

## Overview & Scrutiny Committee

### Tuesday 1 November 2022

An additional meeting of the above Committee will be held in the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa on Tuesday 1 November 2022, at 6.00pm and available for the public to watch via the Warwick District Council [YouTube channel](#).

Councillor Milton (Chair)

Councillor A Barton

Councillor P Kohler

Councillor G Cullinan

Councillor V Leigh-Hunt

Councillor A Dearing

Councillor M Noone

Councillor J Dearing

Councillor P Redford

Councillor O Jacques

Councillor S Syson

Councillor C King

### Emergency Procedure

At the commencement of the meeting, the emergency procedure for the Town Hall will be announced

### Agenda

#### 1. Apologies & Substitutes

- (a) to receive apologies for absence from any Councillor who is unable to attend; and
- (b) to receive the name of any Councillor who is to act as a substitute, notice of which has been given to the Chief Executive, together with the name of the Councillor for whom they are acting.

#### 2. Declarations of Interest

Members to declare the existence and nature of interests in items on the agenda in accordance with the adopted Code of Conduct.

Declarations should be disclosed during this item. However, the existence and nature of any interest that subsequently becomes apparent during the course of the meeting must be disclosed immediately. If the interest is not registered, Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of the interest within 28 days.

Members are also reminded of the need to declare predetermination on any matter.

If Members are unsure about whether or not they have an interest, or about its nature, they are strongly advised to seek advice from officers prior to the meeting.

#### 3. Minutes

To confirm the minutes of the meeting held on 28 September 2022.

**(Pages 1 to 10)**

4. **Work Programme, Forward Plan & Comments from Cabinet**

To consider a report from Democratic Services.

**(Pages 1 to 13)**

5. **Report on the reasons for the cost increases in the Castle Farm Leisure Centre and Abbey Fields Swimming Pool projects**

To consider a report from Deputy Chief Executive's Office.

**(Pages 1 to 6)**

**(See Item 8 for confidential appendices)**

6. **Cabinet Agenda (Non-Confidential Items and Reports) – Thursday 3 November 2022**

To consider the non-confidential items on the Cabinet agenda which fall within the remit of this Committee. The only items to be considered are those which Committee Services have received notice of by 9.00am on the morning after Group meetings.

**(Circulated Separately)**

7. **Public & Press**

To consider resolving that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 that the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following items by reason of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the paragraphs 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 as set out below.

Item Numbers	Paragraph Numbers	Reason
8	3	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)
9	5	Information in respect of which a claim to legal professional privilege could be maintained in legal proceedings

8. **Confidential Appendices - Report on the reasons for the cost increases in the Castle Farm Leisure Centre and Abbey Fields Swimming Pool projects**

Confidential appendices to Item 5 on the agenda.

**(Appendices 1 - 4 )  
(Not for publication)**

9. **Regulatory Services Software Replacement Project – Review and Termination of Supplier Contract**

To consider a confidential report from ICT.

**(Pages 1 to 12)  
(Not for publication)**

10. **Cabinet Agenda (Confidential Items and Reports) – Thursday 3 November 2022**

To consider the confidential items on the Cabinet agenda which fall within the remit of this Committee. The only items to be considered are those which Committee Services have received notice of by 9.00am on the morning after Group meetings.

**(Circulated separately)**

Published Monday 24 October 2022

General Enquiries: Please contact Warwick District Council, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Royal Leamington Spa, Warwickshire, CV32 5HZ.

Telephone: 01926 456114

E-Mail: [committee@warwickdc.gov.uk](mailto:committee@warwickdc.gov.uk)

For enquiries about specific reports, please contact the officers named in the reports.

You can e-mail the members of the Committee at

[standscommittee@warwickdc.gov.uk](mailto:standscommittee@warwickdc.gov.uk)

Details of all the Council's committees, councillors and agenda papers are available via our website on the [Committees page](#)

We endeavour to make all of our agendas and reports fully accessible. Please see our [accessibility statement](#) for details.

The agenda is available in large print on request,  
prior to the meeting, by telephoning (01926)  
456114

# Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the additional meeting held on Wednesday 28 September 2022 in the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa at 6.00pm.

**Present:** Councillor Milton (Chair); Councillors Barton, Davison, J Dearing, Illingworth, Jacques, Kohler, Leigh-Hunt, Quinney, Redford and Syson.

**Also Present:** Councillor Hales, Portfolio Holder – Resources; Councillor Rhead, Portfolio Holder – Climate Change; and Councillor Bartlett – Portfolio Holder – Economy and Culture.

## 26. **Apologies and Substitutes**

- (a) An apology for absence was received from Councillor King.
- (b) Councillor Quinney substituted for Councillor Cullinan; Councillor Davison substituted for Councillor A Dearing; and Councillor Illingworth substituted for Councillor Noone.

## 27. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

## 28. **Minutes**

The minutes of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting held on 9 August 2022 were taken as read and signed by the Chair as a correct record.

(Councillor Leigh-Hunt joined the meeting.)

## 29. **Cabinet Agenda (Non-Confidential items and reports) – Thursday 29 September 2022**

### Item 9 – Notices of Motion from July Council

The Committee supported the report. In respect of Motion 1, the Committee asked that the legal advice provided by the Council's solicitors should be circulated to Cabinet ahead of its meeting. The Committee asked Cabinet to consider this advice before making its decision on the item.

With regards to Motion 2, the Committee received reassurance from the Head of Development Services that Policy H6 Guidance would be updated in due course, and that an updated Local Development Scheme would be brought to Cabinet in December.

### Item 12 – Hydrogen Strategy

The Committee welcomed the report and recognised the complexity of the topic. The Committee welcomed the reassurance from the Portfolio Holder for Climate Change that this was an evolving situation and that a revised

Hydrogen Strategy document would be brought forward in early 2023, alongside the business case.

(Councillor Rhead left the meeting.)

### **30. Development Management and Enforcement Performance Update**

The Committee considered a report from Development Services which updated Members on the recovery of the Council's Development Management and Enforcement Services, and the related ongoing actions to maintain and improve efficiency and effectiveness.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, in line with a national trend, the Development Management service experienced a significant increase in the number of planning applications being submitted. This, combined with several other factors which were set out in a report considered by the Committee at its 8 March 2022 meeting, resulted in a backlog of applications which at its greatest, amounted to over 300 cases.

