

Overview and Scrutiny Committee

Minutes of the meeting held on Tuesday 26 June 2018 at the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa at 6.00 pm.

Present: Councillor Mrs Falp (Chairman); Councillors Ashford, Boad, Bromley, D'Arcy, Davison, Mrs Evetts, H Grainger, Naimo, Parkins, and Shilton.

Also Present: Councillors Grainger, Phillips and Thompson.

8. **Apologies and Substitutes**

- (a) There were no apologies made.
- (b) Councillor Ashford substituted for Councillor Mrs Cain and Councillor Mrs Evetts substituted for Councillor Mrs Redford.

9. **Declarations of Interest**

Councillors Mrs Falp and Shilton made a general declaration of interest because they were members of Warwickshire County Council, in case any matters arose concerning this Council.

Minute 13 – Review of Council’s Sustainability and Climate Change Approach

Councillor Boad declared a pecuniary interest because he was a direct of Act on Energy. He left the room whilst this item was discussed.

Minute 14 Executive Agenda (Non-Confidential Items & Reports – Wednesday 27 June 2018) – Item 5 – Increased Litter Bin Provision

Councillor Mrs Falp declared a personal interest because a close family member worked in Neighbourhood Services.

10. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 30 May 2018 were unavailable for approval and would be presented for approval at the meeting in July.

(Councillor Bromley arrived at the meeting during this item)

11. **Warwick District Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)**

The Committee considered a report from Development Services (Policy & Projects) which provided an update on progress made on the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) that was associated with the District’s future growth requirements to 2029. The IDP continued to be updated to reflect the latest information arising from ongoing discussions with infrastructure providers and to reflect emerging infrastructure requirements necessary to support the Local Plan.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

Mr David Butler, the Council's Business Manager - Policy and Development and Ms Janet Neale, Warwickshire County Council's Infrastructure Manager, explained that the report was a six-monthly update on the IDP. The IDP was a live document which was continually being updated to provide better visibility for members of the Public and Councillors, so that progress on developing key infrastructure that was required could be examined. The IDP also showed receipts of S106 monies through the financial year. They then spoke about each section of Appendix 1 in the report, which provided an update on specific infrastructure, taking questions after each type of infrastructure:

Education:

- The reason why there was a funding gap in this area was mainly because of the relocation of the Kenilworth School, which did not form part of the growth agenda. The funding for the relocation would be something the school would deliver. The County Council and the IDP only had a commitment to fund the growth element. The school would find a lot of its funding from the sale of their sites, although the District Council would be working with the school. The County Council would give some support. We would expect to see the funding gap close as we got a definitive value of the assets.

Additionally, the County Council received funding that was not directly connected to housing growth, but for basic growth caused by a rise in birth rates; this varied year on year. This year the funding would be in the region of £5m, but was expected to rise to £29m in the next financial year because it was recognised that the rise in birth rates at primary school level would affect secondary schools. The Government had recognised that Warwickshire required more funding, and this money would be spent county wide where there was a need.

The figures in the report only reflected housing growth.

- The funding for Special Needs was for all levels of education, not just secondary education. Work was also being done with the Free School sector providers for them to make bids for funding across the County.
- The difference in the funding gaps shown on pages 11 and 12 of the report were due to the fact that these were for different timespans. Page 12 figures reflected the next five years.

Primary Health Care, GP facilities:

- The County Council now had a Planning Officer who worked as part of the Public Health Team; their time was spent working with the Foundation Trusts or the CCGs across the County.

The Foundation Trusts had been successfully securing S106 money for revenue funding. Issues that had arisen had been caused by transformation work around health, for example, longer opening hours at GP surgeries. This made it difficult for the CCGs to assess where there was capacity. Another issue was that GP surgeries operated effectively as businesses.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

- Capital build funding came from NHS Trusts, but there was a funding lag of one year. To help overcome this, they requested revenue funding for as many people as they thought a new housing estate would generate. It was felt that requesting capital funding would be of little benefit; an example cited for this was that it was not possible to expand Warwick Hospital. However, CCGs had started to be more flexible in the way they requested S106 money, and they would also ask for land to be reserved in case new buildings were required.
- Child and Mental Health Servicing was not reflected in the figures in the report because it was not as a direct result of growth, but officers would see if it could be added to the tables for the future.

