

WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL

Minutes of the meeting of Warwick District Council held at Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa, on Wednesday 19 February 2025, at 6.01pm.

PRESENT: Councillor Margrave (Chairman); Councillors Adkins, Armstrong, Barton, Boad, Browne, Chilvers, Collins, Cron, Davidson, Davison, K Dickson, R Dickson, Dray, B Gifford, Gorman, Hales, Kenedy, King, Kohler, Luckhurst, Matecki, Melrose, Milton, Payne, Phillips, Redford, Roberts, Russell, Sinnott, Syson, C Wightman, P Wightman, Williams and Yellapragda.

75. Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Aizlewood, Billiald, Day, Falp, C Gifford, Harrison, Rosu, and Tangri.

76. Declarations of Interest

Minute 83 - Setting of the Council Tax 2025/26

Councillor Melrose declared an interest because one of the proposed amendments to the 2025/26 Budget stated a charity organisation, of which, one of the trustees was a Labour Town Councillor.

Councillor Davidson declared an interest because she was an unpaid ambassador for Safe Line.

Councillor R Dickson declared an interest because he was a member and user of Everyone Active.

Councillor Matecki declared an interest because he was a Warwickshire County Councillor and Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning at Warwickshire County Council (WCC); this position conflicted with the second Conservative amendment as it concerned parking. He abstained from the discussion and did not vote on this amendment as he was due to take a decision on these fees within his role as Warwickshire County Councillor.

Minute 86 –Appointments to Committee

Councillor K Dickson declared an interest because she is a member of South Warwickshire University NHS Foundation Trust (SWFT).

77a. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 18 December 2024 were taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

77b. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 30 January 2025 were taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record subject to the amendment to Minute 66, to remove Councillor C Wightman from the list of Councillors having declared an interest as Town Councillors.

78. **Communications & Announcements**

The Chairman welcomed Councillor Jones, who was elected to the Council on 13 February 2025, representing the All Saints and Woodloes Ward.

The Chairman reminded Members that that there had been a formal launch looking for nominations of individuals to award Freedom of the District to or confirm the status of Alderman/Woman on. This was launched on 17 February 2025 and seven nominations had been received by 19 February 2025.

The Chairman sent best wishes to Councillors Day and Billiald who were unwell.

The Chairman reminded Members of the Lights of Leamington display in Leamington Town Centre where the 2025 Spotlight Festival was ongoing.

79. **Leader and Portfolio Holders' Statements**

The Portfolio Holder for Arts, Culture, and Economy, Councillor Billiald, in her absence, sent a written statement to Councillors ahead of the meeting that is set out at Appendix A to the minutes.

The Portfolio Holder for Decarbonisation, Councillor Williams, informed Council that:

- a) work on the installation of solar panels on Newbold Comyn Leisure Centre had begun as scheduled;
- b) brackets and frames for the solar panels had been installed and panels and optimisers would be fitted from 20 February 2025;
- c) 363 solar panels would be installed on the swimming pool roof which would generate 146,000 kilo watts of electricity annually and would reduce on site imported electricity by up to 30%;
- d) premarket engagement had concluded for the low-cost loan scheme which involved soft market testing;
- e) officers were creating detailed recommendations for the scheme and would share these with Programme Board Members in due course;
- f) the Leyes Lane and Rouncil Lane plans were moving at pace;
- g) low carbon experts, Dr Sarah Lewis and Phil Lewis had progressed in advising on the approach to bring forward an innovative scheme at the Leyes and Rouncil Lane sites;
- h) the new Housing Development Strategy and Programme Forum would oversee the development of the Leyes and Rouncil Lane sites to ensure the current focus was maintained and the work continued to be undertaken at pace; and
- i) Kenilworth residents had been reengaged with, the Strategic Director had met informally with community representatives and was planning further engagement in due course.

The Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood, Councillor Roberts, informed Council that:

- a) work had begun on the refurbishment of the paddling pools in Victoria Park and St Nicholas Park. Both were due to be reopened in early summer 2025;
- b) tenders were being sent out during the week commencing 17 February 2025 for both Castle Farm and Mill Gardens Play areas which would see both play areas upgraded and made increasingly accessible;
- c) the St Nicholas Park survey would close on 28 February 2025. The survey sought to understand residents' views on St Nicholas Park and the changes they desired which would shape the future development of the park;

- d) green waste permits for 2025/26 were available to purchase;
- e) a meeting with officers was scheduled for the week commencing 24 February 2025 to discuss the plans for No Mow May (NMM) in 2025;
- f) NMM was part of the biodiversity action programme and the ecological emergency declared by WDC;
- g) the feedback from NMM in 2024 guided the changes for NMM 2025;
- h) a NMM briefing paper would be sent out in March 2025 for Members to comment on;
- i) as part of the Biodiversity Action Programme, WDC were working with Warwickshire Wildlife Trust to launch a new initiative, namely Nature Patchwork, that was designed to inspire and connect residents as well as support nature by creating wildlife habitats in gardens and community spaces;
- j) the Nature Patchwork Initiative would launch on 8 March 2025 at the SYDNI Centre in Royal Leamington Spa; and
- k) residents could find out more about the Nature Patchwork initiative through searching Nature Patchwork on the WDC website.

The Portfolio Holder for Place, Councillor King, informed Council that:

- a) the response period for the South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP) was shortly coming to an end;
- b) as of 18 February 2025, there had been just short of 3000 representations. Out of these representations, 1128 were in support, 1529 were objecting, and 246 were general comments;
- c) over 98% of all representations had been made online;
- d) as of 19 February 2025, there had been 3138 representations; and
- e) it was hard to advise on the number of individual respondents as many people made more than one question or comment.

The Portfolio Holder for Safer, Healthier, and Active Communities, Councillor Sinnott, informed Council that:

- a) Leamington Town Council were sponsoring Safe Space for 2025/26. This would enable Safe Spaces to open every Friday and Saturday night throughout 2025 which was an increase in provision and created a safer and more vibrant District;
- b) phase two of the Public Space Protection Orders (PSPOs) was in progress. Residents were implored to engage with the consultations;
- c) during January 2025, WDC officers visited the Berry polymer site and monitored the surrounding area together with Environmental Agency (EA) officers. The aim of the visit was to:
 - I. develop a better understanding from the EA with regards to whether the wastewater tank should have been included on the EA permit or not;
 - II. ensure that the EA and WDC officers were detecting the same type of odours on/off the site, they were detected at levels that would not typically be considered as excessive; and
 - III. take the opportunity to understand the wastewater and associated sludge removal processes that were carried out;
- d) following the visit to the Berry polymer site, WDC officers were waiting the response from the EA;
- e) there was a dedicated area on WDC's website where Councillors and residents could obtain further information, Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs), and a direct link to the EA updates webpage; and

- f) WDC officers were still responding to complaints and carrying out visits to those impacted. During January 2025, the team carried out eight visits.

