

 <b>Full Council – 24 June 2014</b>		<b>Agenda Item No. 17B</b>
<b>Title</b>	Overview & Scrutiny Committee End of Term Report	
<b>For further information about this report please contact</b>	Lesley Dury, Committee Services Officer 01926 456114 committee@warwickdc.gov.uk	
<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Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006?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>	Full Council, June 2013	
<b>Background Papers</b>	Agendas/Minutes Municipal Year 2013/14	

<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>Equality and Sustainability Impact Assessment Undertaken</b>	No
Not required as this report gives a synopsis of work undertaken by the O & S Committee and contains no new material.	

<b>Officer/Councillor Approval</b>		
<b>Officer Approval</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Name</b>
Chief Executive/Deputy Chief Executive	25/4/2014	Andy Jones
Head of Service	24 April 2014	Graham Leach
CMT		
Section 151 Officer		
Monitoring Officer	25/4/2014	Andy Jones
Finance		
Portfolio Holder(s)		
<b>Consultation &amp; Community Engagement</b>		
Chairman of Overview and Scrutiny – Councillor Mrs Blacklock		
<b>Final Decision?</b>		Yes
<b>Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below)</b>		

1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 An end of term report to the Council on the work the Overview and Scrutiny Committee have undertaken during the year.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

- 2.1 That the list of matters considered by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee during the municipal year 2013/14, as detailed in appendix A to the report, be noted.

3. **REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 Under Article 6 of the Council's constitution Overview & Scrutiny Committees and Policy Committees are required to provide an end of term report to the Council on work they have undertaken during the year.
- 3.2 The matters considered during the year are attached at appendix A to the report.

4. **POLICY FRAMEWORK**

4.1 **Policy Framework**

The recommendations of the report do not affect the Council's policy framework

4.2 **Fit for the Future**

This report is made annually as a matter of good practice and Council policy.

5. **BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK**

- 5.1 The recommendations of the report do not affect the Council's budgetary framework.

6. **RISKS**

- 6.1 There are no risks associated with this report which is purely provided as a matter of good practice and Council policy concerning Scrutiny committees.

7. **ALTERNATIVE OPTION(S) CONSIDERED**

- 7.1 There are no alternative options because this report complies with the requirements of Article 6 of the Council's Constitution.

**Items considered by Overview and Scrutiny Committee 2012/2013****CHAIR'S INTRODUCTION**

The year 2013/ 2014 has seen some changes in the way the Overview and Scrutiny Committee operates. Membership has fluctuated as some councillors joined – or left – mid-way in the year. There is a new chair. There is a new scheme for dealing with Portfolio Holder reports which has been trialled and will be reviewed after a full 12 months. It entails a written report being sent out in advance so that members can digest the information and come with prepared questions to the meeting. The Portfolio Holder attends only to answer questions from members. Each Portfolio Holder will attend twice – in the spring and in the autumn. The spring report will highlight achievements and setbacks in the previous year and to explain plans for the coming year; and the autumn report will give a progress update and flag up risks and challenges. The aim is to enable members to scrutinise more effectively through having more focussed reports and a set time-table. However, the Committee feels that this has proved too cumbersome and time-consuming and for 2014/2015, a modified scheme will operate with only one principal appearance from each Portfolio Holder.

During the year we have experienced several instances of the Call-In process; and on three occasions we have listened to presentations from members of the public relating to items on the Agenda. They were respectively – the governance arrangements at the LEP, the prevalence of anti-social behaviour in St Nicholas Park, and the parking issues connected with Bowls tournaments at Victoria Park. In each case we benefited from impassioned and informative speeches and agreed to return to these topics at future meetings. It is worth saying that Overview and Scrutiny meetings are always open to the public [except of course when confidential items are discussed] and we would like to see more coming along.

One of the roles of the Committee is to 'Advise and Warn' the Executive in order to help prevent mistakes, to improve policy-making and to define what is meant by new regulations or new policies. Many of our recommendations are not meant as criticisms but as suggestions for greater clarity or workability. It is pleasing to see from the attached list that the majority of our comments and recommendations were accepted in whole or in part by the Executive. However, of the two major items where our recommendations were rejected, one was subsequently abandoned, and another was substantially amended to acknowledge our suggestions. In two cases the Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee agreed strongly with us

An example of the Committee following up something which came to our attention during a related discussion, is the very useful presentation by Martin Brooks on control of accommodation standards in the private rented sector mainly HMOs. Other topics of particular and on-going concern for which we had a series of presentations, were the battle with WCC over the future of on-street car parking and the impact of the welfare reforms on our tenants, and we gave full support to the officers involved. We are grateful to all officers who attended meetings in order to update us and answer questions.