Transport and Highways:

- Relieving congestion issues and encouraging the use of other forms of transport to cars was now fundamental as part of key infrastructure projects. Work was ongoing with the University to ensure routes for public transport to give buses greater access to campus than could be achieved by cars. This was at the forefront of all planning; however it was also recognised that congestion for cars had to be relieved for better air quality.
- The Council was confident that no harm had been caused by the time lag in doing the design code after work had already started on Europa Way, because the build work was only in the first phase.
- The County Council had identified that the T5/South Leamington Gyratory was something for which CIL money was necessary because it was not something that could be directly linked to a particular developer. Therefore it was on the CIL 123 list for the current financial year. Some design work had been done, but to proceed, further funding was required.
- The County Council was investigating Park & Ride services for the whole County. No further information was available as yet.

Indoor Sports / Leisure & Tach Brook Country Park:

There were no questions on this section of the report.

Emergency Services:

- Money was assigned from S106 payments to neighbourhood policing teams, and space was assigned if a hub or offices were required. The money would be used towards new vehicles, uniforms and communications.

The Chairman thanked the officers for the report and taking questions. She then asked for a vote on whether the next IDP update should be done at a joint meeting of both Scrutiny Committees.

Resolved that the next update report on the IDP be given in January 2019 at a joint meeting of the Finance & Audit and Overview & Scrutiny Committees.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

12. Finance – Service Area Update

The Committee considered a report from Finance that brought together details of the Finance Risk Register, contract Register, Budget, and service initiatives.

In previous municipal years, the Committee had asked portfolio holders to attend its meeting on different evenings to Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee, and write a report specific to the remit of each Scrutiny Committee. Certain Members had felt that this should be changed and had requested that a single report came to both Scrutinies on the same evening, but this suggestion had come too late for the Finance Service Area update, which had already taken place in May at Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee; this meant that Overview & Scrutiny was playing “catch-up”. A scheduling clash meant that Councillor Whiting, the Portfolio Holder for Finance was unavailable to attend the meeting, and Councillor Phillip had substituted in his place to note any questions and take them back to Councillor Whiting who would write a response.

The Committee felt that the report needed further work because it was not clear which parts of it were to be scrutinised by it. The Deputy Chief Executive (BH) was asked to speak to the Democratic Services Manager about the formatting of future combined reports.

The following questions were asked; some were given answers; but some would need to be passed to Councillor Whiting to return replies:

(Appendix A to the report – the Finance Risk Register, page 8, item 5 on fraud)

In the last five years:

- How often had the things listed as triggers happened and what had been the scale of loss?
- What sorts of frauds had occurred?
- Were they one-offs or were they recurring issues?
- Had they been plugged?

- The report shows that there would be a surplus at the end of the financial year. Where would this go, and therefore why is there not “in real terms” a surplus?

In response, Councillor Phillips explained that whilst the surplus was there, it would be immediately soaked up by the need to replenish various reserves across the Council.

- What was the difference between the I:\ drive and the H:\ drive stated at item 7?

In response, the Deputy Chief Executive (BH) explained that the I:\ drive could be accessed by all staff, but the H:\ drive was personal to each staff member. It caused issues if work needed by other officers was stored on the H:\ drive when someone left the Council because there was a complicated process to gain access to a staff member’s personal drive. The Council was currently going through a migration exercise to move required data from the H:\ drive onto the I:\ drive.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

- Page 17, item 24 where it showed the residual risk rating as the likelihood more than likely, but the impact low. One of the possible consequences was "reputation" because we were dealing with outside bodies and another was "morale" because it went wrong. Might the impact be a bit low, and required more focus, especially with one of the possible consequences being shown as "reputation"?

(Appendix D to the report, page 38)

- What had happened to help deal with the increase in time taken to process benefit/Council tax reduction claims?

In response, the Deputy Chief Executive (BH) replied that more staff had been recruited.

(Appendix C, page 24)

- Under the Finance Portfolio, the figures listed for contingency budgets had varied from what was a reasonably low figure, to nothing for 17/18, to an original budget figure for 18/19 of nearly £1m. Why was this and where had these figures come from?

(Appendix C, page 26)

- Under S1417 Procurement, Direct Expenditure, Third Party Payments – That figure had gone way above trend up to just above £20k, which was quite a jump. Was this because the Council had entered into partnership with the County Council for strategic procurement support, so it had to be paid for somewhere?

