

# Cabinet

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 4 November 2021 in the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa at 6.00 pm.

**Present:** Councillors Day (Leader), Bartlett, Cooke, Falp, Grainger, Hales and Rhead.

**Also Present:** Councillors: Boad (Liberal Democrat Group Observer), Davison, (Green Group Observer), Cullinan (Labour Group Observer), Milton (Chair of Overview & Scrutiny Committee) and Nicholls (Chair of Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee and Labour Group Observer)

## 57. **Apologies for Absence**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Matecki.

## 58. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made.

## 59. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 23 September 2021 were taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

### **Part 1**

(Items upon which a decision by the Council was required)

## 60. **Fees and Charges 2022/23**

The Cabinet considered a report from Finance which detailed the proposals for discretionary Fees and Charges in respect of the 2022 calendar year. It also showed the latest Fees and Charges 2021/22 income budgets, initial 2022/23 budgets and the actual out-turn for 2020/21.

The Council was required to update its Fees and Charges in order that the impact of any changes could be fed into the setting of the budget for 2022/23. Discretionary Fees and Charges for the forthcoming calendar year had to be approved by Council.

In the current financial climate, and with the impact of COVID-19 still being felt throughout the Council and its services, it was important that the Council carefully monitored its income, eliminated deficits on service specific provisions where possible and minimised the forecast future General Fund revenue deficit.

In accordance with the Financial Strategy and Code of Financial Practice it was appropriate to consider certain other factors when deciding what the Council's Fees and Charges should be:

- The impact of the Fees and Charges levels on the Council's Business Plan.

- The level of prices the market could bear including comparisons with neighbouring and other local authorities.
- The level of prices needed to be sufficient to recover the cost of the service and the impact on Council Finances, where this was not the case.
- The impact of prices on level of usage.
- The impact on the Council's future financial projections.
- Ensuring that fees, in particular those relating to licensing, reflected the current legislation. The regulatory manager had to ensure that the fees charged should only reflect the amount of officer time and associated costs needed to administer them.
- Whether a service was subject to competition from the private sector, such as Building Control. This service had to ensure that charges set remained competitive within the market.
- Income generated from services including Building control, land charges and licensing was excluded from the Medium Term Financial Strategy and was managed through ring-fenced accounts, due to the legislation and criteria under which they operated.
- Management of the Council's Leisure Centres was by Everyone Active. The contract definition stated that 'The Contractor shall review the core products and prices in September of each year and submit any proposed changes to the Authority for approval (the "Fees and Charges Report")'. Appendix C outlined the core fees.

Managers were challenged on ensuring income maximisation and cost recovery where appropriate and provided commentary on the rationale behind some of the charges highlighted below.

Within the savings proposals agreed by Council in December 2020, a target of 15% was agreed in respect of additional income generated from discretionary fees and charges. Consequently, Budget Managers were tasked with seeking to achieve this increase, with the exception for some fees and charges, where legislation and other factors might make it unviable. These were set in accordance with such legislation and service knowledge provided by the managers. This was intended to make a contribution towards the savings that the Council needed to make in its overall Financial Strategy, with the timeline for making significant savings being significantly reduced due to the impact of COVID-19.

As a result of this, the fees and charges outlined in Appendix A to the report presented an overall forecast increase in income of £828,000, or 13.8%. Amounts totalling £398,800 were already factored into the MTFS (£153,800 inflation uplift and £245,000 as per service initiatives programme), with the additional income to be incorporated into the Medium Term Financial Strategy totalling £429,200. This excluded the additional income from certain ring-fenced charges (Building Control, Licensing and Land Charges).

Appendix A to the report also outlined an increase in income within the Housing Revenue Account of £117,000, or 26.6%. This would be factored into the HRA budgets and Business Plan.

The revenue effects of the proposed Fees and Charges were summarised in the following table (ring fenced accounts were removed):

<b>General Fund Services</b>	<b>Actual 2020/21 £ '000</b>	<b>Original Budget 2021/22 £ '000</b>	<b>Forecast 2021/22 £ '000</b>	<b>Forecast 2022/23 £ '000</b>	<b>Change Original 2021/22 - 2022/23 %</b>
ICT	35	30	20	45	50%
Culture	57	229	229	246	7.1%
Place & Economy Development	233	287	262	309	8%
Comm. Protection	50	72	71	82	14%
Housing	18	27	27	31	15.7%
Environment & Ops	33	23	26	28	18%
	3,350	5,342	5,488	6,098	14.1%
<b>Total General Fund Services</b>	<b>3,776</b>	<b>6,010</b>	<b>6,122</b>	<b>6,838</b>	<b>13.8%</b>
<b>Housing Revenue Account</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>440</b>	<b>537</b>	<b>557</b>	<b>26.6%</b>

A breakdown of the key drivers of the 2022/23 Fees and Charges was provided in Appendix B to the report.