Task and Finish: these cross-party groups of councillors who investigate a topic- a policy or a service- causing concern, are a very important method of performing the Scrutiny function. However there have been fewer than usual this year. The T and F on the implementation of the Dog Control Orders reported back and the recommendations were unanimously supported by the Committee. Unfortunately the

Executive response was mixed and we are still waiting for detailed feedback on how the recommendations will be used. The T and F on Sexual Entertainment Venues has not yet reported back. The task proved more complex than anticipated but nevertheless the Committee is disappointed with the delays. The T and F on Staff Volunteering was unable to proceed and the Committee agreed it was not a priority and allowed it to disband.

Two new developments with great potential for significant impact in the future are the appointment of our Children's Champions – Cllr Mrs Falp and Cllr Mrs Gallagher - and the Health Scrutiny Working Party. The latter is to become a Sub-Committee of the O and S Committee, known as the Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee. We look forward to receiving regular reports and advice across the whole field of the topics we shall be discussing next year.

A Blacklock May 2014.

## **OVERVIEW & SCRUTINY ITEMS**

A synopsis of discussions and decisions made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee

### **9 July 2013**

#### The role of the District/Borough nominee on the Local Enterprise Partnership

The Committee received a verbal submission from Councillor Caborn outlining his role on the LEP and providing an overview of the LEP.

It was agreed that the Constitution of the LEP would be circulated to all councillors and also Board papers would be circulated.

#### The role of the Deputy Chief Executive on City Deal

The Deputy Chief Executive (BH) verbally outlined his role on City Deal and explained what City Deal was.

#### Statutory Powers for Housing Private Sector Licensing, especially in respect of HMOs and Student Accommodation

The Committee received a verbal report from the Divisional Environmental Health Officer outlining the licensing regime for Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMOs).

#### Implications on Warwick District Council of Warwickshire County Council proposals to outsource on-street parking enforcement – update report

The Committee received a verbal update from the Head of Neighbourhood Services outlining a presentation he had given, with the other Warwickshire Borough and District Councils, to the County Council's on-street parking task and finish group.

#### Welfare Reforms and Discretionary Housing Payments

The Committee considered a report from Finance and Housing & Property Services that provided Members with information about those living in social rented accommodation who were classed as being under occupying and as a result were no longer subject to the "spare room subsidy".

#### Call-in of Executive Decision – Potential recreation of the Mere at Kenilworth Castle and

#### Call-in of Executive Decision – St Mary's Lands Business Strategy - Update

The Committee considered a report from Civic & Committee Services that explained the process for consideration of the two Executive items that had been called-in for Members' consideration.

The Committee resolved to refer the "Potential Recreation of the Mere" report to Council for debate, and the decision made by the Executive in respect of the "St Mary's Lands Business Strategy" report should proceed.

#### Draft Report – Task & Finish Group, Dog Control Orders

The Committee considered the draft report of the Dog Control Orders Task and Finish Group into the Impact of Dog Control Orders. It resolved to submit the report to the Executive for consideration.

## **10 September 2013**

### Oakley Wood Crematorium Proposed Improvements

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report from the Head of Health and Community Protection. The report gave an update on the current status of the project to improve facilities at Oakley Wood Crematorium.

### Meeting with Warwickshire County Council Task & Finish Group re parking enforcement

A verbal report was given about a meeting between Councillors Barrott, Mrs Blacklock and Mobbs with the Task & Finish Group at Warwickshire County Council to seek a way forward in respect of the County Council's review of parking enforcement that would be fair and equitable across the County. All the main councils affected by this were reported as holding similar views.

### Health Scrutiny Working Party – update report

Councillor Mrs Falp reported that the Working Party had held its second meeting and that due to the volume of information there was to collect, it was anticipated that the Group would not be ready to make recommendations for 12 months.

### Update on the Task and Finish Group, Dog Control Order Report

The report from the Task and Finish Group, originally scheduled to go to the Executive in September, had been delayed for one month at the request of the Portfolio Holder.

## **8 October 2013**

### Task and Finish Group – Staff Volunteering

It was reported that the Task and Finish Group had held its first meeting.

## **12 November 2013**

### Update on the Task and Finish Group, Dog Control Order Report

The Executive had discussed the report from the Task and Finish Group and had agreed all recommendations where there were no cost implications. Those recommendations that did involve expenditure would be considered at a future date.

### Annual Feedback on Outside Appointments

The Committee considered a report from Civic and Committee Services that gave an annual statement of work undertaken by Outside Bodies.

Members felt that the report provided a good starting point for a review which should look at which bodies required a Council representative and the criteria required for this. It was felt that Group Leaders should examine the list with a view to cutting any superfluous appointments.

## **10 December 2013**

### Task & Finish Group – Sexual Entertainment Venues

A draft questionnaire had now been agreed with the exception of one question. It was hoped that the survey would start in early January.

