



<b>Title</b>	Comments from the Executive
<b>For further information about this report please contact</b>	Lesley Dury, Committee Services Officer, 01926 456114 or <a href="mailto:committee@warwickdc.gov.uk">committee@warwickdc.gov.uk</a>
<b>Service Area</b>	Civic & Committee Services
<b>Wards of the District directly affected</b>	N/A
<b>Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006</b>	No
<b>Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number</b>	13 November 2012
<b>Background Papers</b>	Executive Minutes – 14 November 2012

<b>Contrary to the policy framework:</b>	No
<b>Contrary to the budgetary framework:</b>	No
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No
<b>Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number)</b>	No

<b>Officer/Councillor Approval</b>		
With regard to officer approval all reports <i>must</i> be approved by the report authors relevant director, Finance, Legal Services and the relevant Portfolio Holder(s).		
	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>
Relevant Director		
Chief Executive		
CMT		
Section 151 Officer		
Legal		
Finance		
Portfolio Holders		

<b>Consultation Undertaken</b>	
N/A	
<b>Final Decision?</b>	Yes
<b>Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)</b>	

## 1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report informs the Committee of the response the Executive gave to their comments regarding the reports submitted to the Executive in November.

## 2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The responses made by the Executive are noted.

## 3. **REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 This report is produced to create a dialogue between the Executive and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It ensures that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are formally made aware of the Executive's responses.
- 3.2 Where the Overview & Scrutiny Committee have made a recommendation as opposed to a comment the Executive are required to respond to the recommendation(s) made, including whether or not they accept the recommendation(s).

## 4. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 This report is not produced and presented to the Committee.

## 5. **BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK**

- 5.1 All work for the Committee has to be carried out within existing resources.

## 6. **POLICY FRAMEWORK**

- 6.1 The work carried out by the Committee helps the Council to improve in line with its priority to manage services openly efficiently and effectively.

## 7. **BACKGROUND**

- 7.1 As part of the new scrutiny process, the Committee is no longer considering the whole of the Executive agenda.
- 7.2 On the day of publication of the Executive agenda all Councillors are sent an e-mail asking them to contact Committee Services, by 09.00am on the day of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting to advise which Executive items they would like the Committee to consider.
- 7.3 As a result the Committee considered the items detailed in appendix 1. The response the Executive gave on each item is also shown.
- 7.4 In reviewing these responses Committee can identify any issues for which they would like a progress report. A future report, for example on how the decision has been implemented, would then be submitted to the Committee at an agreed date which would then be incorporated within the work programme.

**Response from the meeting of the Executive on Overview and Scrutiny  
Committee Comments –  
14 November 2012**

<b>Item no.</b>	6	<b>Title</b>	City Deal	<b>Requested by</b>	Lib Dem Group
<b>Reason considered</b>	Because of its considerable potential.				
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee accepted the recommendation in the report, but suggested a slight amendment to its wording as follows:</p> <p>“That the Executive note the background information on City Deals set out at Appendix A to this report and delegate authority to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Executive and the other Group Leaders to negotiate and agree <i>an initial expression of interest</i> on behalf of the authority for a City Deal proposal for Coventry, Warwickshire and Hinckley/Bosworth area.”</p> <p>(This simply moves where the words “an initial expression of interest” appears in the sentence.)</p> <p>The Committee suggested that the Executive might consider the Sheffield City Regional City Deal. The Committee also wished to emphasise that this was more than simply a planning issue. Whilst the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are happy for this to move forward, as it is being led by Coventry, the Executive should ensure that it is not at our expense.</p>				
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive accepted the proposed recommendation re wording and thanked the Committee for their comments.				

<b>Item no.</b>	9	<b>Title</b>	2012/13 Portfolio Holder Statements & Fit for the Future Progress Report	<b>Requested by</b>	Labour Group
<b>Reason considered</b>	Already on O & S Agenda for Cultural Services and Community Protection.				
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee made no comments on the report to Executive but as part of its own work programme, it did receive presentations from the Portfolio Holders for Cultural Services and Community Safety. The Committee had the opportunity to question the Portfolio Holders and Service Area Managers on the Portfolio Holder Statements. Afterwards, the Committee thanked the Portfolio Holders Councillors Coker and Cross and the Service Area Managers Roger Jewsbury and Rose Winslip for answering its questions.</p>				
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive noted the comments.				

<b>Item no.</b>	10	<b>Title</b>	Visitor Services Review	<b>Requested by</b>	Labour Group & Lib Dem Group
<b>Reason considered</b>	<p>The Liberal Democrat Group requested the item to understand the rationale behind the opening hours of the Leamington Spa VIC.</p> <p>The Labour Group had questions on the subject.</p>				
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee accepted the recommendations in the report and thanked Joe Baconnet for answering its questions.</p>				
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>The Executive thanked the O &amp; S Committee for its support.</p>				

<b>Item no.</b>	12	<b>Title</b>	Website CMS Replacement	<b>Requested by</b>	Labour Group
<b>Reason considered</b>	<p>The Labour Group felt further discussion was necessary in light of the further information received from officers that was not in the report.</p>				
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee accepted recommendations 2.2 and the second 2.2 (should be 2.3)</p> <p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that the wording on recommendation 2.1 should be changed as follows:</p> <p>“That Executive approves the development of the business case comparing Option A (Appendix A) to Option B, the new option as set out in the email sent to councillors on 9 November 2012.”</p>				
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>The Executive accepted the amendment to recommendation 2.1.</p>				

Item no.	13 A	Title	The Community Right to Bid	Requested by	Labour Group & Lib Dem Group
<b>Reason considered</b>	<p>The Liberal Democrat Group wanted this item because of the significance to the Communities of the District.</p> <p>The Labour Group had questions on the decision making process in the recommendations.</p>				
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends that recommendations 2.2 and 2.3 are changed so that the Heads of Service stipulated to be given delegated authority must consult with the relevant Portfolio Holder and Shadows:</p> <p>2.2 That Executive delegates authority to the Head of Development Services <i>in consultation with the appropriate Portfolio Holder and Shadows</i> to:- .....</p> <p>2.3 That Executive delegates authority to the Head of Neighbourhood Services <i>in consultation with the appropriate Portfolio Holder and Shadows</i> to:- .....</p>				
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>The Deputy Leader, Councillor Caborn, thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their recommendation but advised that it would not be accepted because paragraph 3.7 detailed the relevant parties to be liaised with and sticking to current form and practice was the best option, to avoid complicating the delegation further.</p>				