Members were aware that prior to that, the service had performed exceptionally well on a consistent basis with regard to the timescales for determining planning applications.

By way of response to the increased workload, as well as filling vacant posts, a number of additional temporary posts were created within the service. Whilst staff turnover amongst some of those posts continued to be significant, enough staff remained in place to complete the processing of the surge of planning application work.

At its greatest, during early 2021, there were over 500 applications on hand, of which 200 were being actively worked on, whilst 300 were waiting to be allocated to a Planning Officer. The backlog of work waiting to be allocated to a Planning Officer was eliminated in December 2021 and at the time of writing, there were 336 applications on hand, all of which were being processed by a Planning Officer.

The approach to the consideration of planning applications was to work closely with applicants and negotiate revisions to schemes where that was considered necessary to make them acceptable wherever possible. The alternative would be to refuse proposals without so doing, which would increase the speed of decision making and assist with performance in that regard, but reduce the quality of the service being offered, increase the number of appeals being received, and extend the overall timescale from the customers' perspectives.

The period of time over which those cases were waiting to be allocated to an officer in the backlog queue significantly increased the overall application determination timescale, which was reflected in the lower performance figures for the proportion of applications determined within the statutory or extended timescale which were reported for the period October to December 2021 (42%).

Nevertheless, by the time of the Committee meeting on 8 March 2022, performance for the then current partial quarter had improved to 68% of decisions being made within the statutory or extended timescale.

Since that time, the performance figures for the last two full quarters and the current part-quarter were as follows:

- January to March 22 - 72%
- April to June 22 - 87%
- July to August 22 - 91%

The former backlog of planning applications waiting to be allocated to an Officer remained at zero.

Over the last two years, the Planning Enforcement team had experienced significant issues with long term sickness, vacant posts (including the Team Manager role) and poor response levels to recruitment resulting in an under resourced team over much of that period.

At its worst, that situation contributed to an enforcement caseload of 434 cases, of which 275 were awaiting investigation. This, in turn, led to a low level of customer satisfaction and increased numbers of service complaints.

However, since that time, the Enforcement Manager post had been filled, albeit temporarily on an agency basis, and a further key member of staff had returned from long term sickness. As a result, the team was now proactively working to investigate cases in the most effective manner and to move towards a position where an increasing amount of time was spent on addressing the most harmful cases rather than administering the backlog of work.

In that regard, the current position was that the overall enforcement caseload had reduced to 225 cases, of which 114 were awaiting investigation.

As part of that, there were 19 ongoing cases where formal action had either been, or was proposed to be taken, along with two appeals against Enforcement Notices that had been issued, both of which were being handled by way of a Public Inquiry.

It should, however, be noted that a different and full-time officer within the team had now been on sick leave for an extended number of weeks, which appeared likely to continue.

The application backlog and uncharacteristic subsequent downturn in planning application performance had been a consequence of a combination of factors, most particularly the increase in the volume and complexity of the team's workload summarised above; the vacant posts that were being carried at the time; and sickness within the team during the pandemic.

The Council had also been experiencing a significant increase in the timescales for the receipt of some statutory consultee responses, which was significantly delaying the assessment and determination of some planning applications – principally, the more major schemes.

As reported at the Committee meeting in March 2022, since that time, a number of actions had been undertaken to address the workload situation, principally involving the recruitment to existing vacant posts; the ongoing review of processes and protocols to enhance effective working wherever possible; and recruitment to additional temporary posts.

Those actions were considered to have been key to the elimination of the backlog of unallocated work and the subsequent progress that had been made.

Nevertheless, the recruitment and retention of staff within both the Development Management and Enforcement Teams continued to be a concern, as did levels of sickness, the former particularly as there remained a shortage of experienced planners and enforcement professionals available for the public sector.

That position continued to be exacerbated by other Councils within the sub-region offering more attractive remuneration packages, which was evidenced by low levels of external interest in some roles and the continued loss of existing staff to nearby Councils.

In addition, in order to assist with the ongoing imbalance of demand for enforcement investigations relative to resourcing and increase effective working wherever possible, work continued on the review of team priorities.

Following the unsuccessful recruitment to two additional temporary posts last November – Senior Enforcement Officer (two years) and Enforcement Officer (one year), it was intended to repeat those recruitments shortly.

In addition to the above, work was continuing on the formulation of a longer-term Service Improvement Plan covering both development management and enforcement including:

- the review of capacity and resourcing with the teams;
- a recruitment and retention strategy including the increased use of market supplements where appropriate;
- a succession planning strategy;
- the procurement of a new back-office system;
- the digitising of microfiche records;
- the increased use of Planning Performance Agreements to fund increased capacity within the Team; and
- increased collaboration with statutory and other consultees to assist, where possible in enabling their timelier responses.

In terms of alternative options, other than noting the report and endorsing the proposed actions, there were no other alternatives before the Committee at this time.

An addendum providing a breakdown of planning enforcement investigations awaiting allocation to an officer was circulated prior to the meeting. This showed that since March 2022, this number had reduced from 275 such cases awaiting investigation, to 89.