The Portfolio Holder for People and Organisational Development, Councillor Melrose, informed Council that:

- a) a key milestone had been achieved in the journey to digitise and regenerate Neighbourhood services and the Customer Relationship Management (CRM) system;
- b) residents could renew requests for 2025/26 garden waste permits online, by phone, or in the Pump Rooms, Royal Leamington Spa. This was following on from the work associated with moving the waste calls back in-house in December 2024;
- c) over 2000 residents had signed up for the garden waste permit renewal as of 19 February 2025; and
- d) contact service centres were contacting residents to remind them of their permits.

The Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Leadership, Councillor Davison, informed Council that:

- a) a replacement Strategic Director had not been appointed;
- b) following the WDC debate and motion on the English Devolution White Paper on 30 January 2025, both Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) and WCC had held devolution debates;
- c) SDC and WCC had both committed to working with other Councils in Warwickshire;
- d) several speakers in the SDC and WCC debates desired to retain local services;
- e) both motions proposed included keeping options open and obtaining evidence to support options. Information would be shared by SDC and WCC whilst proposals were developed based on such evidence;
- f) the Leader of WCC remained committed to a single unitary authority across Warwickshire and would not spend money on hiring consultants;
- g) the five District and Borough Councils in Warwickshire were on the verge of commissioning Deloitte to provide evidence on the costs and benefits of North and South Warwickshire unitaries compared with a single authority, as agreed in the motion at the 30 January Council meeting;
- h) the final strategic authority would have a strong bearing on the unitary outcome, as such, the Chief Executive had been talking with his counterparts in many neighbouring Councils and would be raising the issue with the Ministry of Housing, Communities, and Local Government (MHCLG) Officers at the end of February 2025 when all Chief Executives in Warwickshire were to meet; and
- i) the earliest date for unitarisation in Warwickshire was April 2028. However, it could be earlier than this or not take place at all. As such, it continued to be business as usual for WDC officers, the 2025/26 Budget had been geared in this direction.

At the request of the Chairman the Head of Governance and Monitoring Officer informed Council that:

- the upcoming Council meeting had moved from 26 March 2025 to 20 March 2025 to better align with the deadlines for devolution decision submissions;
- a briefing for all Councillors would take place on 13 March 2025;
- Parish and Town Councils would receive a briefing on 3 March 2025; and
- work was ongoing to arrange dates for November 2025 Council meetings to better align with the November 2025 Devolution submission deadlines.

80. Questions to the Leader of the Council & Portfolio Holders

Councillor Barton asked the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood whether it was an option for Whitnash Road and Heathcote Road of Whitnash Ward to opt out of No Mow May (NMM) since a large volume of complaints had been made in 2024.

In response, Councillor Roberts explained that in 2025, NMM would be different to previous years. A discussion with officers was taking place during the week commencing 24 February 2025 to consider feedback from previous years. Councillor Barton's feedback on Whitnash would be considered as part of this discussion.

Councillor Roberts stated that he would neither rule out nor suggest that there would be an opt out option at this time.

Councillor C Wightman asked the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood whether an opt out option which would enable Wards to opt out of NMM entirely could be embedded into the 2025 NMM scheme.

In response, Councillor Roberts explained that:

- a) NMM was a crucial part of WDC's Biodiversity Action Programme to address the ecological emergency that WDC had declared;
- b) ruling out an entire area from NMM was a backwards step in what WDC wished to achieve;
- c) he was aware of the negative feedback received by residents of the All Saints and Woodloes Ward, however, there had been equal numbers of positive remarks made regarding NMM as there had been complaints;
- d) all feedback on NMM would be discussed in the upcoming meeting with officers, after which a briefing paper would be sent to Members; and
- e) after the briefing paper had been delivered, Councillors were welcome to arrange to discuss NMM with him in further detail.

Councillor C Wightman asked the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood how a publicised overspend of £29,000 on NMM in 2024 could be justified in light of an overall reduction in the scheduled number of cuts in Green Spaces in the All Saints and Woodloes Ward.

In response, Councillor Roberts explained that:

- a) the hiring of the machinery was highlighted in the March 2024 briefing on NMM;
- b) the change in climate created the need to review the number of cuts;
- c) the wetter weather in 2024 had contributed to the number of cuts and the cutting schedule; and
- d) the review of the number of cuts carried out by the contractor would be part of the upcoming meeting with officers and the details would be released as part of the briefing paper.

Councillor Syson asked the Portfolio Holder for Place to clarify the number of people who had responded to the ongoing South Warwickshire Local Plan (SWLP) consultation.

In response, Councillor King explained that he could not provide the number of people who had engaged with the consultation, however, the number of responses was 3138 as of 19 February 2025.

Councillor Syson requested that future consultations be broken up into multiple sections that each had a distinct focus to make the consultations more user-friendly.

In response, Councillor King explained that:

- a) such a request had been made previously, however, there were also a number of people who wished to have a large amount of data accessible within the consultation;
- b) the officers who created the consultation were of the opinion it was important for everything included in the consultation to be there; and
- c) the consultation was intuitive with regards to how it should be navigated and used, however, Councillor Syson's concerns would be taken on board.

Councillor Syson stated that it would be beneficial for the consultation to be split into two or three parts. This would make it easier for residents to engage with as they could engage with parts of the consultation that were of particular interest.

Councillor Milton asked the Portfolio Holder for Decarbonisation whether the engagement with community representatives regarding the Leyes Lane site included Ward Councillors and whether Ward Councillors would be engaged with going forward.

In response, Councillor Williams explained that the engagement with community representatives had been informal. The Strategic Director had met with representatives of the local community in response to a query that they had raised. The Strategic Director endeavoured to arrange a formal consultation after May 2025. At the point of the formal engagement, Ward Councillors would be invited.

Councillor K Dickson asked the Portfolio Holder for Decarbonisation whether the plans that were going to be available for consultation could be developed alongside the progress at the Leyes Lane and Rouncil Lane school sites.