The Chairman asked Members to send any further questions direct to Councillor Whiting for a response, and to copy her when they did so. She thanked Councillor Phillips for attending the meeting.

13. Review of Council's Sustainability and Climate Change Approach

The Committee considered a report from Health & Community Protection which summarised the Council's latest position in relation to Sustainability and Climate Change including a refresh of the Sustainability Approach document and the Council's achievements in the last year.

In response to questions, the Ms Ellis, Sustainability Officer and Councillor Thompson, Portfolio Holder Health & Community Protections replied that:

- The Council was working on a dockless bicycle scheme was being worked upon, with bids being made next month and a possible launch date for next spring.
- The Expression of Interest had been submitted and approved by the Ultra-Low Emission Bus Scheme to have electric buses and charging infrastructure on route 67 (Sydenham – Leamington – Cubbington). The bid would be in before 16 July. An update would be given at Council.
- In respect of the need for alternative arrangements for staff parking, the Council was working on a current travel plan, car share and bike share. There would be more promotion of car share and bike share days. The use of "Pool" cars had moved up the agenda.
- We were working with the Private Sector landlords in respect of energy efficiency in buildings, which was also a national

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

requirement; using data we already possessed to encourage certification.

- The Council was developing a fuel poverty strategy, which included a marketing strategy to get the message out to residents. This was still a work in progress.
- The "Drop-in" energy days had not been as well attended so there was a need to re-think how the message could be better communicated.
- Air quality was not in this report because it had its own action plan, but the two initiatives complemented each other.
- Ways were being sought to improve car sharing and keep costs down such as "liftshare.com", or use of the Intranet. The Council would be implementing a car share scheme. As yet there was not a time table for a car share scheme, but it was moving up the agenda in priority.
- Councillor Thompson would raise the matter of Members being unable to access the Council's Intranet.
- Councillor Phillips was heading up work to improve sustainability in the Council's own housing stock with initiatives such as solar PV panels or solar thermal panels.
- Corporate properties needed a different approach because their roofs were larger.
- Data would be provided on how well we were performing against the target set for biomass fuel systems.

14. Executive Agenda (Non-confidential items and reports) – Wednesday 27 June 2018

The Committee considered the following confidential item which would be discussed at the meeting of the Executive on Wednesday 27 June 2018.

Item 5 – Increased Litter Bin Provision

The Committee welcomed and supported the recommendations in the report.

Ideas were raised about using new technology where possible and providing different types of refuse bins in different areas, based on demand and use, e.g. Parade in Leamington Spa might have different requirements to quieter streets, such as Milverton Hill in Leamington Spa.

The Committee was pleased that these proposals would cover the District.

15. Review of the Work Programme, Forward Plan and comments from the Executive

The Committee considered its work programme for 2018 and the Forward Plan and the responses the Executive gave to the comments the Overview and Scrutiny Committee made regarding the reports submitted to the Executive in May 2018.

The minutes from the first meeting of the Task & Finish Group on the role of the WDC Chairmen were discussed. Members asked that paragraph 1.2 should be amended to say that all past chairmen of the Council who were contactable should be consulted with a list of questions.

OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE MINUTES (Continued)

A request from Housing Services had been received to present the Stock Condition Survey to both Scrutiny Committees together in June ahead of their separate meetings. This had been delayed until July because of information still required, and so the request had been made that it should be presented to a joint meeting in July instead.

Resolved that

- (1) a joint meeting of both Scrutiny Committees would be held before Overview & Scrutiny Committee in July for a presentation of the Stock Condition Survey;
- (2) a report on the direction of travel for the renewal of the recycling contract in 2019/20 should be presented to the Committee in late August if possible for pre-scrutiny work and if necessary following this, a decision to do Task & Finish Group work;
- (3) a report on Fuel Poverty be presented to the Committee at its late September meeting;
- (4) a full update on what progress has been made on what was agreed at Executive in June 2017 on HMOs should come to the meeting in July; and
- (5) In respect of the previous Chairmen to be consulted by the Task & Finish Group dealing with the role of the Council's Chairman; the Task & Finish Group could decide which chairmen should be consulted.

(This was an amendment to a decision made by the Committee at its meeting in May, which required all contactable ex-chairmen to be consulted.)

(The meeting finished at 8.37 pm)

CHAIR
24 July 2018