In answer to questions from Members, the Development Manager and the Head of Place, Arts and Economy advised Members that:

- The team had a target of 90% or above in terms of aiming to resolve planning issues within the statutory deadlines, which put Warwick District Council at the top of the charts across the country. A target of 100% was not realistic and had never been hit before.
- With enforcement, there was a wide range of requests and issues, varying from something urgent, such as a demolition of part of a listed building, to more minor requests, where it might be deemed that no action should be taken. The build-up of cases was minor, and clearing these from the system would make space for those issues that did really require officers to intervene.
- The Enforcement Manager position was key, and it was very important that this role was finally appointed to, having been vacant for quite some time, preceded by long-term sickness.
- The lack of planning staff members was an issue across the entire planning profession, where not enough people were coming through. In addition, the Council was competing with the private sector which offered much more appealing remuneration schemes, and so did other neighbouring local authorities.
- Although this was not happening at the moment, the aim was for the Enforcement Manager to review new cases coming through on a daily basis and assign these to officers the same day.
- On occasion, officers would get enquiries about other areas of legislation or about issues which were out of the Council's control, and in those instances, officers would still need to reply to the clients and explain.
- All of the cases which were nine to 21 months' old were at the lower end of the triage scale, and the aim was to clear this backlog by the end of the year.
- A letter notification, a visit or combination of both were issued to residents not building according to the standards. However, the backlog remained an issue, in that not a great deal was done in the meantime.
- Officers were looking at a range of different ways to engage with statutory consultees, including Warwickshire County Council and in particular, the Highways Department, and this was a work in progress.
- The delay in hearing back from statutory consultees did ultimately impact significantly on officers' ability to deal with planning applications and houses being built.
- In spite of the drop in the number of planning applications coming forward when compared to the pre-pandemic levels, Development Services was still on target for hitting its projected income for the year.
- At times, morale within the team had been low, but it was good at the moment, with a number of temporary staff helping get through the backlog of work accumulated during the pandemic.
- It was essential to improve staff retention.
- Officers were very careful not to "lose" any cases, but if Councillors or members of the public wanted to follow up, they could email officers.
- Sometimes, a really old case could still be looked at due to appeals taking place and in some way, this happened as a result of officers taking action rather than not.



- The Development Manager was keeping under review the option of potentially using apprentices.
- There was currently one vacancy across Development Services.
- There were only two appeals due to non-determination, and therefore, the appeals in planning decisions were not significantly impacted.

Members welcomed the report and thanked officers for their work in improving performance given the challenges.

**Resolved** that the report be noted, and a further report be brought forward to the Committee in six months' time.

The Chair reminded Members that a training session on Finance was scheduled for the Tuesday after the meeting and informed those present that no formal training on finance scrutiny had been provided to the Committee at that time.

(Councillor Bartlett joined the meeting.)

31. **Treasury Management Activity Report for period 1 October 2021 to 31 March 2022**

The Committee considered a report from Finance which detailed the Council's Treasury Management performance for the period 1 October 2021 to 31 March 2022.

The Council's 2021/22 Treasury Management Strategy and Treasury Management Practices (TMPs) required the performance of the Treasury Management Function to be reported to Members on a half-yearly basis in accordance with the Treasury Management Code of Practice.

LIBOR and LIBID rates ceased from the end of 2021. For benchmarking purposes, they had been replaced with SONIA (Sterling Overnight Index Average) and Warwick District Council Treasury Team had decided to use 'backward' looking rates.

In terms of alternatives, the report retrospectively looked at what had happened during the last six months and was, therefore, a statement of fact.

The Principal Accountant advised Members of a correction to the recommendation, which should have stated "That the Overview & Scrutiny Committee notes the contents of the report", and not the Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee.

Councillor Illingworth thanked officers for the good results shown in Appendix D to the report.

In answer to questions from Members, the Principal Accountant and the Portfolio Holder for Resources advised that:

- Historically, investing in other Councils had been very common practice, but it was less so more recently. However, local authorities were still coming to the market offering very good rates sometimes.

- Warwick District Council was not a borrower in that way, and other authorities were not invested in this Council.
- In theory, all local authorities were sovereign bodies and as such, there was no risk in investing in struggling local authorities because, in theory, the Government would bail them out. However, Warwick District Council would not want to invest in another local authority if there was a liquidity risk.
- Most of the counterparties the Council invested in had money market ratings by various agencies. The Council had a rule not to invest unless it had at least an A-rating. However, local authorities did not have a rating.
- The Council was likely to go back into corporate equity funds and officers were looking at green equity funds for divesting.

**Resolved** that the report be noted.

### 32. **Annual Treasury Management Report 2021/2022**

The Committee considered a report from Finance which covered Warwick District Council's Treasury Management performance for the whole of 2021/22, as attached at Appendix A to the report.

The Council was required by regulations issued under the Local Government Act 2003 to produce an Annual Treasury Management review of activities and the actual prudential and treasury indicators for 2021/22. The report met the requirements of both the CIPFA Code of Practice on Treasury Management, (the Code), and the CIPFA Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities, (the Prudential Code).

The Treasury Management Strategy for 2021/22 and the Council's Treasury Management Practices, in accordance with the Code of Practice for Treasury Management, required that the Treasury Management function reported on its activities during the year by no later than 30 September in the year after that being reported on.

During 2021/22, the minimum reporting requirements were that the Council should receive the following reports:

- an annual treasury strategy in advance of the year (Council 24/2/2021);
- a mid-year (minimum) treasury update report (Finance & Audit Scrutiny 03/11/2021); and
- an annual review following the end of the year describing the activity compared to the strategy (the current report).

In addition, the Council received a half-yearly Treasury Management update report for the second half of 2021/22, which was also on the agenda for the meeting.

The regulatory environment placed responsibility on Members for the review and scrutiny of Treasury Management policy and activities. The report was, therefore, important in that respect, as it provided details of the outturn position for treasury activities and highlighted compliance with the Council's policies previously approved by Members.

The Council was required to confirm that it had complied with the requirement under the Code to give prior scrutiny to all the above Treasury Management reports. In previous years, this had been undertaken within the scrutiny function of Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee. As that Committee had ceased to exist and the Council only had a Scrutiny Committee, it was considered by officers that the report for now should come to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee before they were reported to the Council.

Officers had considered this and, on reflection, in future felt that this work was more closely aligned with the Audit & Standards Committee and therefore it was recommended that this should fall under the remit of the Audit & Standards Committee. Officers had undertaken comparison work with other Councils and found that there was no unified approach across the sector. Grant Thornton tended to see treasury management reports being considered by an Audit Committee, with anything required then also going to Cabinet on the proposed approach (with referral to Council for certain decisions). This would not remove the ability for the Overview & Scrutiny Committee to consider any report regarding treasury management that was on the Cabinet agenda.

The report commented, where appropriate, on the Council's actual performance against what was forecast in the 2021/22 Treasury Management Strategy as well as, in certain instances, latest forecasts. The Council was also required to comment on its performance against its Annual Investment Strategy for the year.