In response, Councillor Williams explained that:

- a) the view was to be as transparent as possible as plans for the sites developed;
- b) the Strategic Director had made it clear that there was currently a more technical piece of work ongoing which concerned maximising efficiency of the site, meeting the requirements with regards to social and affordable housing, and making the best use in protecting HRA;
- c) as of 19 February 2025, officers had not got into the finer details of revisions to site designs or layouts, excluding the initial plan which was completed sometime ago; and
- d) when the appropriate phase had been reached, an intuitive consultation would be undertaken.

Councillor R Dickson addressed the Portfolio Holder for Decarbonisation when providing an observation from a resident lived close to the Kenilworth school site and was unaware what had been happening to the site. The resident had received no communication from WDC. Councillor R Dickson therefore suggested that this be addressed.

Councillor R Dickson asked the Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Leadership how many Members of the Cabinet were at the Spark Lite 2025 event.

In response, Councillor Davison explained that he would request that Councillor Billiald, as Portfolio Holder for Arts, Culture, and Economy, provide an answer to Councillor R Dickson.

Councillor R Dickson explained that Councillors Milton, Syson, and himself attended the Spark Lite 2025 event and requested that thanks be conveyed to the members of the WDC Arts and Economy team for running the successful event.

Councillor R Dickson then asked the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood when it was first promised that the works to the Glendale Play Area were to be completed.

In response, Councillor Roberts explained that he was not able to provide a specific date. There had been complications to the Glendal Play Area site and development. It was therefore promising that work had now commenced on its refurbishment and it should thus be opening soon.

Councillor R Dickson explained that it was May 2019 that the works to the Glendale Paly Area were promised to be completed.

Councillor Williams responded to Councillor R Dickson's earlier statement regarding the resident who had received no communication on the works at the Kenilworth school site. Councillor Williams explained that a press release was sent out after the 18 December 2024 Council Meeting which provided Kenilworth Town Council with an update on what was happening on the site.

Councillor Syson raised a point of information and explained that Councillor Billiald was present at the Spark Lite 2025 event.

Councillor P Wightman proceeded to ask the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood whether he agreed that it was wrong for residents to feel as though NMM was being imposed on them and whether it would therefore work better residents could opt in to NMM.

In response, Councillor Roberts explained that:

- a) the wet weather conditions in 2024 created delays in cutting the grass after NMM;
- b) the Island Junction was not a District Council initiative;
- c) residents understandably assumed that issues with overgrown grass came down to NMM;
- d) each year, NMM would grow and change in accordance with the feedback that was received;
- e) NMM was firmly a part of the Biodiversity Action Programme which was part of the ecological crisis declared by WDC;
- f) all information would be provided in the briefing notes which Members were invited to provide feedback on;
- g) the briefing paper in March 2024 demonstrated the learning curve from NMM in 2023; and
- h) Members were welcome to meet with him to discuss NMM after the briefing paper had been released.

Councillor Yellapragada explained that many concerns had been raised by residents regarding dried out hedgerows and dead trees in the Priors, the new housing estate in the Myton and Heathcote Ward that was to be adopted by WDC. She therefore asked the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood to offer reassurance and outline what steps WDC were taking to hold developers to account and ensure that they

delivered on their commitments before WDC adoption. Taxpayers' money should not be used to complete work that developers were responsible for.

In response, Councillor Roberts explained that:

- a) other Councillors had raised similar concerns with regards to alternative developments and therefore a comprehensive answer would be provided to address concerns;
- b) the adoption process was robust;
- c) as part of the planning consent, the developers had approved landscaping plans. It was vital these plans were adhered to;
- d) developers would have also agreed a Section 106 which accompanied the consent and set out the steps for the adoption of the public open space;
- e) the adoption process was set out in the public open space Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). Appendix 4 to the SPD referred to the legal process behind the adoption;
- f) initially, the onus was on the developers to write to the Council to inform them that their public open space was ready for inspection with the view of issuing the completion certificate;
- g) the completion certificate was required to start the 12 months maintenance period which sat with the developer;
- h) the officer would go out to the site and inspect it, assessing the planting and the conformity to the approved plans;
- i) if the site had been developed in accordance with the approved plans, then the completion certificate would be issued. If there were remedials to be actioned, the certificate would not be issued, and the developer would be provided with the Snag list as well as photos of the elements that required action. It was expected that such actions would be undertaken promptly and at least within the first available planting season;
- j) should there be inaction by the developer, the case would be transferred to the Enforcement Team. The Green Spaces Officer would work with the Enforcement Team with the view of serving a breach of condition notice;
- k) if the developer addressed the remedial actions and the site looked in accordance with the plans, the site would then go into the 12-month maintenance period;
- l) within the 12-month period, there would be a number of further inspections of the site to insure it was meeting its maintenance requirements. If this was being maintained properly then this would culminate in the issuing of an open space final certificate and the site would be adopted by the Council;
- m) if the site was not being maintained to the standard required, further Snag lists and photos would be issued to the developer to allow them sufficient time to address said concerns. Failure to address the concerns would result in the site being passed back to the Planning Enforcement Officer who would decide to pursue enforcement action against the developer;
- n) the inspection regime was based on the areas that were defined as public open spaces, street trees and private residential gardens did not fall within this; and
- o) whilst WDC would adopt most public open spaces, there were instances where land would be transferred to a management company. This would not be the responsibility of WDC. This could lead to areas where residents would be paying a management fee and not always getting the same level of service delivered by WDC.

Councillor Phillips asked the Portfolio Holder for Place why the current consultation was not being extended for an extra period since the goal posts had been moved substantially. during the middle of the consultation period (7 January 2025 to 7 March 2025), an email was received which detailed the goal posts having been

moved, and small sites had started to be included. Residents who had replied to the consultation prior to the 5 February 2025 would not have been aware that they were also supposed to reply to the small sites. Therefore, Councillor Phillips sought to understand what WDC were doing to advise residents that they were required to comment on small sites too.

In response, Councillor King explained that the number of responses to the consultation was increasing fast and daily, as such, the percentage of people represented should soon increase. With regards to the length of the consultation, Councillor King explained that he would respond to Councillor Phillips via email after the meeting.

Councillor Phillips explained that he understood the extension of the consultation to be a Cabinet decision, however, since the goal posts had moved substantially and residents were unaware that they were required to respond to small sites too, it was necessary for the consultation to be extended.