Increased income from Fees and Charges would seek to ensure where possible the costs of the provision of respective services were covered. Any increases would reduce the ongoing savings target within the Financial Strategy.

The current forecasts for 2021/22 and 2022/23 would be reviewed within both the Base Budget Report (December) and Budget setting Report (February 2022). Managers would also continue to review their projections on a monthly basis.

The recommendations would enable the Council to continue to offer and deliver services while reducing and eliminating deficits on specific service provisions, supporting the overall financial position of the Council going forward.

In terms of alternative options, the Council could either leave fees and charges at 2021 levels or increase at a reduced level. This would increase the savings to be found over the next five years unless additional activity could be generated to offset this.

Another alternative option would be to increase at a level higher than proposed in the report. Excessive increases could deter usage where the take up is discretionary. Customers might choose to use the service less frequently or use an alternative supplier where one is available.

Both of the above were not realistic options given the current position of the Financial Strategy, and the level of savings required.

Public speaker, Mr Gill, addressed the meeting on this item. He raised concern about the proposed increase in fees for the use of community rooms such as those on Charles Gardner Road. This was because the Groups which use the rooms were often small in number and also less wealthy. In some instances, they were used by groups who were normally harder to engage with as a community and provided important community

facility and links. Therefore, to introduce these increases would have a disproportionate affect to other charges with the proposals.

The Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Hales acknowledged that 15% might be a large increase but pointed out that this decision would come to Council for debate. He then proposed the report as laid out.

**Recommended** to Council that

- (1) the Fees and Charges proposals set out in Appendix A to the report operate from 3 January 2022 unless stated otherwise, be agreed; and
- (2) provided the changes proposed by Everyone Active to the core products and prices from January 2022 are within the September RPI, the Heads of Culture and Finance, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Holders (Cllrs Bartlett and Hales), can accept the changes.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Hales)  
Forward Plan Reference 1,194

#### 61. **Adoption of revised Enforcement Policy and Business Charter**

The Cabinet considered a report from Health and Community Protection which sought the Council's adoption of the revised joint Warwick District and Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC) Enforcement Policy and Business Charter covering a range of the two Council's regulatory services.

The Enforcement Policy was reviewed and updated to reflect a joint policy across the two Councils, with the inclusions of additional regulators and changes to enforcement powers.

The Warwick District Council policy was last reviewed in 2018.

The main changes were:

- Inclusion of additional enforcement areas within the scope of the policy. Namely: parking.
- Inclusion of an SDC Development Service appendix to the enforcement policy.
- Updates to legislation and governing guidance for relevant enforcement activities.
- Updated wording to provide additional clarity and understanding.

The Business Charter was reviewed and updated to reflect a joint business charter across the two Councils and the support organisations which represented our businesses.

The Warwick District Council Charter was last reviewed in 2018 and was being introduced for Stratford-on-Avon District Council.

The main changes were:

- Updated wording to provide additional clarity and understanding.
- Inclusion of Stratford District Council contact details.

The Department for Business, Innovation & Skills introduced the Regulators' Code which came into force on 6 April 2014. Its aim was to provide a regulatory framework that supported compliance and growth while enabling resources to be focussed where they were most needed. It set out a framework for proportionate and accountable regulatory delivery and established principles of how local authorities should engage with businesses to avoid imposing unnecessary regulatory burdens.

Business Support Organisations were consulted regarding the policy and charter. These included:

- Landlords Groups;
- Chamber of Commerce; and
- Federation of Small Businesses

All comments received from the organisations were given due consideration and incorporated into the Policy and Charter as appropriate. Those comments which were better suited for inclusion in other relevant documents or upon the website were forwarded for consideration in those publication reviews.

As this was a statutory duty, the Council needed to adopt an effective enforcement policy.

Alternative content could have been considered. However, the proposed version reflected the Government's recommended approach. There was no requirement to produce a single Council-wide policy and Members could prefer service-specific policies rather than the associated appendix to the report, which outlined variations of specific powers which were not detailed within the corporate Enforcement Policy.