In terms of alternative options, as explained above, the Code of Practice mandated that Annual Treasury Management Performance had to be reported by 30 September after that financial year had closed, demonstrating compliance with the Prudential Code, or explaining any divergence for the approved Treasury Management Strategy and Prudential Indicators.

The Council had announced that it would divest from fossil fuels at the earliest opportunity; no later than the end of 2025, and ideally by the end of 2022. The Council was able to take advantage of market movements to divest in September 2021, as outlined in the report.

The Council might consider varying its investment vehicles or counterparty limits; however, this would alter the potential credit and liquidity risks.

The 2021/22 Annual Treasury Management Report was contained at Appendix A to the report and demonstrated that the Council's Treasury Management activity was compliant with Prudential Indicators and the requirements of the Prudential Code.

Councillor Syson congratulated Councillor Hales, the Portfolio Holder for Resources, for presenting the Committee with such a good use of the Council's resources.

**Resolved** that the contents of the report in respect of the Council's Treasury Management activities during 2021/22, be noted; and

**Recommended** to Council that in future, updates on Treasury Management should be considered by the Audit & Standards Committee and the Constitution and relevant Policies be updated to reflect this.

33. **Cabinet Agenda (Non-Confidential items and reports) – Thursday 29 September 2022**

Item 4 – Quarter 1 Budget Report

The Committee noted the report and thanked officers for their time in producing it. The Committee noted the positive impact the new financial system was having already and wished to thank officers and Members for the collaborative work on that.

Members highlighted their concerns on the impact of the energy crisis on Council finances and looked forward to receiving an action plan on that in the near future.

Members had also asked that where emergency powers were used, full details should be made available in the Cabinet report to enable scrutiny to take place efficiently.

(Councillor Quinney left the room.)

Item 5 – Final Accounts 2021/22

The Committee noted the report and congratulated officers on their efforts.

(At 8.05pm the meeting was adjourned for a comfort break. The meeting resumed at 8.15pm.)

(Councillor Quinney re-joined the meeting.)

Item 6 – Relocation of Kenilworth Wardens

The Committee was concerned about the level of financial risk inherent in the project.

The Committee recommended that the Cabinet should fully understand all different scenarios including project overspend, and that the Resources PAB should review the business case prior to disbursement.

Item 13 – Covent Garden Car Park

The Committee welcomed the report and thanked officers for their efforts in bringing it forward.

The Committee recommended to Cabinet that the feasibility study should look at the potential for generating electricity for future, in line with the Council's ambitions.

34. **Work Programme, Forward Plan and comments from the Cabinet**

The Committee considered its work programme for 2022 as detailed at Appendix 1 to the report. Appendix 2 to the report gave responses from the Cabinet to the comments and recommendations the Committee had made to Cabinet reports it had scrutinised.

The Deputy Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer informed Members that the Service Area Plans (SAPs) were now available online to all Members, and were updated by each Service Area. A link had been circulated to all Councillors, but Members were advised to contact Committee Services if they needed any assistance.

The Chair asked that an update should be given at the next meeting of the Committee from the Task & Finish Group – Equality & Diversity. The Chair emphasised that an update would be beneficial, even if there might not be a lot to report.

The Deputy Chief Executive & Monitoring Officer informed the Committee that unfortunately the ARCUS project, which was supposed to improve the delivery of community protection, was not successful. He asked Members to consider adding a report to scrutinise this, focusing on lessons learnt, to its work programme.

**Resolved** that

- (1) appendices 1 and 2 to the Work Programme report be noted;
- (2) the following items be added to the Work Programme:
  - a. November 2022 – ARCUS – termination of contract written report;
  - b. December 2022 – Climate Emergency Action Plan update, deferred from November 2022; and
  - c. March 2023 - Development Management and Enforcement Performance Update subsequent to reports made to O&S in March 2022 and September 2022.

(The meeting ended at 9.30pm)

CHAIR  
1 November 2022

Overview & Scrutiny Committee  
1 November 2022

Title: Work Programme, Forward Plan & Comments from Cabinet

Lead Officer: Lesley Dury, Principal Committee Services Officer

Portfolio Holder: Not applicable

Public report

Wards of the District directly affected: Not applicable

Accessibility checked: Yes

---

## Summary

This report informs Members of Overview & Scrutiny Committee:

- (1) of the Committee's work programme for 2022/2023 (Appendix 1);
- (2) responses that Cabinet gave to comments and recommendations made by Overview & Scrutiny Committee regarding the reports to Cabinet 29 September 2022 (Appendix 2); and
- (3) of the response that Council gave to a recommendation made by Overview & Scrutiny Committee regarding how future updates on Treasury Management should be considered by Audit & Standards Committee (Appendix 3).

## Recommendations

- (1) That Members consider the work programme (Appendix 1) and agree any changes as appropriate.
  - (2) That the Committee:
    - identifies any Cabinet items on the [Forward Plan](#) on which it wishes to have an input before the Cabinet makes its decision; and
    - nominates a Member to investigate that future decision and report back to the Committee.
  - (3) That Members note the responses made by the Cabinet on the Comments from the Cabinet report (Appendix 2).
  - (4) That Members note the response made by Council on the recommendation made by Overview & Scrutiny Committee regarding how future updates on Treasury Management should be considered by Audit & Standards Committee (Appendix 3).
- 

## 1 Background/Information

- 1.1 The five main roles of overview and scrutiny in local government are: holding to account; performance management; policy review; policy development; and external scrutiny.
- 1.2 The pre-decision scrutiny of Cabinet decisions falls within the role of 'holding to account'. To feed into the pre-decision scrutiny of Cabinet decisions, the Committee needs to examine the Council's Forward Plan and identify items which it would like to have an impact upon.

- 1.3 The Council's Forward Plan is published on a monthly basis and sets out the key decisions to be taken by the Council in the next twelve months. The Council only has a statutory duty to publish key decisions to be taken in the next four months. However, the Forward Plan was expanded to a twelve-month period to give a clearer picture of how and when the Council will be making important decisions.
- 1.4 A key decision means a decision made in the exercise of an executive function by any person (including officers) or body which meets one or more of the following conditions:

- (1) The decision is likely to result in the Council incurring expenditure or the making of savings in excess of £150,000. Excluded from this are all loans to banks or other financial institutions made in accordance with the Treasury Management Strategy.