Councillor Phillips asked a supplementary question and questioned why Councillor King considered the current formatting of the consultation to be valid since the goal posts had been moved.

In response, Councillor Davison explained that the SWLP consultation was primarily concerned with strategic growth areas and settlements. This meant that the areas for consultation were not the small sites for this consultation.

Councillor Phillips maintained that the goal posts had been changed significantly.

In response, Councillor Davison explained that:

- a) the significant aim in terms of locations was the new settlements and the strategic growth areas;
- b) WDC were aiming to fill most of the allocation, 54,700 homes, with the new settlements and the strategic growth areas and so the smaller sites may come in later;
- c) it was difficult to know which of the smaller sites were to be included at this stage of the consultation, however, this would become clear at the end of the consultation; and
- d) there had been some confusion as it had been said at the beginning of the consultation that the small sites were included but not the primary focus. The clarification of this provided by the officers may have caused some confusion, however, the change was not significant.

Councillor Phillips made a point of order to clarify that WDC had written out to Parish/Town Councils stating that the consultation now included comments from small sites.

At the request of the Chairman, the Chief Executive explained that:

- a) a clarification email had been sent from SDC in response to a request from a Parish Council in the Stratford District which was then shared across the two Local Authority areas;
- b) it was always intent that the small sites should be looked at as part of this consultation;
- c) the email that had been sent to Parish/Town Councils was an attempt to clarify that small sites had always been a part of this consultation;

- d) a response had been delivered to Parish Councils who had asked whether the consultation had changed;
- e) this was not the final stage of the consultation;
- f) the issue concerning the confusion over the inclusion of the small sites did not undermine the consultation as there were a number of other, more legally significant, stages for the Local Plan to go through. At those stages it would be important that the comments were made, and the statutory process was followed; and
- g) this stage of the consultation was about influencing and helping to shape what would go into the latter and more important stages.

Councillor Kohler asked the Portfolio Holder for Safer, Healthier, and Active Communities whether there was a danger that the Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPO) consultation would receive a low number of responses because it was active at the same time as the SWLP consultation.

In response, Councillor Sinnott explained that he was willing to listen to feedback from Members regarding a 'consultation overload'. However, Councillor Sinnott maintained that he would push for the PSPO consultation to go ahead because this would provide residents with the chance to voice their concerns over public spaces.

Councillor Kohler asked a supplementary question and requested that Councillor Sinnott look at the outcome of the consultation and compared the volume of responses to previous PSPO responses when the SWLP consultation was not ongoing. Councillor Sinnott responded by explaining that the responses to the PSPO consultations would be compared and he would hope to see an improvement in the number of responses.

Councillor Redford asked the Portfolio Holder for Place whether he was aware that people, including herself, had experienced issues when attempting to access the SWLP consultation.

In response, Councillor King explained that he was not aware of the issues that Councillor Redford was experiencing as she had not informed him of such matters.

In response to a supplementary question from Councillor Redford, Councillor King clarified that any issues experienced by Members or reported to Councillors from residents should be directed to him so that he could provide efficient assistance.

Councillor Redford asked the Portfolio Holder for Safer, Healthier, and Active Communities what WDC were planning to do for Victory in Europe (VE) Day.

In response, Councillor Sinnott explained that he would liaise with officers to provide further information in due course.

Councillor Hales asked the Portfolio Holder for Decarbonisation whether there was an option to demolish the Kenilworth school sites since there were concerns amongst residents regarding antisocial behaviour.

In response, Councillor Williams explained that there was a reasonable concern over safety. There had been discussions of abolition already, however, there was sequencing of the budget which had been an issue. Councillor Williams assured that in the procurement exercise, WDC would work towards being in a position in which demolition could be performed quickly when it was chosen to do so. The concern over safety and the preference for abolition would be fed into the procurement exercise.

Councillor B Gifford asked the Portfolio Holder for Place whether he could provide information on the success of the consultation with regards to the number of people who had responded, and not the number of responses received as a person could have made a number of responses.

In response, Councillor King explained that:

- a) resources were required to make such analysis and other work on the SWLP that required such resources was taking priority;
- b) although resources were limited an answer could hopefully be provided in due course;
- c) a comprehensive package of engagement had been put together;
- d) it was resource intensive to make individual contact to members of public;
- e) officers were doing all that they could to make engagement with the public; and
- f) he would look at Councillor B Gifford's question concerning the number of people who had responded to give a definitive answer.

Councillor B Gifford asked a supplementary question requesting that if the exact number of people who had responded to the consultation could not be provided, an idea of whether the consultation had been filled in completely or if respondents were only filling in a small section be provided instead.

Councillor B Gifford maintained the importance of the consultation and stated that he had received comments from residents who were of the opinion that the consultation had been designed to favour the developers.

Councillor King responded by explaining that he would see what was possible.

Councillor Matecki asked the Leader and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Leadership how many Members lived outside Warwick District and did not have a work address in Warwick District.

In response, Councillor Davison explained that:

- a) Members had completed forms in which they declared pecuniary interests, such forms detailed where Councillors may have a land interest;
- b) two Councillors had declared that they did not have a land interest within Warwick District, if the assumption was that land interest equated to where a Councillor resided, this would mean that two Councillors did not live in Warwick District, however, it could be greater than two Councillors; and
- c) with regards to whether Members worked in Warwick District, it was difficult to confirm as the employer was required to be declared on the pecuniary interests form which did not always equate to where a Councillor may work.

Councillor Matecki asked the Portfolio Holder for Place why WDC were not informing WCC at present when they approved new home buildings for occupation, which enabled WCC to work with developers more swiftly on adoption of highways, and whether assurance could be offered regarding all work being done to supply the required information to WCC in a timely manner in future.

In response, Chris Elliot explained that if WDC were not the building control authority, the notice to WCC could not be served. A number of the new house building in the District was approved by private building control contractors rather than WDC which was part of the problem. Councillor Matecki's question had arisen

several times and it was because of the disparity in building control authority and regulation. Many major house developers did not work with WDC's local building control service.

Councillor Matecki asked a supplementary question requesting that where WDC services were used, could they inform WCC.

In response, Councillor King explained that:

- a) Councillor Matecki's concern was a live issue;
- b) part of the levelling and regeneration Act 2023 had a section 93G, when the section 93G got enacted, this should allow the automatic triggering of this information to be shared;
- c) it was likely that section 93G would be enacted but it was not active as of 19 February 2025; and
- d) there was no legislative reason why the notification received by WDC when a CIL application was put forward could not be passed on to WCC. This would address the concerns raised by Councillor Matecki and was therefore being investigated.

