

**Response from the meetings of Cabinet on the O&S Committee's Comments –
10 April 2024 and 15 May 2024**

10 April Meeting:

Item 4 – Park Exercise Permit

Scrutiny Comment:

The Committee did not scrutinise this report at the meeting because a report on the subject shortly before the scheme was introduced had been considered by the Committee. Following consideration of that report, the Committee had requested a follow-on report after the scheme had been in operation for a while to check that the permits were operating in the way intended and then to discuss if the scheme should continue. The follow-on report was never forthcoming because various issues arose which stymied the operation of the scheme in the way intended to produce measurable results.

The recommendations in the report to Cabinet did not include an option on whether to proceed or not with the scheme but was purely to determine if the terms and conditions of the scheme should be changed.

The Committee requested that a report should be produced after the summer period on how the scheme was performing along with some data, including data on how much of officers' time was being spent with the implementation and governance of the scheme.

Cabinet Response:

The recommendations in the report were approved.

Item 5 – Revisions to fees for markets in 2024

Scrutiny Comment:

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee did not scrutinise this report at the meeting but made comments to Cabinet.

The Committee requested that when in the future these same types of recommendations are made, more evidential data backing up the proposals being made should be provided; if fees are to be reduced then there should be options provided to mitigate or alternative plans that help to overcome some of the challenges being faced.

The Committee raised a concern that footfall numbers were reducing but there were no plans to reduce the fees. Markets were an important part of communities and the economy in towns.

Members of the Committee wish to remind Cabinet that these assumptions are built into our budget for the year and therefore making changes after the budget has been set could be problematic.

Cabinet Response:

Item 8 – Joint Waste Contract – Customer Services

Scrutiny Comment:

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee did not scrutinise this report at the meeting because it had very recently considered a report on the subject under its own Work Programme and it is one of the Council's contracts the Committee has chosen to scrutinise.

The Committee thanked officers for their work in bringing that report to it proactively. The Committee welcomed the recommendations in the report to Cabinet.

Cabinet Response:

The recommendations in the report were approved.

Item 13 – Milverton Homes Ltd Business Plan Revision

Scrutiny Comment:

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee held good discussions supported by officers and would like to further explore Milverton Homes. The Committee is intending to set up a specific meeting to coincide with the time when Milverton Homes will hold its AGM (November). This will allow Members to better understand the assumptions going into the business plan and the mechanisms for running the business over the next 12 months.

The Committee asked that more attention should be placed on the way words and language could be interpreted in reports. The use of "no liability" stated in the report at paragraph 10.1 should more accurately have made plain that the Council was taking measures to mitigate the liability, so the statement "no liability" was technically incorrect. The word "constrained" at paragraph 1.1.4 was also problematic because it did not explain why this was and that the arrangements being used were perfectly valid and used in other Authorities.

Cabinet Response:

The recommendations in the report were approved.

15 May meeting:

Item 04 - Newbold Cycle Trails

Scrutiny Comments:

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee held a good discussion regarding the process of procurement and how the contract would be managed moving forward.

The Committee has asked for Cabinet to consider the following points:

- the procurement process should include how resident feedback would be integrated and looking at measurables within the contract e.g. promoting courses and how often they are open;
- learning from previous procurement exercises should be included;
- the social value element should be a factor to be considered in determining the successful tender;
- at paragraph 1.6.7 in the report the first bullet point should stop after "reputational damage"; and

- the Committee asked to ensure that the tender is well publicised, particularly local businesses, to maximalise opportunity to respond.

Cabinet Response:

The recommendations in the report were approved.