### Task & Finish Group – Staff Volunteering

Councillor Illingworth stated that the Group was waiting for approval of a questionnaire to staff; but he raised concerns on the viability of the Group. He was asked to discuss this with the Democratic Services Manager.

### Discretionary Housing Payments

The Committee considered a report from Finance that provided information regarding discretionary housing payments. The Overview and Scrutiny Committee requested a further update in May 2014.

## **7 January 2014**

### Assets Review – Call in of Executive Decision

Overview and Scrutiny Members resolved to refer the decision taken by the Executive in respect of the Assets Review report to Council for debate following call-in of the Executive's decision to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

### Task and Finish Group – Sexual Entertainment Venues

It was reported that progress had stalled after receipt of advice that outside consultation should be handled by outside consultants.

### Kenilworth Public Service Centre Feasibility Study & Business Case – Call in of Executive Decision

Overview and Scrutiny Members resolved to refer the decision taken by the Executive in respect of the Kenilworth Public Service Centre report to Council for debate following call-in of the Executive's decision to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

## **11 February 2014**

### Neighbourhood Plans Designations – Call in of Executive Decision

Overview and Scrutiny Members resolved that the decision taken by the Executive in respect of Neighbourhood Plans Designations report could be implemented without further delay following call-in of the Executive's decision to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

### Health Scrutiny Working Group

The Group hoped to submit its recommendations to Overview and Scrutiny in April.

### Car Parking – National Bowls Championships

Mr David Adams, a representative from Friends of Victoria Park, addressed the Committee with concerns about the parking plans for the National Bowls Championships.

## **15 April 2014**

### Health Scrutiny at Warwick District Council – Recommendations from the Health Scrutiny Working Group

Overview and Scrutiny Members resolved to form a Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee, and would decide its membership and delegated powers at the meeting in June 2014.

## **7 May 2014**

### Discretionary Housing Payments

The Benefits and Fraud Manager gave an update on how the Discretionary Housing Payments system was working.

## **ROUTINE ITEMS**

- Comments from the Executive
- Forward Plan
- Review of the Work Programme
- Portfolio Holder Updates as follows:
  - October 2013 – Neighbourhood Services
  - November 2013 – Finance
  - December 2013 – Cultural Services and Health & Community Protection
  - January 2014 – Strategic Leadership
  - February 2014 – Housing & Property Services and Corporate & Community Services
  - March 2014 – Neighbourhood Services and Finance
  - April 2014 – Development Services and Health & Community Protection



## **EXECUTIVE ITEMS CONSIDERED BY THE COMMITTEE**

A synopsis of comments and recommendations to Executive made by the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and a synopsis of the Executive's response to these comments and recommendations.

**18 June 2013**

<b>Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Scheme – Amendment to Criteria</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Applications should be considered quarterly, not as and when they arrive; and</li> <li>(2) Delete the whole section on Town and Parish Council and say it is preferable to have the support of your Town or Parish Council or a District Ward Councillor.</li> </ol>
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>In response, the Portfolio Holder did not accept quarterly basis – too slow a process, too many valid, worthwhile &amp; urgent applications which could be disadvantaged as a result.</p>

<b>Potential recreation of the Mere at Kenilworth Castle</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that the money is not allocated for a feasibility study. This was unanimously supported by all Members present. In times of austerity, this gives completely the wrong message to the public and the Service Transformation Reserve is not the right fund to use.</p>
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>In response, the Portfolio Holder expressed his disappointment at the lack of support from the scrutiny committees. He reminded them that this had been a project that had been talked about for some time and felt that the Council had a duty to look to the future vision of the District. He also highlighted that at this stage, the funding would only be for the feasibility study which would decide if the project was feasible or not.</p> <p>Members debated the implications of investing in the future, encouraging tourism and potentially providing employment opportunities for the health and wellbeing of the community against the public perception that this was a frivolous waste of money.</p> <p>The Portfolio Holder for Development Services hoped that the project would encourage English Heritage and Kenilworth Castle to find ways to share business and the benefits that the project could bring.</p> <p>With regard to the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's comment that the Service Transformation Reserve was not the right fund to use, the Portfolio Holder for Finance advised that both he and the Section 151 Officer were happy with this arrangement.</p> <p>The Executive did not accept the recommendations from either scrutiny committee because they felt it was vital to invest in the long term vision for Warwick District, to encourage tourism and to look to the future for both residents and visitors to the town.</p>

<b>Communication Strategy</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee commented that the report was generally accepted, but the role of councillors as described on page 6 was not accurate. Councillors would welcome training and advice on Social Media. Members welcomed the single point of contact that some departments are operating.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Portfolio Holder disagreed that the role of councillors was incorrect and thought it depended on how you read it

