 2025. The relocation of the Food and Craft Fair from Belgrave Hall to the Abbey Pumping Station had resulted in an 70% increase in visitor numbers.
- Initiatives to increase engagement for children and young people included the Holiday Activity and Food (HAF) programme at Abbey Pumping Station over the summer, with 416 participations. Children received a nutritious meal as part of the visit.

- In total there had been nearly 16,000 visitors from 1st May, with additional offsite activity with volunteers.
- Newarke Houses Museum had been open for special events such as the Siege of Leicester event programme and for Heritage Open Days. School visits had also continued.
- The museum service was on track to deliver on the vision and strategic objectives.

In response to member discussion and questions, the following was noted:

- The Arts Council National Portfolio Organisation funding is would be used at multiple sites, including Newarke Houses Museum and Abbey Pumping Station.
- The steam train continued to be in operation at Abbey Pumping Station, including on event days and railway days. Families had the option to visit the free museums. A proposal to open Newarke Houses Museum at Easter would be considered.
- The team had designed a portable cabinet of curiosities to engage with the wider community. A calendar of events would be distributed to the commission.
- Regular surveys were conducted to capture the amount of new engagement from taking the service out into the community.
- Newarke Houses Museum was free, and was therefore not a ticketed site.

AGREED:

- 1) That the report be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account by the lead officers.
- 3) For consideration of Easter Holiday weekend opening at Newark Houses Museum.
- 4) The calendar of events would be shared.

191. SELECTIVE LICENSING UPDATE

The Director of Neighbourhoods and Environmental Services submitted a report on progress with selective licensing schemes in the city.

The Deputy City Mayor for Housing, Economy and Neighbourhoods introduced the item, noting that the process had been very thorough and was delivering on targets. The first five-year cycle was coming to an end. Implementation of the Renter's Rights Act 2025 was imminent and would impact on the responsibilities for the private sector teams.

The Head of Regulatory Services gave a presentation as attached to the agenda, key points to note were as follows:

- It was estimated that there were around 8000 licensable properties in

the 3 areas. At the end of 2025 around 77% of the applications expected across the 5 years had been received, with the majority having been dealt with.

- For the number of applications within each designated area, Westcotes and the Fosse area had the highest numbers received.
- Most hazards were category 2 and were required to be addressed for licensing. In many cases formal action did not need to be taken after issues being highlighted to the landlord.
- Where necessary work to rectify was not organised by the landlord, the council may undertake these works in default and the costs recharged to the landlord.
- Formal actions included hazard awareness notices, improvement notices and prohibition orders - an incremental approach was usually taken.
- There were a number of investigations in process.
- Landlords were invited to regular forums.
- Team changes had included new management.
- A planned piece of work included reviewing designations, all three of which were due to end next year. Consideration would be given as to whether they needed to continue.

In response to member questions and discussion, the following was noted:

- The Council was not permitted to generate a profit on the scheme, and any income was reinvested back into delivery. A realistic fee was set to cover programme delivery costs and support the empowerment, education and signposting of landlords. Unlike some authorities, the scheme used a combined fee of £1,290 and included inspections to confirm properties meet minimum standards before a licence is granted. The cash flow forecast was under review.
- A different framework of standards was in place for council properties. A dip sample had taken place to support the Housing service which found consistency with the Housing team. The Decent Homes Standard would be implemented as part of the Renters Rights Act in the future, bringing changes to the private letting sector.
- The timescale to resolve hazards was dependent on the severity of the hazard. Landlords were responsible for arranging any alternative accommodation during rectification periods.
- The private rented sector team could investigate housing standards issues such as damp and mould, overcrowding and fire safety across all rented properties in the city regardless of licensing.
- There was not a ruling on how often properties would be inspected but robust checks were completed.
- For the numbers awaiting licensing, work was in place which included door knocking and leaflets being left. Tenants were also supported by being signposted to Justice For Tenants. There was a potential for tenants to recover up to 12 months of the rent paid if the landlord had not acquired a licence, this would be going up to two years under the Renter's Rights Act. There was also the possibility of a civil penalty. Since the service review, there was an increased drive

to identify unlicensed landlords

AGREED:

- 1) That the reports be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account by the lead officers.