Officers' delegated powers to make The cabinet decisions are subject to the key decision/call-in regime where it is likely that the Council would incur expenditure or make savings above the threshold of £150,000.

In relation to letting contracts the key decision is the proposal to let a contract for a particular type of work. The subsequent decision to award the contract to a specific contractor will not be a key decision provided the value of the contract does not vary above the estimated amount by more than 10% for contracts with a value of up to £500,000 or 5% for contracts of over £500,000;

- (2) The decision is likely to be significant in terms of its effects on communities living or working in any two or more Wards.

In considering whether a decision is likely to be significant, a decision-maker will need to consider the strategic nature of the decision and whether the outcome will have an impact, for better or worse on the amenity of the community or quality of service provided by the Council to a significant number of people living or working in the locality affected.

- 1.5 The Forward Plan also identifies non-key decisions to be made by the Council in the next twelve months, and the Committee, if it wishes, may also pre-scrutinise these decisions.
- 1.6 There may also be policies identified on the Forward Plan, either as key or non-key decisions, which the Committee could pre-scrutinise and have an impact upon how these are formulated.
- 1.7 The Committee should be mindful that any work it wishes to undertake would need to be undertaken without the need to change the timescales as set out within the Forward Plan.
- 1.8 At each meeting, the Committee will consider their work programme and make amendments where necessary, and also make comments on specific Cabinet items, where notice has been given by 9am on the morning after Group meetings. The Committee will also receive a report detailing the

response from the Cabinet, on the comments the Committee made on the Cabinet agenda in the previous cycle.

- 1.9 The Forward Plan is considered at each meeting and allows the Committee to look at future items and become involved in those Cabinet decisions to be taken, if members so wish.
- 1.10 As part of the new scrutiny process, the Committee is no longer considering the whole of the Cabinet agenda.
- 1.11 On the day of publication of the Cabinet 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 Cabinet items they would like the Committee to consider.
- 1.12 As a result, the Committee considered the items detailed in appendix 2. The response the Cabinet gave on each item is also shown.
- 1.13 In reviewing these responses, the 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.

## **2 Conclusion/Reasons for the Recommendation**

- 2.1 The work programme should be updated at each meeting to accurately reflect the workload of the Committee.
- 2.2 The proposed plan at Appendix 1 has been developed in order for the Committee to focus on the four agreed core themes (Covid 19, Climate Change, Medium Term Financial Strategy and Business Plan). While this Committee will not have as much focus on the Medium-Term Financial Strategy, it will have to spend significant times looking at the other areas in detail.
- 2.3 Two of the five main roles of overview and scrutiny in local government are to undertake pre-decision scrutiny of Cabinet decisions and to feed into policy development.
- 2.4 If the Committee has an interest in a future decision to be made by the Cabinet, or policy to be implemented, it is within the Committee's remit to feed into this process.
- 2.5 The Forward Plan is actually the future work programme for the Cabinet. If a non-cabinet member highlighted a decision(s) which is to be taken by the Cabinet which they would like to be involved in, that member(s) could then provide useful background to the Committee when the report is submitted to the Cabinet and they are passing comment on it.
- 2.6 Appendix 2, Comments from Cabinet, is produced to create a dialogue between the Cabinet and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It ensures that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee is formally made aware of the Cabinet's responses.
- 2.7 Where Overview and Scrutiny Committee has made a recommendation as opposed to a comment, the Cabinet is required to respond to the recommendation(s) made, including whether or not it accepts the recommendation(s).



**Meeting Date: 1 November 2022**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Where did item originate from</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Lead Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Next report date if applicable</b>	<b>Completion Date / Notes</b>
Report on the reasons for the cost increases in the Castle Farm Leisure Centre and Abbey Fields Swimming Pool projects	Request from P Herlihy to bring a report before O&S	Written report with confidential appendices	Padraig Herlihy		
Regulatory Services Software Replacement Project – Review & Termination of Supplier Contract	O&S – September 2022	Written Confidential Report	David Elkington		
Task & Finish Group – Equality & Diversity – Phase 2	O&S 6 July 2021	Verbal update	Councillor Kaur Mangat	Every meeting until completed	
Park Exercise Permits – annual review of the scheme	August 2020	Verbal update – response received following the request to chase progress made at September 2022 meeting.	Ann Hill		
HEART Shared Service update		This has been postponed to December's 2022 meeting because a report will be going to Cabinet which O&S can call in for scrutiny.	Lisa Barker		

**Meeting Date: 6 December 2022**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Where did item originate from</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Lead Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Next report date if applicable</b>	<b>Completion Date / Notes</b>
HEART Shared Service update including the implementation of the new IT system, progress/improvements made and if needed, the options available to Council to change the service.	April 2022	Call in the report going to Cabinet.	Lisa Barker		
Environmental Enforcement Update subsequent to the report made in March '22	March 2022, O&S	Written report	Zoe Court		
Noise Nuisance Investigations: Review of the Policy and the service area's performance in respect of all forms of noise nuisance more generally	9 August 2022	Written report	Lorna Hudson		
Climate Emergency Action Plan update from previous period and giving progress against carbon emissions and what is coming forward.	May 2022 O&S	Written report	Dave Barber	May 2023	Every 6 months

## Appendix 1 – Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee Work Programme

<b>Title</b>	<b>Where did item originate from</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Lead Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Next report date if applicable</b>	<b>Completion Date / Notes</b>
<p>To provide options for financing climate change action programme projects as promised at O&amp;S 24 May 2022.</p> <p>To give a RAG risk status at the start of the report showing the summary of risks and stage reached to achieving the Council's ambitions without carbon offsetting becoming necessary.</p>					

**Meeting Date: 7 February 2023**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Where did item originate from</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Lead Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Next report date if applicable</b>	<b>Completion Date / Notes</b>
Digital Strategy Update	O&S November 2021	Written report	David Elkington	August 2023	Every six months
Task & Finish Group – Equality & Diversity Phase 2 report for approval to submit to Cabinet in March		Written report	Councillor Kaur Mangat	Report on Cabinet decision following its March meeting.	