There was no requirement to have a Business Charter and therefore Councillors could have chosen not to adopt the Charter. However, the content of the Charter reflected the Better Business for All agenda which sought to ensure that businesses were supported by regulators and a level playing field was established.

WDC had a Business Charter in place since 2018 and received only positive feedback in relation to the balanced approach of the Charter and Enforcement Policy.

Councillor Falp stated that the Policy had worked well over the last few years and she proposed the report as laid out.

**Recommended** to Council that

- (1) the revised Enforcement Policy and its associated appendices as set out in Appendix 1 to the report be adopted; and
- (2) the Business Charter as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be adopted.

The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Falp)  
Forward Plan Reference 1,242

**62. Review of Warwick District Council Member's Allowances Scheme**

This item was withdrawn following the publication of the agenda to allow Members further time to reflect on the report.

**Part 2**

(Items upon which a decision by the Council was not required)

**63. Additional Grant to Community Village Shop, Norton Lindsay**

The Cabinet considered a report from the Chief Executive, that sought approval for further grant funding to the Community Village Shop, Norton Lindsay.

The Council had agreed a grant toward a Community Village Shop in Norton Lindsey forming part of a wider community hub including a pub, in 2017. At that time a legal agreement was sought which took a long time to resolve and which was followed by the pandemic which prevented the proposal from progressing. The local community wanted, and were ready, to implement the proposal but costs rose since the original quote and they were now in need of a further £36,794 in addition to the £38,500 (excl VAT) previously granted, totalling £75,294. It was proposed that the grant award be made subject to the usual pre-conditions about sign off associated with RUCIS grants. It was proposed that this be funded from the 2021 RUCIS Scheme budget.

It was proposed that the additional award be granted to enable the original concept of a community hub in Norton Lindsey to be completed by adding a community village shop. The additional award was small by way of comparison to other awards made so although there was a risk that the community shop would not work it was judged to be an acceptable risk.

The Cabinet could decide not to award the grant. Clearly given what was said by the applicants then the proposal would not be able to go ahead. The Cabinet could also withdraw the existing grant award and return the sum to its reserves. The proposal would not continue.

The Group observers supported the recommendations in the report, noting that a local shop would be beneficial from a planning and sustainability perspective as it removed the need for residents to drive to the nearest shop.

Councillor Falp highlighted the success of the shop in Barford, which brought in £40,000 a year for the village.

Councillor Hales proposed the report as laid out.

**Resolved that** an additional grant of £36,794 be awarded to Norton Lindsey Community Pub (NLCP), in addition to the previously awarded £38,500, to be funded as an exception from the existing 2021/22 RUCIS scheme budget subject to the usual conditions and processes for RUCIS grants also applying.

(The Portfolio Holders for this item were Councillors Falp and Hales)

**64. Amendments to the Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Plan**

The Cabinet considered a report from Development Services, which recommended two non-material amendments to the Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Plan (NP). The NP had been 'made' by Warwick District Council on 12 May 2021 following successful referendum. This proposed amendment followed a request from Royal Leamington Spa Town Council as the Qualifying Body with the intended purpose of updating/correcting the fact, and not materially impacting the application of the plan. The relevant statutory power which enabled minor amendments with the consent of the Qualifying Body is S61M(4) and (4A) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, applied to neighbourhood plans by virtue of S38c of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

The Lillington Conservation Area was a statutory designation. It was omitted from the Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Plan in error, and its insertion reflected the fact, but did not materially impact the application of the policies.

The proposed update to policy RLS17 would reflect changes to the Use Class Order and provided greater clarity in the application of the policy.

In terms of alternative options, a 'do nothing' option was considered. It was concluded however, that that would not assist in clarifying the points raised by the Qualifying Body.

Councillor Cooke noted that this was a technical paper that included important points missed out in the previous report. He then proposed the report as laid out.

**Resolved that:**

- (1) the addition of references and an appropriate map of the Lillington Conservation Area map to the Royal Leamington Spa Neighbourhood Plan be noted and agreed. Specifically:
  - Update paragraph 5.1.16 of the neighbourhood plan to reflect that there are three conservation areas within the neighbourhood area.
  - Insert a link at the end of paragraph 5.1.16 to the relevant Warwick District Council

webpage where detail of the Lillington Conservation Area is available.