192. DRAFT PSPO ZONE: 2 IMPLEMENTATION UPDATE

The Director of Neighbourhood & Environmental Services and the Head of Safer Communities gave a presentation providing an update on the development of a Public Space Protection Order (PSPO) for the outer city areas.

The Deputy City Mayor for Housing, Economy and Neighbourhoods introduced the report and noted that it needed to be a data-driven exercise and that expectations would need to be managed.

Slides were presented as attached to the agenda pack. Additional key points to note were as follows:

- This was a work in progress, but the presentation gave an early insight into the formation of the proposed second PSPO (PSPO2).
- There had been a limited amount of responses from Ward Councillors, and there was a need to encourage the public to take part of the consultation process.
- Anti-Social Behaviour (ASB) had been recorded in different locations by different teams, so a variety of data had been collected.
- Types of ASB were sometimes interconnected.
- E-bikes had been an issue with regard to vehicle-based ASB.
- The timeline had changed since the slides had been published and it was currently aimed to push back the timeline to give a realistic timeframe, the timeline was now running 2-4 weeks behind. It was important to ensure that this was done correctly and not rushed through.

In response to member discussion, the following was noted:

- In response to a query on the clarity of boundaries, it was noted that geolocations were mapped by postcode and the boundaries were exact. It was further noted that it was useful for ward residents to encourage them to take part in the consultation.
- It was also important for residents to report ASB. The Love Clean Streets app could be used for this, there were also QR codes that could be scanned. Additionally, a new tool and web portal was being launched. People could also report via computers in libraries, where staff could help. If people did not report, data was not available.
- With regard to fly-tipping this was dealt with by City Wardens. This used

a similar data set and dashboards. This work could increase as more data was received.

- This work would have a team of 11 officers to look after PSPO1 and to do targeted work in PSPO2.
- Data could be analysed to see where problems were likely to occur and when. Some issues, such as fireworks, were seasonal.
- This scheme was about project-based intervention work. The team could support and intervene where necessary and work could be done and measured to see if it had a positive impact.
- As the project was data-led, if there was a specific issue then hotspots and trends could be identified, and the team could look to be deployed, highlighting the importance of reports.
- The scheme would go live in the Autumn, and staff would be appointed from April. These staff could be deployed in Wards for targeted intervention work.
- Councillors were encouraged to bear in mind the key facts (as set out on the slide) when talking to constituents.
- It was noted that in some areas, people could drink in public if they weren't doing so in an anti-social way.
- As the approach needed to be evidence-based, spitting was hard to catch, however, signage could be installed to discourage it. Work would be undertaken on engagement and education where there were groups of problematic behaviour.
- Members were reminded that PSPOs were not implemented to generate fines but to encourage behaviour change.
- It was necessary to educate ourselves and the public on that PSPOs could achieve, and manage expectations. If a PSPO were introduced in certain areas, it would be necessary to think about the priorities of that area. It was necessary to think about what was aimed to be achieved with Ward Councillors and residents.
- Bikes were an issue, but not enough to build into PSPO2. This was different to PSPO1. PSPO2 would not adopt whole Wards, but would look at hotspots where there was evidence. Illegal E-bikes would be looked at and the Police would be worked with on Operation Pedalfast. The PSPO team did not have the power to stop moving vehicles, whereas the Police did.
- PSPO2 was very different to PSPO1 as it was more project-based intervention. Therefore, it was necessary to show when time and effort had been put in and positive impacts on the community. Outcomes could be shared with the Commission in the new municipal year.
- If certain behaviours arose in other pockets, another PSPO would be written. If Councillors felt an area needed a PSPO, they needed to encourage people to report behaviours as PSPOs needed to be data-driven. Ways to report could be discussed at Ward Meetings.
- It was noted that this was a citywide initiative.

AGREED

- 1) That the reports be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account by the lead officers.

193. PRIDE IN PLACE PROGRAMME

The Director of Corporate Services submitted a report setting out the details of the Government's Pride in Place Programme (PiPP), including information on compliance, mobilisation, governance, and early groundwork actions required for this long-term initiative.