Councillor Matecki asked the Portfolio Holder for Place whether he was prepared to admit that the alleged statement he made:

"it has been acknowledged by both sides that it wouldn't have made any difference to the decision on that application".

was wrong and therefore warranted an apology. Councillor Matecki explained that he believed Councillor King did recall making the statement and he wanted to understand whether Councillor King believed the statement to be inaccurate in its contents.

In response, Councillor King explained that he did not recall making the comment. He would not have been cognisant of the amount of information he would need to make such a comment as he was not particularly familiar with the case at the time.

Councillor King apologised for any confusion but maintained that he did not make the alleged comment as it would have been unwise.

Councillor Matecki clarified that his question to the Portfolio Holder for Place was not whether he made the comment, but instead whether he admitted that the statement was wrong and would apologise accordingly.

In response, Councillor King explained that it would be unnecessary to apologise for a remark that he did not admit to making.

Councillor Jones asked the Portfolio Holder for Neighbourhood if he would agree to meet to discuss the hedge trimming schedule and the impact of NMM.

In response, Councillor Roberts explained that he was happy to meet with any Member if residents had concerns regarding NMM.

Councillor Kennedy asked the Portfolio Holder for Housing whether following the recent change in secondary legislation under rights to buy, she could provide an assessment of the impact of the change on the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) budget, stock of council homes, and ability to invest in council homes in line with WDC's ambitions.

In response, Councillor Adkins explained that:

- a) prior to the legislation, WDC would estimate to lose 26-35 dwellings per year through right to buy;
- b) the revised forecast post the legislation saw this number drop to 10 dwellings per year;
- c) this revision would be brought forward in the HRA business plan due before Cabinet in March 2025;
- d) Central government rules meant that not all of the income received from the sale of properties could be repurposed to provide social housing. WDC budgets would therefore benefit from the reduction;
- e) it was forecasted that more homes would be retained than lost to home ownership;
- f) whilst WDC had strived to acquire or develop new homes to bridge the gap, the policy would enable WDC to retain stock numbers without incurring any additional borrowing;
- g) WDC's HRA currently used the income it was permitted to retain from the Right To Buy (RTB) receipts to contribute to the costs of Housing Development and WDC would need to be mindful in their use to ensure that WDC continued to maximise the benefits available through stamp duty land tax; and
- h) WDC generally appraised the viability of their new schemes without the need for RTB receipts. Therefore, WDC should be able to maintain a strong programme of new development going forward.

Councillor Payne addressed the Portfolio Holder for Safer, Healthier, and Active Communities when explaining that:

Councillor Payne asked the Portfolio Holder for Safer, Healthier, and Active Communities what he could do to press upon the Community Wardens team that it was a service for the whole District and therefore there was a requirement for the wardens to be active in the rural Parishes more regularly. This was because there was demand for Community Wardens in the Cubbington and Leek Wootton Ward as there were persistent issues with dog fouling and elderly residents had concerns over crime. Additionally, Community Wardens could perform community work that the police arguably did not have the resources to complete.

In response, Councillor Sinnott explained that:

- a) the Wardens regular patrol was predominantly in the main towns in the District and especially in hotspot areas;
- b) it was an evidence based and data driven system;
- c) over the past year, Community Wardens had engaged with Parish Councils, and had been on patrol in some rural villages on request;
- d) the Community Wardens had attended some community events in Weston-under-Weatherly. This was organised by Warwickshire Police's Rural Crime Officer;
- e) Community Safety officers had attended some Parish Council meetings;
- f) having the warden van meant the team of Community Wardens could be highly responsive. This meant they could easily reach rural areas and therefore be responsive there;
- g) if Parish councils wanted Community Safety officers to attend any of their future meetings or events, they would be happy to oblige;
- h) WDC had a proportion of resource from the Rural Advisors team based in SDC, if there were any concerns relating to rural crime, they could be deployed to assist with this; and

- i) the Community Wardens were a finite resource, they had to keep with other services for funding from WDC.

(The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 7.28 pm for a 19-minute comfort break).

83. **Setting of the Council Tax 2025/26**

The Head of Finance explained that there were two addendums that were circulated before the meeting.

Councillor Matecki raised a point of order and sought clarification over whether those Members who were living outside the District should declare an interest as they were imposing WDC Council Tax on others.

The Head of Governance and Monitoring Officer clarified that Members living outside the District could vote on the item and were not required to declare an interest.

- (a) The recommendations from the meeting of the Cabinet held on 6 February 2025 in Minute Number 98, were proposed by Councillors Chilvers and seconded by Councillor Melrose.

Councillor Boad proposed the first Liberal Democrat Amendment to the budget, seconded by Councillor Kohler, that £27,800 to extend the Community Wellbeing Co-ordinator role for an additional 12 months from June 2025, as part of the Lillington Health Hub. This is to be funded from the Community Projects Reserve.

The proposer and seconder accepted a revised wording for their proposal so that the amendment read as follows:

“work with South Warwickshire University NHS Foundation Trust (SWFT) and Warwickshire County Council (WCC) to understand the funding need for Lillington Health Hub and feedback to Cabinet and Ward Members by the end of March 2025.”

Councillors Kohler, B Gifford, King, Chilvers, Hales, Sinnott, and Boad spoke on this amendment.

On being put to the vote the amendment was approved.

Councillor Boad proposed the second Liberal Democrat Amendment to the budget, seconded by Councillor Milton. That would:

- allow up to £150,000 to support the renovation of the skate park at Castle Farm. This would be subject to half of the funding being provided from other sources, including the Town Council and require a more detailed proposal being brought forward to Cabinet in due course, outlining the proposal, including timeline and funding. Funding would be allocated within the Corporate Assets reserve.

Councillors Milton, K Dickson, Roberts, R Dickson, Chilvers, and Boad spoke on this amendment.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

Councillor Hales proposed the first Conservative Amendment to the budget, seconded by Councillor Phillips. That would:

- allow up to £130,000 to support the renovation of Baginton Village Hall. This would require a more detailed proposal being brought forward to Cabinet in due course, outlining the proposal, including timeline and definitive funding requirements. Funding would be allocated within the Corporate Assets reserve.