- Update Figure 7 to include the Lillington Conservation Area in addition to the other areas shown; and

- (2) changes proposed to Policy RLS17 – Royal Leamington Spa Creative Quarter (as set out paragraph 1.8 of this report) be noted and agreed, to reflect the changes to the Use Class Order made in September 2020

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Cooke)

Forward Plan Reference 1,251

## 65. **Riverside House Development Brief**

The Cabinet considered a report from Development Services. The report informed the Cabinet; of the outcome of the public consultation on the draft Development Brief for the Riverside House site; the proposed updates in response; and, sought approval for the updated Development Brief to enable options/proposals to be brought forward for the development of the site.

On 8 July 2021, Cabinet approved the draft Development Brief for the Riverside House site for public consultation.

The Development Brief would be used to guide future development on the Riverside House site. It was updated following the Public Consultation and was now ready for approval. Officers would then focus on the next steps of how the site might be brought forward for development.

In terms of alternative options, the Council could choose not to approve the updated draft Development Brief and instead rely on policies in the Warwick District Local Plan and in other adopted Supplementary Planning Documents. Whilst this approach would still enable the site to come forward in compliance with planning policy, it would not allow the Council to articulate its wider ambitions for the site and maximise the community benefits that the redevelopment of this site would bring. This alternative option was therefore discounted.

The requirement for wider community benefits to be delivered other than that usually be required on a site owned by another party, it could impact on the eventual land receipt that the Council received for the site or could even require a financial contribution in order to achieve them. The Council could choose to vary the Brief and the reduce the requirements on the site with the intention of driving up its land value but the steer from Cabinet was to develop a brief that set out the Council and wider community aspirations. This option was therefore discounted.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report, but also recommended that in the brief, the Council's wish for the developer to find carbon savings in the build/construction process and to investigate the reuse of materials, be made clear.



The Green and Labour Group Observers stated that they had discussed this item at length. Councillor Davison remarked that one colleague described this report as “exemplary”, with Councillor Cullinan echoing these positive comments.

Councillor Day proposed, and Councillor Rhead seconded, that the recommendation from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, be approved.

Councillor Cooke proposed the report as laid out, along with the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee.

The Committee therefore

**Resolved** that:

- (1) the outcomes of the public consultation and the updated contents of the Development Brief for Riverside House be noted;
- (2) the updated Development Brief for Riverside House, attached at Appendix 1 to the report be agreed, subject to the inclusion of the aspiration of the Council that the developer to find carbon savings in the build/construction process and to investigate the reuse of materials, be made clear, and that this be used to guide future development on the site; and
- (3) a report for the options on how a development at Riverside House may be brought forward in the first quarter of 2022.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Cooke)  
Forward Plan Reference 1,250

**66. Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Scheme (RUCIS) Application**

This item was withdrawn following the publication of the agenda because the report related directly to the Whitnash Ward and following the publication of the Notice of Election the Council was in a pre-election period for this area.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Hales)  
Forward Plan Reference 1,193

**67. Climate Change Action Programme**

The Cabinet considered a report from the Programme Director for Climate Change which sought approval of the Climate Change Action Programme (CCAP) that had been developed to work towards the Climate Change Ambitions, which were shared with Stratford-on-Avon District Council and agreed by Cabinet in July 2021.

In terms of alternative options, the Cabinet could consider whether to include of any alternative commitments/actions in to the CCAP and/or the exclusion of any commitments/actions that are currently proposed.

The Cabinet could consider whether they would recommend any changes to the communications and community engagement strategy or the proposed funding strategy.

The Cabinet could consider whether the spending proposals set out at paragraph 1.6 of the report were appropriate or whether any changes should be made. In particular, the Cabinet could consider whether any of the other proposals set out in the CCAP should be included as alternatives.

The Overview and Scrutiny Committee welcomed the report and the request for additional resource. The Committee recommended the following:

- That a carbon descent plan is created for use as a target and tracker for use to measure progress on the programme.
- The Council should promote good news stories, e.g., the divestment of fossil fuel investments, so that residents are aware about the progress being made.
- A consolidated view of the different standards in Housing that are in use across the District should be produced to give more clarity on which standards would apply.

In response to questions from the Committee, the Portfolio Holder Councillor Rhead reassured Members that, despite the disparity in funds between Warwick District Council (WDC) and Stratford-on-Avon District Council (SDC), the money would definitely be spent within Warwick District. He added that although SDC and WDC had a unified approach to tackling climate change, the disparity reflected the different circumstances of each Council. He reiterated that the Councils had not yet merged so were therefore still separate entities, but that this did not undermine the common goal

Councillor Rhead proposed the report as laid out, along with the recommendations from the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. A note of thanks was made to the Programme Director of Climate Change and his team, the Climate Change Programme Advisory Board, and the People's Forum for their hard work on this report, which was an important first step in the evolution of the Climate Change Action Plan.