<b>St Mary's Lands Business Strategy</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) There should be full and widespread consultation with the people of Warwick and Warwick Town Council</li> <li>(2) Recommendation 2.6 should be removed because there is a potential conflict of interest and there is no need for this position</li> <li>(3) The scheme must come back to the Council/Executive before any agreement with the Racecourse is concluded</li> <li>(4) Procurement guidelines must be followed closely and the possibility for open bidding for the leases must be ensured</li> <li>(5) The independence of the Planning Committee must be safeguarded and made clear to the public</li> </ol> <p>Several Members of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee had strong reservations about the location of the hotel.</p>
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>In response, the Portfolio Holder for Development Services, stated that Warwick Town Councillors had not been as involved as much as he would have liked them to be. He reminded Members that nothing had been set in stone and the correct controls would be in place to improve the area and benefit the residents of Warwick. He assured Members that full consultation would be undertaken as a matter of course and felt that it was more sensible to have a business strategy and masterplan to consult on so to defer a decision on the report at this stage would be impractical.</p> <p>In response to the Overview and Scrutiny comments, the Executive reiterated that full consultation would be included as part of due process, as would the scheme being reported back to Members before any agreement with the Racecourse was concluded. In addition, procurement guidelines were stringently followed on all projects, as per the Code of Procurement Practice.</p> <p>The Chief Executive addressed members regarding recommendation (5) from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and reminded them that all planning applications were dealt with in accordance with planning policy. He stated that the Planning Committee could not run 'independently' from the rest of the Council because Council policies had to be given due regard when dealing with applications. He therefore, suggested that the recommendation be reworded to refer to the integrity of the Planning Committee rather than the independence.</p>

<b>Planning Policy for HMOs and Student Accommodation in Warwick District</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee accepted the report and policy as far as it went. It was regretted that Leamington Spa Town Council had not been consulted. A clearer definition of a "thoroughfare" (page 8) is required, and Members questioned whether the bus stop mentioned on page 9 was either a university bus stop or a normal one. The Committee has major concerns about the standards of the living conditions for many residents in HMOs.
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>Planning Officers responded to the comments as follows:</p> <p>In response to Leamington Spa Town Council not being formally consulted with; once this draft policy has been approved for consultation, Leamington Spa Town Council as with all Town and Parish Councils will be notified of the consultation, and will be able to make any comments or observations during the consultation process. Officers will be willing to attend any council meetings to explain the policy or to answer any questions.</p> <p>In response to defining a "thoroughfare", it is difficult to be too specific with defining a thoroughfare; however, they would normally be Classified A &amp; B roads.</p> <p>The Bus stops mentioned on Page 9 refers to all bus stops, they are not confined solely to University bus stops.</p> <p>The living conditions in HMOs are in the remit of Housing Strategy who are consulted on all HMO applications.</p>

**10 July 2013**

<b>Progress on the Warwick Town Centre Plan</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview & Scrutiny Committee welcomed the report, in particular the survey about Warwick Mop. However, the Committee stressed the importance of canvassing as wide a range of opinions in Warwick as possible particularly amongst young people, about the Mop.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The recommendations were agreed as set out in the report. The Executive welcomed the comments from Overview & Scrutiny and agreed that involvement from younger residents of the District should be encouraged with regard to the Mop survey.

<b>Procurement of Services from the Voluntary and Community Sector – Summary Year 1</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Committee welcomed the report and strongly supported the approach for future years as set out in Paragraph 3.10 of the report.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The recommendations were agreed as set out in the report.

**6 August 2013**

<b>Budget Review to 30 June 2013</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee registered concerns about the future viability of some parts of the Council, but wait for more details in October.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Mobbs, advised that the October report would lay out the plans for the major savings ahead.

<b>Proposal for the delivery of on-street Enforcement across Warwickshire</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that the staff who worked on the report should be complimented. The Committee accepted the report in its entirety and gave full support to the delegation.
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>Councillor Mrs Grainger supported the recommendations and stated that this was a good example of the local Councils working together, led by the political heads, which was a good sign. She felt it was important that residents received a fair service and did not want to see a private enterprise take the service over.</p> <p>Councillor Coker endorsed the report and was hopeful that a strong partnership was starting to build with the County Council. He reminded Members that this service, if handled poorly, could ruin a town centre's reputation.</p>

<b>Local List of Historic Buildings</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report but had reservations about how it will operate in practice.
<b>Executive Response</b>	In response, the Portfolio Holder for Development Services, thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their comments and hoped that it would be possible to assist some groups.