**Meeting Date 7 March 2023**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Where did item originate from</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Lead Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Next report date if applicable</b>	<b>Completion Date / Notes</b>
Summary of the role, responsibilities and performance of the SWCSP	This is a mandatory report.	Written report	Liz Young / Marianne Rolfe.	March 2024.	This is an annual report.
Annual update from Shakespeare's England, looking back over the previous year's activity and forward to next year.	April 2022	Written report	Martin O'Neill and Councillor Bartlett	March 2024.	This is an annual report.
Development Management and Enforcement Performance Update subsequent to reports made to O&S in March 2022 and September 2022	March 2022 O&S September 2022 O&S	Written Report	HoS Development / Gary Fisher	TBA	

**Meeting Date 18 April 2023**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Where did item originate from</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Lead Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Next report date if applicable</b>	<b>Completion Date / Notes</b>
Overview & Scrutiny End of Term report.	Standing Annual Item.	Written report.	Committee Services Officer.	April 2023.	This is an annual report.

**Briefing Notes to All Councillors – April 2023: Not for O&S Agenda, but to be emailed to all WDC Cllrs**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Where did item originate from</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Lead Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Next report date if applicable</b>	<b>Completion Date / Notes</b>
Children's and Adults' Safeguarding Champions: End of Term Report.	Standing Annual Item.	Briefing note	Marianne Rolfe.	April 2024.	This is a briefing note to all Councillors.
Members' Annual Feedback on Outside Appointments / Annual review of membership/participation of Outside Bodies (Includes a short synopsis on Champions)	Standing Annual Items	Briefing note	Andrew Jones	April 2024	This is a briefing note to all Councillors.

**Meeting Date: To Be Advised**

<b>Title</b>	<b>Where did item originate from</b>	<b>Format</b>	<b>Lead Officer / Councillor</b>	<b>Next report date if applicable</b>	<b>Completion Date / Notes</b>
Decide if an update is required on the Catering and Events Concessions Contract – Royal Pump Rooms and Jephson Gardens Glasshouse.	Committee meeting 26 September 2019.	Informal update.	Dave Guilding / Philip Clarke.	TBA	
Update - plans to improve accessibility to, and the condition / cleanliness of, toilets for people living with disabilities.	Committee meeting 26 September 2019 and briefing note 8 December 2020.	Written report	Zoë Court	To be advised if applicable.	No officer will attend the Committee meeting unless there is a request.
Minimum Energy Efficiency Standards Enforcement Process – Private Sector Housing	O&S August 2020	Written Report	Lisa Barker		A review was requested once the scheme had been operation for 12 months. Covid affected the process.

**Response from the meeting of the Cabinet on the  
O&S Committee's Comments – 29 September 2022**

Item Number 4 – Quarter 1 Budget Report

**Scrutiny Comment:**

The Committee noted the report and thanked officers for their time in producing it. The Committee noted the positive impact the new financial system is having already and would like to thank officers and Members for the collaborative work on that.

Members highlighted their concerns on the impact of the energy crisis on Council finances and look forward to receiving an action plan on that in the near future.

Members have also asked that where emergency powers are used, full details should be made available in the Cabinet report to enable scrutiny to take place efficiently.

**Cabinet Response:**

The Leader advised that in terms of the cost-of-living crisis, there was a package of measures that was originally going to come through the Leadership Coordinating Group (LCG), but this was postponed due to the funeral of the Queen. There was a special LCG session organised for 3 October to deal with this work, and the drafts he had seen so far had been very impressive and he was confident a strong package would be put forward. With the Medium-Term Financial Strategy (MTFS), there was a need to get a grip on the projected £3 million deficit, however there had been similarly eye-watering amounts projected in previous years and the Council had managed to do something about it. There was a plan to take the budget development through the Resources Programme Advisory Board (PAB) as well as through LCG, to ensure that this was done on a cross-party basis and to give the full disclosure of the thinking behind decisions. The Leader offered to sit down with Councillor Davison to go through the details of the Spencer Yard project, in order to give him the confidence he was looking for.

Councillor Hales noted the concerns regarding the increase in gas, electric, but it was important to note the steps already taken, for example the use of reserves for the applause package for staff, as well as the use of funds for the Energy Rebate scheme. He thanked the support of Group Leaders, and officers for their efforts in working to produce the balanced budget that was required. He then proposed the report as laid out.

The recommendations in the report were approved.

Items 5 – Final Accounts 2021/22

**Scrutiny Comment:**

The Committee noted the report and congratulated officers on their efforts.

**Cabinet Response:**

The recommendations in the report were approved.

Item 6 – Relocation of Kenilworth Wardens

**Scrutiny Comment:**

Members were concerned about the level of financial risk inherent in the project.

The Committee recommended that the Cabinet should fully understand all different scenarios including project overspend, and that the Resources PAB should review the business case prior to disbursement.

**Cabinet Response:**

In response to the comments and recommendation made by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Hales proposed the following amended additional condition:

“That Cabinet agrees to release £300,000 from the Council’s Reserves/Balances, the precise source to be determined by the Head of Finance and asks that the Resources PAB reviews the business case and reports its findings to the Leadership Co-ordinating Group (LCG) prior to the release of the funding”.

The Leader gave the opportunity to the Chair of the Overview Scrutiny Committee to comment on whether the amended additional recommendation satisfied the concerns raised by the Committee. He stated that although it was noted that the money was recoverable with the sale of the land, there were other potential consequences where if the project were considerably overspent, that money would need to be recovered from somewhere, having consequences both to the Council and the Wardens.

The Deputy Chief Executive and Monitoring officer advised that he agreed with that concern, and a review of the business case would include that scenario, and he gave his assurance that he would work with the Resources PAB on this, which the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee was satisfied with. The PAB would review concerns about the sustainability of the club, its business model going forward, the cost of the move to pay for the relocation, scenario planning, for example an exit strategy if needed. The homework behind this would also come through the LCG, whereby a view on whether to progress or reverse the decision that the Cabinet would take at this meeting.

