

**Response from the meeting of the Executive on the
O&S Committee's Comments – 11 February 2021**

Item Number: 4 – Working together with Stratford District Council

Requested by: Councillor Milton & Green Group.

Reason Considered:

Councillor Milton: Because of the importance to the Council and its residents.

Green Group: *concerns a strategic priority of the Council or key project*

We are concerned that the Deloitte's presentation was only strong regarding financial aspects, therefore wish to discuss what measures will be taken to preserve (or enhance) the 'sense of place' and how the larger organisation can remain accountable to residents.

Aspects of this include:

- Evidence that super-districts create a stronger sense of place and enable residents to have a stronger voice compared with other districts that use the same technologies and approaches.
- Whether there will be resident-facing services provided in all the super-district towns and possibly larger villages to save on headquarters cost and bring services closer to residents.
- Which responsibilities (and hence funding) could be devolved to towns and parishes.

Scrutiny Comment:

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee was pleased to note the intention to provide quarterly updates but it recommended that this should go further and that there should be a "Scrutiny Plan". This plan should set out points in the project where there were key decisions being made and where matters requiring scrutiny at either or both O&S or F&A were embedded within the plan. Short progress updates should also be provided to each Scrutiny meeting so that the Committees were not overwhelmed with less frequent, longer reports that effectively meant there was no time to scrutinise other areas of the Council's operations at those meetings.

Members were mindful of the amount of time officers required to undertake this project and the Committee would plan its meetings to allow sufficient time to scrutinise with the aim to help the Executive. It would look at whether joint meetings of both Scrutiny Committees would be of assistance, and also joint meetings with Stratford District Council.

Executive Response:

Councillor Day accepted the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and thanked its Members for their thoughtful contributions, as well as the contribution from other Groups, and was pleased to see Groups working together so effectively. He also thanked the Chief Executive and other senior officers for the extensive work that had gone into the report in a relatively short space of time.

Item Number: 11 – Warwick District Leisure Development – Kenilworth Facilities

Requested by: Councillor Milton & Green Group

Reason Considered:

Councillor Milton: Due to the potential impact on residents in respect of the proposal in recommendation 2.8 to keep the Leisure Centres closed from now on and to seek alternative outcomes.

Green Group: *The number of residents impacted and the significance of that impact)*

Thank you for the responses given so far, but we wish to discuss the costs and benefits of closure other than 'cost to the taxpayer' given the massive benefit social, mental and also financial if, as we expect, there is a boom in demand for leisure after lockdown is lifted.

How has the 80K deficit been calculated for the 2021 spring-summer period when the demand is unknown yet potentially very high post-vaccine-lockdown? Why use an argument based on a relatively small, hypothetical deficit to deprive Kenilworth residents/council tax-payers of all leisure facilities in the town when the total subsidy to the operators nears £1 million.

Question from the Labour Group regarding appendix A:

This Risk assessment has no mention of the impact the much extended closure of Leisure amenities in Kenilworth may have on residents at this very difficult time.

Scrutiny Comment:

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee recommended that the amended recommendation 2.8 should be further amended to include consultation with both the Leadership Co-ordination Group (LCG) and all Kenilworth District Councillors over when and which facilities should be re-opened.

Executive Response:

In relation to the recommendation from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Rhead felt that singling out the Kenilworth Councillors was not appropriate, as this was a matter for Warwick District Council as a whole. When put to a vote, the recommendation from the Overview and Scrutiny was rejected. Councillor Rhead subsequently proposed the report as laid out, and subject to the amendments in the addendum, which were then approved.