Key points to note were as follows:

- The Pride in Place Programme (PiPP) was distinct from the Pride in Place Impact Fund.
- A government initiative had been launched at the end of 2025, and an understanding of what was required had been developed.
- The programme looked to focus on creating thriving places, stronger communities and community democracy (giving residents a say over what was needed in the area).
- Up to £20m over 10 years had been identified by the government. This would be split into 63% Capital (i.e. buildings) and 37% Revenue (i.e. services).
- Deprivation data was used to identify areas that needed investment. The government also used a Community Needs Index, although the Council did not have access to this.
- Three areas were considered in the report, these were Middle Layer Super Output Areas (MSOA).
- The money would not be received in one go, it would be received over three periods. The first would be received between now and the 2029/2030 financial year, the second between 2030 and 2031/32, and the last between 2033/34 and 2035/36.
- The Council had a responsibility to an outside body to ensure spending was consistent with financial spend rules. Procurement was taken into account. Transparency on spending was needed. It was necessary to ensure that each area was spending within government guidelines.
- It was necessary to support programme delivery. Part of this was recruiting an independent Chair with the local MP. A job profile had been identified for this and it was now out to expressions of interest. There were specific rules on who qualified around local connections and the skills and capabilities to fulfil the role.
- It was necessary to create a plan for each area on how to spend the money over a ten year period.
- Neighbourhood Boards would be resident-led with between eight and fifteen people on each board. The boards would contain at least one Ward Councillor, and MP, as police officer and representatives from anchor institutions, but the majority would be residents.
- It was necessary to collect information as the accountable body and

then it would be necessary to go through the process of engagement and to go through designs for areas and spending plans. Each plan needed to be submitted by the end of November.

In response to member discussion, the following was noted:

- It was clarified that areas were based on MSOAs rather than Wards.
- It was acknowledged that there could be logistical problems for MPs and it was being asked as to whether MPs could send representatives. The programme needed to be community-led, but the MP would have a role in the recruitment of the Chair.
- With regard to questions about how this differed from historical schemes, it was noted that there had been lots of investment in buildings and spaces previously, but the focus was different here as it was on the areas given to work towards. Local organisations would be engaged with to learn from them.
- There would be clear Terms of Reference for board which would outline who needed to be there and whether substitutions would be allowed.
- It was important to recognise that other areas were in need. It was necessary to be careful on the perspective created. The Council did not have control over the areas.
- It was important to understand that whilst the Council could encourage things to be looked at, the Council did not want to tell communities what they wanted.
- Conversations could be had with boards about extending boundaries, for example if there was a facility on the edge of a boundary, but this would need to be evidenced and put to the government.
- The independent Chair and the board would set the needs for the area, therefore it was necessary to ensure that meetings were as accessible as possible, including to younger and working-age people.
- With regard to queries raised about disparity in food retail offerings, it was noted that community pantries were an example of what could be done, but it was up to areas to decide what to do.
- Issues were raised about how Councillors were selected. The method of selection was not the Council's decision.

The Director of Neighbourhoods and Environment gave an update on the Pride in Place Impact Fund (PiPIF).

The following points were raised:

- This was a complementary fund of £1.5m of capital for investment in the City and was not limited to MSOAs.
- It was focussed on quick investment opportunities which were low-cost and high-impact.
- There was a need to set out the investment process. This gave the option to focus on investment in the community and in public spaces and highstreets.

- The process of shortlisting was being undertaken to try and pick out projects that were known to communities and neighbourhoods and Ward Councillors. Members would be guided through the intentions on this shortlist of schemes, with an emphasis on high-need areas or the areas alongside them.
- The money needed to be spent in equal proportions over two years and it was necessary to show how the money was being spent.
- The government had talked about engagement with local representatives such as Ward Councillors and constituents.
- People could be guided on what were thought to be suitable schemes.
- There was a focus on high-need deciles and on parks and open spaces, also looking at where it might be complementary to the LCNA
- A briefing would be given to members before Full Council.

AGREED:

- 1) That the reports be noted.
- 2) That comments made by members of this commission to be taken into account by the lead officers.

194. WORK PROGRAMME

The work programme was noted.

195. ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS

There being no further items of urgent business, the meeting finished at 8:12pm