Councillors Chilvers, Sinnott, Redford, King, Boad, Phillips and Hales spoke on this amendment.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

Councillor Hales proposed the second Conservative Amendment to the budget, seconded by Councillor Phillips. That would:

- allow two hours free parking in all WDC Car Parks for 2025/26. Based upon weekly ticket sales from 2024, this would result in a reduction in car park income of £1.582m. It should be noted that due to the timing of the proposal, no impact assessment of the change had been completed.

Councillors Melrose, Roberts, Chilvers, B Gifford, Jones, King, Collins, Barton, Kennedy, Phillips, and Hales spoke on this amendment.

On being put to the vote the amendment was lost.

Councillor Boad proposed the third Liberal Democrat Amendment to the budget, seconded by Councillor Milton. That would:

- recognise the impact of the removal by WCC of the contract to support sexual abuse survivors; and
- agree to write to WCC within the next week offering to contribute a one off £12500 to the 2025/6 contract if WCC can find the remaining £12500. This allocation would be funded from the Community Projects Reserve.

On being put to the vote the amendment was approved.

Councillor King proposed the Labour and Green Amendments to the budget, seconded by Councillor Chilvers. That would:

- make a one off allocation of £95,000 to be spent in conjunction with Town Councils until December 2026 to support our four town centres with a focus on events to increase footfall. Allocation to be made from the Community Projects reserve and in the context of the emerging events strategy; and
- welcome the willingness of Kenilworth Town Council to support the renovation of the Skate Park at Castle Farm and the work they have already done with users. Ask green spaces to bring forward the business case to Cabinet for the project and investigate funding options once the Castle Farm Play Area works have been completed.

Councillors Kennedy, R Dickson, Hales, Chilvers, Barton, and King spoke on this amendment.

On being put to the vote the amendment was approved.

There were no abstentions.

Resolved that the recommendations contained in minute 98 headed "General Fund Revenue and Capital Budget 2025/26" as set out in the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 6 February 2025, subject to the below amendments, be approved and adopted:

- (1) work with South Warwickshire University NHS Foundation Trust (SWFT) and Warwickshire County Council (WCC) to understand the funding need for Lillington Health Hub and feedback to Cabinet and Ward Members by the end of March 2025;
- (2) recognise the impact of the removal by WCC of the contract to support sexual abuse survivors. Agree to write to WCC within the next week offering to contribute a one off £12500 to the 2025/6 contract if WCC can find the remaining £12500. This allocation would be funded from the Community Projects Reserve;
- (3) make a one off allocation of £95,000 to be spent in conjunction with Town Councils until December 2026 to support our four town centres with a focus on events to increase footfall. Allocation to be made from the Community Projects reserve and in the context of the emerging events strategy; and
- (4) welcome the willingness of Kenilworth Town Council to support the renovation of the Skate Park at Castle Farm and the work they have already done with users. Ask green spaces to bring forward the business case to Cabinet for the project and investigate funding options once the Castle Farm Play Area works have been completed; and

By law, a recorded vote was required on this decision. The votes on this were as follows:

For: Councillors Adkins, Armstrong, Barton, Boad, Browne, Chilvers, Collins, Cron, Davidson, Davison, K Dickson, R Dickson, Dray, B Gifford, Gorman, Hales, Kennedy, King, Kohler, Luckhurst, Margrave, Melrose, Milton, Payne, Redford, Roberts, Russell, Sinnott, Syson, Williams, C Wightman, P Wightman, Yellapragada, and Jones.

Against: Councillors Matecki and Phillips.

- (b) the report of the Responsible Financial Officer the Council Tax for the area of Warwick District, incorporating its own Budget, which was borne by Council Tax, along with the precepts from the other authorities within the area.

The report was proposed by Councillor Chilvers and seconded by Councillor Melrose.

Resolved that

- (1) as set out in the General Fund Revenue and Capital Budget 2025/26 (Cabinet recommendations, 6 February 2025 and Appendix 3)
 - (a) the Revenue Budgets for 2025/26
 - (b) the Capital Programme for 2025/26, be approved;
- (2) the amounts for the 2025/26 Warwick District Tax Base, be noted;
- (3) the amounts for Warwick District Council's 2025/26 Council Tax, including Parish / Town Council precepts (Appendix 1 to the report and set out at Appendix B and C to the minutes), be noted;
- (4) the amounts for the 2025/26 Warwickshire County Council and Warwickshire Police and Crime Commissioner precepts, be noted; and
- (5) the total Council Tax for the District for each band in each Parish / Town Council (Appendix 2 to the report and set out at Appendix D to the minutes), be noted.

By law, a recorded vote was required on this item and the votes were recorded as follows:

For: Adkins, Armstrong, Barton, Boad, Browne, Chilvers, Collins, Cron, Davidson, Davison, K Dickson, R Dickson, Dray, B Gifford, Gorman, Hales, Kennedy, King, Kohler, Luckhurst, Margrave, Matecki, Melrose, Milton Payne, Phillips, Redford, Roberts, Russell, Sinnott, Syson, Williams, C Wightman, P Wightman, and Jones.

There were no votes against.

There were no abstentions.

(Councillor Matecki left the room at 8.30pm for the duration of the discussion regarding the second Conservative amendment as he was due to take a decision on these fees within his role as Warwickshire County Councillor. He re-entered the room at 8.47pm)

84. Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget 2025/26 and Housing Rents Setting Report

The report of the Cabinet of 6 February 2025 in respect of minute number 99 was proposed by Councillor Adkins, seconded by Councillor Chilvers and

Resolved that the recommendations contained in minute number 99 headed "Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budget 2025/26 (including Rent Setting)" as set out in the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 6 February 2025, be noted and approved.

85. Cabinet Report

It was proposed by Councillor Chilvers and seconded by Councillor King that the recommendations from the of 6 February 2025 Cabinet meeting in respect of Preparing for the introduction of the Procurement Act 2023 and the Q2 Budget Monitoring and updated MTFS, be approved.

Resolved that that the recommendations contained in minute number 100 headed "Preparing for the introduction of the Procurement Act 2023" and 101 headed "Q2 Budget Monitoring and updated MTFS" as set out in the report of the Cabinet meeting held on 6 February 2025, be approved.

86. Appointments to Committee

Councillors Matecki and Sinnott spoke on this item.