**10 September 2013**

<b>Warwick District Council's Response to Stratford-on-Avon District Council's Core Strategy Consultation Process</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report. It recognised the importance of the discussions and had concerns about the potential traffic impact in Warwick District; therefore it welcomed discussions with Warwick County Council and hoped that these would focus particularly on infrastructure.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Deputy Leader, Councillor Caborn, endorsed the report and stated that the report laid out the Council's marker with the understanding that because discussions would be on-going, Members may choose to propose different recommendations later. He assured Members that discussions would continue about the Lighthorne development which could have a big impact on traffic issues for Warwick District. Councillor Caborn advised that this was by no means a formal objection but would reserve the Council's right to comment in the future.

<b>Call-In of Executive Decision – Potential Recreation of Kenilworth Mere</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee thanked and gave full credit to the Executive for listening and was looking forward to see ideas that residents can support for tourism development for the whole District. The Committee looked forward to taking part in tourism strategy.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive resolved that no further action would be taken at the present time in relation to the commissioning of a feasibility study, although it would continue to investigate the various matters raised by Members. It also confirmed its commitment to a policy of underpinning and strengthening the local economy with specific reference to the tourism sector.

<b>Call-In of Executive Decision – St Mary’s Lands Business Strategy</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee broadly welcomed the report but was very concerned that members of the Steering Group should be chosen very carefully so that they were widely representative. The Committee suggested that the Steering Group itself should canvass opinions, especially of local residents. The Committee was pleased that the Executive had already committed to a consultation at the next stage.
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>The Executive resolved that the decision made by the Executive on 19 June 2013 was confirmed, so it could be implemented without further delay.</p> <p>In the light of the discussion which took place at the Council meeting and for the removal of any doubt, the Portfolio Holder for Development Services agreed to confirm the undertakings given to the Scrutiny Committee representatives and the Executive as to the process to be adopted in relation to the proposals for St Mary’s Lands which came before the Executive on 19 June 2013.</p> <p>It therefore confirmed that a Working Party consisting of 2 local Town Councillors appointed by the Town Council and three District Councillors, (Barrott, Mrs Blacklock and Hammon) together with local stakeholders including Warwick Racecourse Company, will develop a St Mary’s Lands business strategy based on GVA Leisure’s options appraisal report and the Executive decision in respect of this, and that no further decisions will be made by Executive pending the report from the Working Party and a public consultation on its findings.</p>

<b>Recruitment of Major Sites Monitoring Officer</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee understood the need for this post and it was concerned that the person appointed should look at infrastructure issues.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Chief Executive stated that this post would have an extensive work load and would not be able to take on additional responsibilities.

**8 October 2013**

<b>Warwick District Sports &amp; Leisure Vision and Principles</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported the report and strategy as set out in the report. It congratulated Chris Charman and members of the team involved with the report.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive thanked the Scrutiny Committee for its comments and echoed its views regarding Chris Charman and the members of his team.

<b>Building Control Shared Service – Confidential Report</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Committee passed comment on item 8 on the Executive agenda, “Building Control Shared Service”, which would be discussed at the meeting of the Executive on Wednesday 9 October 2013.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive thanked the Scrutiny Committee for its recommendations and accepted them as part of its decision.

<b>City Deal Governance and the establishment of a Sub-Regional Joint Committee and Coventry and Warwickshire City Deal</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee welcomed the reports and strongly supported the initiative/thrust to develop the advanced manufacturing and engineering sector. In respect of Recommendation 2.7 of the City Deal Governance Report (Item 7 on the Executive Agenda), the Committee felt that in light of the significance of what was being proposed, our representative on the Joint Committee should provide feedback to Overview and Scrutiny on a six monthly basis or in respect of any significant issues or decisions between times, to ensure proper scrutiny of the new arrangements.</p> <p>The Committee was concerned that the wording of the planning proposals within Appendix One was disappointing and that this was remedied within the final City Deal document, as while fully supportive of the principle of removing barriers to AME sector applications the reference to a 21 day determination might feed a public perception that any such applications would be driven through without proper consultation, in contravention of statutory timescales and/or full consideration of any public concerns raised.</p> <p>Finally, the Committee felt that it was extremely important that the Joint Sub-Regional Committee should operate transparently and that agendas and minutes should be publically available with minutes published within one month.</p>
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive thanked the Committee for its comments.

<b>Local Plan: Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee congratulated the officer on an excellent report and wanted prompt action to implement the consultation on the villages report.
<b>Executive Response</b>	Having read the report and the representations from Overview and Scrutiny and local residents, the Executive decided to agree the recommendations in the report with the assurance that prior to consultation, any reference to the word 'proposed' would be amended to read 'preferred'.

<b>Alternative use of part of West Rock car park</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee approved the plan and it was noted that most Warwick councillors agreed that there was a need for affordable housing.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive agreed the recommendations as written.