The recommendations in the report were approved, along with an additional recommendation that Cabinet agrees to release £300,000 from the Council’s Reserves/Balances, the precise source to be determined by the Head of Finance and asks that the Resources PAB reviews the business case and reports its findings to the Leadership Co-ordinating Group (LCG) prior to the release of the funding.

Item 9 – Notices of Motion from July Council

**Scrutiny Comment:**

The Committee supported the report. In respect of Motion 1, the Committee asked that the legal advice provided by the Council’s solicitors should be circulated to Cabinet ahead of its meeting. The Committee asked Cabinet to consider this advice before making its decision on the item.

With regards to Motion 2, the Committee received reassurance from the Head of Development Services that Policy H6 Guidance would be updated in due course, and that an updated Local Development Scheme would be brought to Cabinet in December.



**Cabinet Response:**

The recommendations in the report were approved.

(The legal advice had been circulated as requested in respect of Motion 1.)

Item 12 – Hydrogen Strategy

**Scrutiny Comment:**

The Committee welcomed the report and recognised the complexity of the topic. The Committee welcomed the reassurance from the Portfolio Holder for Climate Change that this was an evolving situation and that a revised Hydrogen Strategy document would be brought forward in early 2023, alongside the business case.

**Cabinet Response:**

The recommendations in the report were approved.

Item 13 – Covent Garden Car Park

**Scrutiny Comment:**

The Committee welcomed the report and thanked officers for their efforts in bringing it forward.

The Committee recommended to Cabinet that the feasibility study should look at the potential for generating electricity for future, in line with the Council's ambitions.

**Cabinet Response:**

The recommendations in the report were approved, along with the following recommendation from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee:

"the feasibility study should look at the potential for generating electricity for future, in line with the Council's ambitions".

**Response from the meeting of Council on the  
O&S Committee's Recommendation – 19 October 2022**

Minute 32, Overview & Scrutiny Committee 28 September 2022 – "Annual Treasury Management Report"

**Scrutiny Recommendation to Council:**

The Committee recommended that in future, updates on Treasury Management should be considered by the Audit & Standards Committee and the Constitution and relevant policies be updated to reflect this.

**Council Response:**

The recommendation from Overview & Scrutiny Committee was approved.

Title: Report on the reasons for cost increases in the Castle Farm Leisure Centre and Abbey Fields Swimming Pool projects.

Lead Officer: Paddy Herlihy (01926 456 228)

Portfolio Holder: Councillor Andrew Day

Wards of the District directly affected: Kenilworth Abbey and Arden and District-wide

---

## Summary

The purpose of this report is to present the reasons for the increase in costs for the two projects between the two stages of the procurement process. The body of the report gives some of the reasons for this increase. The confidential appendices provide more detail on the amounts involved in each element of these increases. The appendices are in the private and confidential part of the agenda as they reveal in some detail the financial negotiations between the Council and Kier, and this information is commercially sensitive as it would give other building contractors substantial information about the costs ascribed to particular elements, and also about the negotiating processes involved in the two contracts.

## Recommendation

That Members note the content of this report

---

## 1 Background/Information

- 1.1 Phase Two of the Leisure Development Programme consists of the demolition and reconstruction of the Castle Farm Leisure Centre and the Abbey Fields Swimming Pool, both in Kenilworth. The contracts for the construction of these two facilities were let separately, as part of the same two-stage procurement exercise. Kier Construction were identified as the preferred contractor of the works. In the period between Stage One and Stage Two of the two stage procurement process the costs of the work rose considerably.

### 1.2 Costs during the Procurement Process

- 1.2.1 The first stage of the procurement process to secure a contractor for the construction of the new Abbey Fields Swimming Pool and the new Castle Farm Leisure Centre (the Centres) was completed in September 2021. This process assessed the tenderers on the basis of their quality and experience, and on the profit and overhead that they would require for the project. Tenderers were asked for their view on overall project costs, but they were not assessed on this aspect. Kier Construction were identified as the preferred contractor and invited to the second stage of the procurement

process. Kier's estimate of the cost of the two projects at that time was within the budget predicted by Mace Cost Consultancy.

- 1.2.2 The Kier non-binding Stage One cost estimate for Castle Farm was £9,936,922.38. The Kier non-binding Stage One cost estimate for Abbey Fields was £8,468,462.40.
- 1.2.3 The second stage of the procurement process involved Kier working with the Design Team under a Pre-Construction Service Agreement (PCSA) to finalise the details of the project and to establish the agreed project cost. Kier worked hard during this stage with the Design Team on an open book basis and also worked with their supply chain to establish the cost of the works during a period of considerable economic uncertainty.
- 1.2.4 The accepted Stage Two tender offer from Kier for Castle Farm was £14,153,180.34. This represents a 42% increase on the Stage One estimate. The accepted Stage Two tender offer from Kier for Abbey Fields was £12,550,000. This represents a 48% increase on the Stage One figure. A number of reasons can be identified for this increase in costs.
- 1.2.5 Firstly, the economic situation at that time led to considerable uncertainty over material and labour costs and this led to significant inflation in the building industry and concern amongst sub-contractors, who had to build risk into the prices that they were quoting. Securing fixed price quotes from the market during this much volatility also led to increased prices.
- 1.2.6 Secondly, Kier undertook commercial betterment through the second stage of the tender process. It is likely that Kier also included for the tendering costs and the costs of the PCSA period, which was extended by the complexity of the market at that time. They may have also improved their Overhead and Profit (OHP) percentage during this process. An analysis is shown in the private and confidential Appendix 1 and 2 that shows that if Kier had made these and other changes at Stage One of the tendering process they would still have been a clear winner for both sites.
- 1.2.7 A third factor is that Kier had not properly quantified the foundation works for Castle Farm Leisure Centre at stage one of the tendering process. Having identified the issue they have corrected their quantities which resulted in a significant cost increase in their second stage tender.
- 1.2.8 A fourth factor was that Kier's work with the Design Team enabled them to develop a fuller understanding of the sub-contract scopes of work at Stage Two of the tendering process and this was not fully captured in the Kier cost estimate at Stage One.
- 1.2.9 In addition, the Council made some design changes during this period which led to an increase in some prices. The Council also chose to 'buy' some risks from the contractor during this process. When this happens, the Council gives money to the contractor to 'buy' a given risk from the contractor. If the risk should materialise, any additional costs are then the responsibility of the contractor rather than the Council.
- 1.2.10 The amount of additional costs created by these various reasons is shown in detail for each facility within the private and confidential Appendix 1 and 2.