It was proposed by Councillor King, seconded by Councillor Davison and

Resolved that

- (1) Councillor Aizlewood be replaced by Councillor Jones on the Audit and Standards Committee;
- (2) Councillor Yellapragada be replaced by Councillor Jones on the Housing Scrutiny Committee;
- (3) Councillor Aizlewood be a substitute for Audit and Standards Committee;
- (4) Councillor Yellapragada be a substitute for Housing Scrutiny Committee; and
- (5) Councillor Sinnott be Governor to represent WDC on SWFT from 1 March 2025.

87. Public & Press

It was proposed by Councillor Davison and seconded by Councillor Melrose that the Council move into Confidential Session to enable a confidential update on the employment for the Strategic Director.

Resolved that under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 that the public and press be excluded from the meeting for the following item by reason of the likely disclosure of exempt information within the paragraphs of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006.

88. Employment Sub-Committee

The Council received a confidential update from the Leader regarding the Employment Sub-Committee for the appointment of the Strategic Director.

89. **Common Seal**

It was proposed by the Chairman, seconded by Councillor Davison, and

Resolved that the Common Seal of Warwick District Council be affixed to such documents as it may be required for implementing decisions of the Council arrived at this day.

(The meeting ended at 9.17pm)

CHAIRMAN
20 March 2025

Arts, Culture and Economy Portfolio Holder Statement – Cllr Billiald

Pantomime

I am pleased to report a record year for the pantomime at the Royal Space Centre. We took **£601,000 in sales**, beating the previous target (set last year) by **20%**. We sold 93% of all tickets over 48 performances (including 11 school performances), and it was especially pleasing to see the post New Year sales being strong with over 400 at the last show. Our partner charity (South Warwickshire Foundation Trust) also did very well and have extended its thanks to the Council for our support. Remember that it is not too early to buy tickets for this year's pantomime "Peter Pan". Tickets are already selling fast.

Pump Rooms

There has been a lot of recent activity in the Pump Rooms.

- Plans are progressing well to start work on the repair to the Pump Rooms roof and we hope that works will start imminently by our contractor Stepnell. It is our aim that the building will remain operational throughout the period of the works.
- We launched our latest free exhibition "**Unravelling History**" at the end of January and were delighted to welcome Artist – Daniel Liesmore to Leamington, who has created their 66th piece of work especially for the textile exhibition. "Unravelling History" runs until 11th May.
- Following the experiment with the pop-up shop in the temporary exhibition in the autumn and winter, we have purchased some display cases to enable us to create sales space for local artists in the foyer area.

Spark Lite

The **Spark Lite 2025** event took place on 14th February and proved to be a resounding success, offering significant value to the local creative community. With **250 delegates** in attendance from a wide range of creative industries, the event provided a crucial platform for networking, collaboration, and professional development.

Events team

Work is underway on an Events Strategy, which will include the review of current events, and I will be bringing this to Cabinet for consideration in due course in the Summer.

Town Hall

Phase 1a of the Town Hall refurbishment are close to completion, as tilers' plasterers and decorators are busy on site. The final completion date has been extended due to manufacturers delay to the lift carriage. As the building has remained live throughout the works, delay in completion will not significantly affect the use of the site. The Council Chamber is already back in operation and meetings are taking place again as planned. Partial completion and handover for other areas such as reception and toilet block are under discussion for release as 'partial completion' as soon as possible.

The Arts Team and Project Manager have begun planning to increase use of the building. By growing relationships with local community interest groups such as the Local History group, an emergent 'Leamington Green Hub Network', and Warwick University there are some exciting ideas and opportunities that may help us to increase public engagement.

Budget and Council Tax 2025/26
Calculation of Warwick District Council Element including Special Expenses

Minute 83
Appendix B

	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Warwick District Council	125.07	145.91	166.76	187.6	229.29	270.98	312.67	375.20
PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL								
Baddesley Clinton	148.35	173.07	197.80	222.52	271.97	321.42	370.87	445.04
Baginton	165.32	192.87	220.43	247.98	303.09	358.20	413.30	495.96
Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton	174.02	203.01	232.02	261.02	319.03	377.03	435.04	522.04
Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall	162.26	189.29	216.34	243.38	297.47	351.55	405.64	486.76
Bishops Tachbrook	163.90	191.22	218.54	245.85	300.48	355.12	409.75	491.70
Bubbenhall	167.51	195.42	223.35	251.26	307.10	362.93	418.77	502.52
Budbrooke	155.39	181.28	207.19	233.08	284.88	336.67	388.47	466.16
Burton Green	157.55	183.80	210.07	236.32	288.84	341.35	393.87	472.64
Bushwood	125.07	145.91	166.76	187.60	229.29	270.98	312.67	375.20
Cubbington	155.46	181.37	207.28	233.19	285.01	336.83	388.65	466.38
Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury	161.73	188.68	215.64	242.59	296.50	350.41	404.32	485.18
Hatton	135.91	158.56	181.21	203.86	249.16	294.47	339.77	407.72
Kenilworth	143.64	167.58	191.52	215.46	263.34	311.22	359.10	430.92
Lapworth	144.47	168.54	192.63	216.70	264.86	313.01	361.17	433.40
Royal Leamington Spa	143.85	167.82	191.80	215.77	263.72	311.67	359.62	431.54
Leek Wootton	181.36	211.59	241.82	272.04	332.49	392.95	453.40	544.08
Norton Lindsey	156.74	182.86	208.99	235.11	287.36	339.61	391.85	470.22
Old Milverton & Blackdown	151.80	177.10	202.40	227.70	278.30	328.90	379.50	455.40
Radford Semele	149.23	174.10	198.97	223.84	273.58	323.33	373.07	447.68
Rowington	150.90	176.05	201.20	226.35	276.65	326.95	377.25	452.70
Shrewley	140.27	163.64	187.03	210.40	257.16	303.91	350.67	420.80
Stoneleigh & Ashow	159.55	186.14	212.73	239.32	292.50	345.69	398.87	478.64
Warwick	159.42	185.98	212.56	239.12	292.26	345.40	398.54	478.24
Weston-under-Wetherley	173.78	202.73	231.70	260.66	318.59	376.51	434.44	521.32
Whitnash	188.03	219.36	250.71	282.04	344.72	407.39	470.07	564.08
Proportion of Band D	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9