<b>Access to Kingfisher Pools, Warwick</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that this decision be deferred until local Ward Councillors and the Town Council had been consulted to facilitate looking at alternative options and all issues.
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>The Executive did not feel that a deferral would assist the Club especially with the imminent arrival of winter weather. In addition, it felt that officers had already investigated any alternative routes available and had reported on the most suitable option available. However, to ensure that all parties were sufficiently consulted with, it was agreed that authority to carry out the works could be delegated to the Head of Service in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holder.</p> <p>Having read the report and the recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee the Executive decided to amend the recommendation to ensure that the relevant Ward Councillors and Warwick Town Councillors were consulted prior to the works taking place.</p>

**10 December 2013**

<b>Assets Review</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Committee made the following comments and recommendations to Executive:</p> <p>“The Royal Pump Rooms is part of the heritage of Royal Leamington Spa and has a museum showing the history and culture of the Town. As a Council we have a responsibility to heritage. Therefore because of this and the significant amount of public money that has been spent on the building the Committee made a recommendation to the Executive as detailed below.</p> <p>The Committee also emphasised the importance of factoring in relocation costs and continued service provisions to the same current standards to the overall costs of the projects.</p> <p>Priory Park and Abbey Fields in Kenilworth were not listed as assets and the Committee felt that the Executive should ensure these ruins were included.</p> <p>The Committee recommends that recommendation 2.2 should be amended to include “maintaining full and free access to the building”.</p>
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive did not agree the recommendation put forward by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee because Members felt that officers should be given a free hand to be investigate all options. The Executive accepted that special care and attention was needed for these facilities and did not want officers to be restricted at the exploratory stage.

<b>CCTV &amp; Lighting in St Nicholas Park</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee received a presentation from local residents and following this the Committee felt that it needed to make a recommendation to the Executive, detailed below.</p> <p>The Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee also wished to see a further report back in six months about what has happened and been implemented.</p>

	<p>The Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee recommends to the Executive that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) recommendation 2.5 is amended to read that, as a matter of urgency, officers work with Warwickshire Police to ensure that boy racers are eradicated from the park by taking appropriate action;</li> <li>(2) recommendation 2.6 is amended to read "act urgently to work with Ward Councillors, Friends of the park and its users to allocate the remaining funding to those other desirable projects previously identified by the working party whilst looking at resolving the public nuisance issues from boy racers"; and</li> <li>(3) the Executive write to the Police Commissioner about the issues with boy racers and encourage police liaison to help tackle the problem early in the summer months when the problem is most acute.</li> </ol>
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>The recommendations in the report were agreed along with the recommendations from Overview &amp; Scrutiny with a minor amendment to (3) as detailed in bold, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) recommendation 2.5 is amended to read that, as a matter of urgency, officers work with Warwickshire Police to ensure that boy racers are eradicated from the park by taking appropriate action;</li> <li>(2) recommendation 2.6 is amended to read "act urgently to work with Ward Councillors, Friends of the park and its users to allocate the remaining funding to those other desirable projects previously identified by the working party whilst looking at resolving the public nuisance issues from boy racers"; and</li> <li>(3) Councillor Coker will write to the Police Commissioner independently about the issues with boy racers and encourage police liaison to help tackle the problem early in the summer months when the problem is most acute.</li> </ol>

**Review of Security of Open Spaces Within Warwick District Council to prevent Illegal Encampments**

<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview & Scrutiny Committee noted the report.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The recommendation in the report was agreed.

**Kenilworth Public Service Centre**

<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that the Executive took alternative option 6.3 as set out in the confidential report.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive accepted the recommendations in the confidential report.



## 11 February 2014

<b>Assets Review – Update Report</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee had concerns on how the conclusions were reached as shown in Appendix 1 of the report and questioned the criteria for how the Council was prioritising the assets. It was felt that the use of Ward Boundaries gave a false impression.
<b>Executive Response</b>	Following the Overview and Scrutiny meeting, Members had received and explanations from the Deputy Chief Executive (BH) which clarified their questions. The Executive agreed the recommendations as written.

<b>Peer Challenge Improvement Plan Update</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee felt that the Leader of the Council should encourage people to participate. The Committee welcomed recommendation 2.4 and making available £8,000 for mentoring support providing it would be available for all councillors to take part. The Committee was pleased with the efforts to provide information to other councillors.
<b>Executive Response</b>	Members applauded the mentoring facility stating that it was a valuable tool which all Members should consider taking advantage of.  Having read the report and having heard the representations from the Scrutiny Committees, the Executive decided to agree the recommendations as written.