### **1.3 Initial Stage Two position and entering contracts**

- 1.3.1 In February 2022 Kier provided their initial Stage Two position to the Council. For the reasons shown above, costs had risen significantly since Stage One of the tender. Kier gave a warning that their initial Stage Two position was likely to rise further, due to the on-going volatility in the markets. The Design Team was closely involved in liaison with Kier to drive these costs down as much as possible.

- 1.3.2 In that month Mace Cost Consultancy, who had been leading on commercial matters for the Design Team, produced a detailed assessment of what was likely to be the final position on costs, when and if the Council was to enter into contract on the two sites. This assessed the cost of the additional known risks and also a likely level for unknown risks. This calculation is shown as private and confidential Appendix 3 to this report.
- 1.3.3 This calculation was used as the basis for the discussion at Leadership Co-ordinating Group, when the decision was made to proceed to contract at both sites. It was also used to make provision within the Medium-Term Financial Strategy for the servicing of the additional sums required.
- 1.3.4 Private and confidential Appendix 4 shows the subsequent movements in the costs of the two projects from the February decision until signed contracts were agreed. It is worthy of note that Mace's estimation was extremely accurate, with the final difference between their estimate and the actual costs representing less than 0.1% of the total cost of the projects.

## **2 Alternative Options that were available to Cabinet at that time**

- 2.1 When the initial Stage Two costs were made known to the Council, it would have been possible to decide not to enter into contracts with Kier for the two sites. It would have been possible to either abandon the projects altogether, or to go back out to tender.
- 2.2 To abandon the projects completely would have involved the Council in significant wasted capital expenditure in getting the sites fit for use again and would have denied residents in Kenilworth and throughout the District of two modern leisure centres of the same quality as Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres. Going back out to tender would have prolonged the length of the projects significantly and would probably have been counter-productive in terms of costs, as inflation was increasing at that time and new tenders would have reflected that increase.

## **3 Consultation and Member's comments**

- 3.1 The decision to proceed to contract for both sites was taken by the Kenilworth Project Board, following a positive discussion at the Leadership Co-ordinating Group.

## **4 Implications of the current situation**

### **4.1 Legal/Human Rights Implications**

- 4.1.1 The Council has now entered into contracts with AR Demolition and Kier Construction for the demolition and re-construction of the Abbey Fields Swimming Pool and the Castle Farm Leisure Centre. These contracts are all fixed price and so subsequent inflation is the responsibility of the contractors and not the Council.

### **4.2 Financial**

- 4.2.1 The financial implications of the projects were covered in the report on the Medium-Term Financial Strategy made to Cabinet in February 2022.

### **4.3 Council Plan**

- 4.3.1 The re-construction of the two main leisure facilities in Kenilworth is a key priority for the Council. The new facilities will significantly enhance the services available in the town and will encourage people to adopt healthy lifestyles.

#### **4.4 Environmental/Climate Change Implications**

4.4.1 The environmental and climate change implications of the new facilities have been the subject of previous reports to the Cabinet and to Council.

#### **4.5 Analysis of the effects on Equality**

4.5.1 Similarly, the inclusive nature of the designs of the two centres, which will provide facilities for all, has been the subject of previous reports.

#### **4.6 Data Protection**

4.6.1 It is important that the details contained in the private and confidential appendices to this report remain confidential as the details are commercially sensitive.

#### **4.7 Health and Wellbeing**

4.7.1 The new facilities will offer a step-change in the opportunities provided to local people to adopt healthy lifestyles.

### **5 Risk Assessment**

5.1 This report refers to actions in the past, and therefore a Risk Assessment is not relevant.

### **6 Conclusion/Reasons for the Recommendation**

6.1 Provide a summary of the proposals and reasons for it by way of a conclusion.

#### **Confidential Appendices:**

Appendix 1 – Castle Farm Tender Cost Movement Review

Appendix 2 – Abbey Fields Tender Cost Movement Review

Appendix 3 – Additional Budget Request Estimate

Appendix 4 – Tender Reconciliation

### Report Information Sheet

Please complete and submit to Democratic Services with draft report

<b>Committee/Date</b>	Overview and Scrutiny Committee / 1 November 2022	
<b>Title of report</b>	Report on the reasons for cost increases in the Castle Farm Leisure Centre and Abbey Fields Swimming Pool projects.	
<b>Consultations undertaken</b>		
<b>Consultee *required</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>
<b>Ward Member(s)</b>		
<b>Portfolio Holder WDC *</b>	19/10/22	Councillor Andrew Day
<b>Financial Services *</b>	18/10/22	Richard Wilson
<b>Legal Services *</b>	18/10/22	Kieran Brehany
<b>Other Services</b>		
<b>Chief Executive(s)</b>	18/10/22	Chris Elliott
<b>Head of Service(s)</b>	18/10/22	Andy Jones
<b>Section 151 Officer</b>	18/10/22	Andrew Rollins
<b>Monitoring Officer</b>	18/10/22	Andy Jones
<b>CMT (WDC)</b>		
<b>Leadership Co-ordination Group (WDC)</b>	19/10/22	Andrew Day
<b>Other organisations</b>	18/10/22	Joshua Barber, Mace Consultancy
<b>Final decision by this Committee or rec to another Ctte/Council?</b>	No	Recommendation to :Cabinet / Council .....Committee
<b>Contrary to Policy/Budget framework</b>	No	No/Yes
<b>Does this report contain exempt info/Confidential? If so, which paragraph(s)?</b>	Yes	No/Yes, Paragraphs : Appendix 1, 2, 3, 4
<b>Does this report relate to a key decision (referred to in the Cabinet Forward Plan)?</b>	No	No/Yes, Forward Plan item – scheduled for ..... (date)

<b>Accessibility Checked?</b>	Yes	File/Info/Inspect Document/Check Accessibility
-------------------------------	-----	--