**Budget and Council Tax 2025/26
District and Parish/Town Council by Band**

**Minute Number 83
Appendix C**

	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Warwick District Council	125.07	145.91	166.76	187.6	229.29	270.98	312.67	375.20
PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL								
Baddesley Clinton	23.28	27.16	31.04	34.92	42.68	50.44	58.20	69.84
Baginton	40.25	46.96	53.67	60.38	73.80	87.22	100.63	120.76
Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton	48.95	57.10	65.26	73.42	89.74	106.05	122.37	146.84
Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall	37.19	43.38	49.58	55.78	68.18	80.57	92.97	111.56
Bishops Tachbrook	38.83	45.31	51.78	58.25	71.19	84.14	97.08	116.50
Bubbenhall	42.44	49.51	56.59	63.66	77.81	91.95	106.10	127.32
Budbrooke	30.32	35.37	40.43	45.48	55.59	65.69	75.80	90.96
Burton Green	32.48	37.89	43.31	48.72	59.55	70.37	81.20	97.44
Bushwood								
Cubbington	30.39	35.46	40.52	45.59	55.72	65.85	75.98	91.18
Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury	36.66	42.77	48.88	54.99	67.21	79.43	91.65	109.98
Hatton	10.84	12.65	14.45	16.26	19.87	23.49	27.10	32.52
Kenilworth	18.57	21.67	24.76	27.86	34.05	40.24	46.43	55.72
Lapworth	19.40	22.63	25.87	29.10	35.57	42.03	48.50	58.20
Royal Leamington Spa	18.78	21.91	25.04	28.17	34.43	40.69	46.95	56.34
Leek Wootton	56.29	65.68	75.06	84.44	103.20	121.97	140.73	168.88
Norton Lindsey	31.67	36.95	42.23	47.51	58.07	68.63	79.18	95.02
Old Milverton & Blackdown	26.73	31.19	35.64	40.10	49.01	57.92	66.83	80.20
Radford Semele	24.16	28.19	32.21	36.24	44.29	52.35	60.40	72.48
Rowington	25.83	30.14	34.44	38.75	47.36	55.97	64.58	77.50
Shrewley	15.20	17.73	20.27	22.80	27.87	32.93	38.00	45.60
Stoneleigh & Ashow	34.48	40.23	45.97	51.72	63.21	74.71	86.20	103.44
Warwick	34.35	40.07	45.80	51.52	62.97	74.42	85.87	103.04
Weston-under-Wetherley	48.71	56.82	64.94	73.06	89.30	105.53	121.77	146.12
Whitnash	62.96	73.45	83.95	94.44	115.43	136.41	157.40	188.88
Proportion of Band D	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9

Council Tax Calculations 2025/26 Warwick District Council
Including Warwickshire County Council and Warwickshire Police and Crime Commissioner

Minute 83
Appendix D

PARISH/TOWN COUNCIL	BAND A	BAND B	BAND C	BAND D	BAND E	BAND F	BAND G	BAND H
	£	£	£	£	£	£	£	£
Baddesley Clinton	1,566.12	1,827.14	2,088.16	2,349.18	2,871.22	3,393.26	3,915.30	4,698.36
Baginton	1,583.09	1,846.94	2,110.79	2,374.64	2,902.34	3,430.04	3,957.73	4,749.28
Barford, Sherbourne & Wasperton	1,591.79	1,857.08	2,122.38	2,387.68	2,918.28	3,448.87	3,979.47	4,775.36
Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall	1,580.03	1,843.36	2,106.70	2,370.04	2,896.72	3,423.39	3,950.07	4,740.08
Bishops Tachbrook	1,581.67	1,845.29	2,108.90	2,372.51	2,899.73	3,426.96	3,954.18	4,745.02
Bubbenhall	1,585.28	1,849.49	2,113.71	2,377.92	2,906.35	3,434.77	3,963.20	4,755.84
Budbrooke	1,573.16	1,835.35	2,097.55	2,359.74	2,884.13	3,408.51	3,932.90	4,719.48
Burton Green	1,575.32	1,837.87	2,100.43	2,362.98	2,888.09	3,413.19	3,938.30	4,725.96
Bushwood	1,542.84	1,799.98	2,057.12	2,314.26	2,828.54	3,342.82	3,857.10	4,628.52
Cubbington	1,573.23	1,835.44	2,097.64	2,359.85	2,884.26	3,408.67	3,933.08	4,719.70
Eathorpe, Hunningham, Offchurch, Wappenbury	1,579.50	1,842.75	2,106.00	2,369.25	2,895.75	3,422.25	3,948.75	4,738.50
Hatton	1,553.68	1,812.63	2,071.57	2,330.52	2,848.41	3,366.31	3,884.20	4,661.04
Kenilworth	1,561.41	1,821.65	2,081.88	2,342.12	2,862.59	3,383.06	3,903.53	4,684.24
Lapworth	1,562.24	1,822.61	2,082.99	2,343.36	2,864.11	3,384.85	3,905.60	4,686.72
Royal Leamington Spa	1,561.62	1,821.89	2,082.16	2,342.43	2,862.97	3,383.51	3,904.05	4,684.86
Leek Wootton	1,599.13	1,865.66	2,132.18	2,398.70	2,931.74	3,464.79	3,997.83	4,797.40
Norton Lindsey	1,574.51	1,836.93	2,099.35	2,361.77	2,886.61	3,411.45	3,936.28	4,723.54
Old Milverton & Blackdown	1,569.57	1,831.17	2,092.76	2,354.36	2,877.55	3,400.74	3,923.93	4,708.72
Radford Semele	1,567.00	1,828.17	2,089.33	2,350.50	2,872.83	3,395.17	3,917.50	4,701.00
Rowington	1,568.67	1,830.12	2,091.56	2,353.01	2,875.90	3,398.79	3,921.68	4,706.02
Shrewley	1,558.04	1,817.71	2,077.39	2,337.06	2,856.41	3,375.75	3,895.10	4,674.12
Stoneleigh & Ashow	1,577.32	1,840.21	2,103.09	2,365.98	2,891.75	3,417.53	3,943.30	4,731.96
Warwick	1,577.19	1,840.05	2,102.92	2,365.78	2,891.51	3,417.24	3,942.97	4,731.56
Weston-under-Wetherley	1,591.55	1,856.80	2,122.06	2,387.32	2,917.84	3,448.35	3,978.87	4,774.64
Whitnash	1,605.80	1,873.43	2,141.07	2,408.70	2,943.97	3,479.23	4,014.50	4,817.40
Proportion of Band D	6/9	7/9	8/9	9/9	11/9	13/9	15/9	18/9