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Warwick Sea Scouts' Headquarters</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee was broadly in favour of the recommendations but great care must be taken with the proposals at planning applications stage. The Committee suggested that the Sea Scouts might consider approaching Severn Trent to move the pipe and to pay for the hut.
<b>Executive Response</b>	Members were full of praise for the organisation and the smartness and manner in which they presented themselves through the District. It was hoped that better facilities would encourage even more families to get involved.  Councillor MacKay fully supported the report and reminded Members that this troop had a very high reputation, following inspections carried out by Senior Royal Naval inspectors.  Members were mindful of a letter from the Warwickshire Gardens Trust prior to the meeting and hoped that some of the concerns could be taken on board.  Having read the report and having heard the representations from the Scrutiny Committees, the Executive decided to agree the recommendations as written.

<b>Car Parking – National Bowls Championships</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends that recommendation 2.7 is highlighted for importance. The Committee recognises that this year's event is in the nature of a trial and recommends that the review report is produced by the end of the year based on similar lines to the last Bowls event review. It also recommends that the Friends of Victoria Park are consulted, along with local residents and users of the park as part of the review process.
<b>Executive Response</b>	In response to the recommendation from Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Councillor Cross was happy to amend the wording of recommendation 2.7 to make it more robust but highlighted that this would be a review of the 2014 event with the findings and lessons learned being reported to the Executive in January 2015.

<b>Public Service Network (PSN) Compliance</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommends that further review on the feasibility of separating the email system from the PSN is undertaken to allow access to emails in a more flexible manner.
<b>Executive Response</b>	Members supported the investigation into separating the email system from PSN.

<b>10, 12 &amp; 14 Chapel Street, Warwick</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the confidential report and addendum and agreed recommendation 2.2 in the addendum.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The recommendations in the report were agreed, including the additional recommendation as detailed in the addendum.

**11 March 2014**

<b>Housing Strategy 2014-17 Delivery Plan</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee welcomed the report and commended it to the Executive.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Portfolio Holder for Housing and Property Services, Councillor Vincett, endorsed the report and thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for its support.  Having read the report and having heard the representation from the Scrutiny Committee, the Executive decided to agree the recommendations as written.

<b>Hackney Carriage Fare Increase – Request from Drivers</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that the Executive delayed any decision in respect of fare increases pending a complete review of the taxi drivers' code of conduct to improve standards of service and vehicles.
<b>Executive Response</b>	Members were concerned about the comments raised at Overview and Scrutiny Committee and were uncomfortable with the proposed new fares, considering the level of service currently being reported. In addition, it was felt that a 50% increase in the soiling charge was too high.  Councillor Coker also felt that further communication should take place between officers and the hackney carriage drivers, during the review of processes, to negotiate a more suitable fare increase, with a report to

	<p>come back to Executive at a later date.</p> <p>Having read the report and having and in light of the comments from Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee, the Executive refused the recommendations in the report and resolved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. That the recommendations in the report were refused.</li> <li>2. The existing fares were confirmed at their current rate.</li> <li>3. That the Executive fully supported the pending review of the policies and procedures relating to Taxi Licensing.</li> </ol> <p>As part of that review, officers were asked to negotiate with drivers about fare charges, and report back to the Executive in due course.</p>
--	---

<b>Proposed Housing Development on Bowling Green Street / Theatre</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the confidential report which it believed would benefit Warwick.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive agreed the recommendations in the report.

### 25 March 2014

<b>Petition against the High Speed Rail (London West Midlands Bill)</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee agreed with both recommendations in principle and recommended that the Council's representative on 51M was included in the named parties given delegated authority in recommendation 2.2. It also recommended to the Executive that all councillors see the final petition before it was submitted.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive agreed with the comments from the Scrutiny Committee. Members accepted that they could not name Councillor Illingworth or the Council's 51M representative within the decision because they did not hold a formal position relevant to this matter. However the Executive provided assurance that Councillor Illingworth would be involved in the formulation of the response.

<b>Relocation of the Council's HQ offices</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that the Executive delayed the decision for a short period to confirm that the correct decision had been made on the relocation site.
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>In response to the recommendations from the Scrutiny Committees the Leader proposed the following amended and additional recommendations:</p> <p>Amended 2.4 That Executive approves a WDC project budget of £100,000, separate from the LLP forward funding, to cover 'client' project costs, subject to any expenditure being compliant with the Code of Procurement Practice.</p> <p>Amended 2.6 That Executive notes, the proposed Project timetable, as set out at Appendix Four, and that this will require the presentation of a further report in February 2015 seeking final approval for the project once the financial appraisals have been undertaken and all necessary planning approvals gained, subject to a revision to Appendix Four to ensure that the award of the contract to a development partner is not made until after the Executive decision.</p>

	<p>New 2.10 That, in parallel with the LLP funded detailed financial and design appraisals of the Spa Centre site, Executive instruct officers to formally review the potential use of other WDC town centre landholdings as alternative relocation sites and to report back no later than May 2014.</p> <p>New 2.11 That Executive agree to establish a sub-group to the existing Member Reference Group, made up of 1 member of each Group who is not a member of Planning Committee (and will also become ineligible to be a substitute for any Planning Committee meeting relevant to this project) to review, with officers, the design specification and car parking arrangements for the proposed new HQ offices at the Spa Centre site.</p>
--	---

**15 April 2014**

<b>Local Air Quality</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee felt it was an interesting report and supported the recommendations in the report. The Committee believe this report is exactly the type of topic that will be discussed by the Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive agreed the recommendations of the report with additional wording to recommendation 2.2 to advise that page 19 of the Low Emission Strategy Guidance for Developers, which relates to transport policy TR2, will be updated to comply with the version contained in the Local Plan.

<b>Racing Club Warwick &amp; West Midlands Reserve Force &amp; Cadets Association</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview and Scrutiny Committee made an alternative suggestion to the recommendations in the confidential report.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The Executive accepted the recommendations in the confidential report.

**23 April 2014**

<b>Local Plan Submission Draft</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Joint Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report as amended, including the two new recommendations but proposed one additional recommendation:</p> <p>“The Joint Scrutiny Committee recommends to the Executive that they ensure that firm proposals are included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in respect of Sustainable Transport Infrastructure to effectively deliver all aspects of the future transport agenda as set out in the Submission Draft Local Plan.”</p>
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>The Executive agreed the recommendations within item 13 “Local Plan Submission Draft”, which were relevant to them, subject to the following amendments:</p> <p>That the amended indicative total cost tables of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan, as circulated at the meeting, replace the tables that appear at the end of each section of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p>

	<p>That Appendix 5, sub regional approach to Delivering Housing Requirement as amended, set out below, by the Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Committee on 20<sup>th</sup> March, be noted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recommendation 2.1 - Amend the figure to read 3750-3800 dwellings;</li> <li>• Recommendation 2.2.1 - Amended to read "... according to a timetable to be agreed ...";</li> <li>• Recommendation 2.2.4 – add "To recognise relationships outside of the sub-region."; and</li> <li>• Additional recommendation: That Updates are to be received at Joint Committee Meetings and details to follow through to the review of the Strategic Economic Plan.</li> </ul> <p>In addition to the recommendations in the report the Executive also resolved that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• if the Gateway planning application does not succeed the Local Planning Authority will review the evidence base in relation to the need for the sub-regional employment site in light of the Secretary of State's decision".</li> <li>• the findings of the Transport Demand Management Study be reported to Executive along with recommended amendments to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan"</li> </ul> <p>in response to the recommendation from the joint meeting of the Scrutiny Committees the Executive will ensure that firm proposals are included within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan in respect of Sustainable Transport Infrastructure to effectively deliver all aspects of the future transport agenda as set out in the Submission Draft Local Plan.</p>
--	--

**7 May 2014**

<b>Council HQ Relocation Project – Update Report</b>	
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	<p>The Overview and Scrutiny Committee did not support any of the recommendations in the report and recommended that the Executive referred the decision to Full Council and this decision should be based on a further evaluation of all the sites in Appendix 1 of the report.</p> <p>It further recommended that a Green Travel Plan should be further advanced because some Members of Overview and Scrutiny were not convinced that there would not be a net loss of parking spaces. (The Committee recognised that a Green Travel Plan was not a site based issue.)</p> <p>A lot more work should be done on the future of the Town Hall and this needed to be progressed more quickly.</p> <p>If the Executive approved the recommendations in the report, then the Overview and Scrutiny Committee recommended that the Stage 3 decision point in the report was not taken until after the elections in May 2015.</p>
<b>Executive</b>	The Executive took on board the comments and recommendations from

<p><b>Response</b></p>	<p>the Overview and Scrutiny Committee and, in response, proposed some revised recommendations as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• That Executive recommends to Council on 25 June 2014 that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2.1 That Council notes the review findings as set out at Appendix One;</li> <li>2.2 That Council confirms that the Spa Centre site will be the location of the Council's new HQ offices, subject to successful progression of the project from Stage 2 to Stage 3 following the completion of the scheme viability tests and their formal 'sign-off' by both the LLP and the Council;</li> <li>2.3 That Council agrees that potential future options for the sites listed in Appendix One will be considered through the development of a Leamington Town Centre Area Action Plan;</li> <li>2.4 That Council notes that the sub-group of the Members Reference Group will be involved in the development of the draft planning application and accompanying Green Travel Plan and that these will be brought to Council for consideration prior to submission; and</li> <li>2.5 That Council notes that any delay in the HQ office relocation will cost the Council and Council Tax payers up to £350k per year.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• That Executive instructs officers to agree with the Group Leaders a programme of member briefings, to ensure that all councillors are able to make an informed decision on 25 June.</li> </ul>
------------------------	--