**Resolved that:**

- (1) the Climate Change Action Programme compromising the Action Plan, as set out Appendix 1 to the report; the Communications and Engagement Strategy, as set out at Appendix 3 to the report; and the Funding Strategy, as set out at Appendix 4 to the report, be agreed;
- (2) the Stratford District Council and Warwick District Council carbon baselines, as set out at Appendix 2 to the report, and Climate Change Action Programme Risk Register, as set out at Appendix 5 to the report, be noted;

- (3) the proposals for utilising the Climate Action Fund budget for 2022/23 and 2023/24 to deliver part of the CCAP, as set out in the table at paragraph 1.5 to the report, be agreed;
- (4) authority be delegated to the Programme Director for Climate Change (PDCC), in consultation with the Climate Change Portfolio Holder to spend from the Climate Action Fund in line with the proposals set out in paragraph 1.5 of the report, including variances of up to 10% from the amounts shown. In addition, authority be delegated to the PDCC, in consultation with the Climate Change Portfolio Holder to authorise sums up to £10,000 for spending that is outside the proposals within paragraph 1.5 to the report as long as the PDCC and Climate Change Portfolio Holder are satisfied that this will not compromise the delivery of the proposals at paragraph 1.5 to the report;
- (5) a range of funding sources are explored and utilised for the unfunded actions set out on the CCAP, including future Council budget setting processes;
- (6) the commitment to the ambition of becoming a net zero carbon Council by 2025 in the event that, for whatever reason, a merger of Stratford-on-Avon DC and Warwick DC does not materialise, be confirmed;
- (7) a carbon descent plan is created for use as a target and tracker for use to measure progress on the programme;
- (8) promotion of good news stories, e.g., the divestment of fossil fuel investments, so that residents are aware about the progress being made, will be reviewed to see how this can be improved; and
- (9) a consolidated view of the different standards in Housing that are in use across the District to give more clarity on which standards would apply, be produced.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Rhead)  
Forward Plan Reference 1,248

## 68. **Significant Business Risk Register**

The Cabinet considered a report from Finance which set out the latest version of the Council's Significant Business Risk Register for review by the Cabinet. It was drafted following review by the Council's Joint Management Team and the Leader of the Council.

The report set out the latest version of the Council's Significant Business Risk Register for review by the Cabinet. This would aid effective governance within the Council.

In terms of alternative options, the report was not based on 'project appraisal' so this section was not applicable.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report. Members noted the intent was that once there was a decision on the potential merger, the Significant Business Risk Register would include a specific risk on that topic. The Committee also noted the redundant wording in the Climate Change Risk relating to the Council Tax Referendum, which was no longer a possible trigger.

Councillor Hales proposed the report as laid out.

### **Resolved** that:

- (1) the Significant Business Risk Register, attached at Appendix 1 to the report, be noted; and
- (2) the emerging risks identified in section 1.4 of the report be noted, and that an additional risk be included in future relating to the proposed merger with Stratford-on-Avon District Council.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Day)

Forward Plan Reference 1,196

## 69. **Health and Well-being- South Warwickshire Place Arrangements**

The Cabinet considered a report from the Chief Executive which sought to outline and to gain support for the arrangements proposed to be put into operation for Health and Well Being for South Warwickshire Place.

The proposals for new arrangements for the South Warwickshire Place provided an excellent opportunity to deliver real improvements in health and well-being outcomes for local communities and therefore should be supported.

In terms of alternative options, the Cabinet could decide not to support the proposals in this report, but this would leave one or both Councils adrift from being involved in an important policy area locally. This would not be in the Councils' interests nor those of the local communities and so was discounted as an option.

In response to questions from Members, the Chief Executive noted that the primary focus of this report was on the South Warwickshire Place Arrangements, rather than on social care and the NHS. He emphasised that

around 80% of the impacts on health were found outside of the NHS. For example, the standards of housing were very important to the overall health of residents. He stated that Warwick District would be represented on the Warwickshire Health and Well-being Board, where we would have the ability to influence decisions.

Councillor Falp echoed the Chief Executive's comments, saying that even seemingly minor things such as maintaining public parks all indirectly helped to improve the health of residents through preventative measures- "the more we do, the less the NHS needs to do". She then proposed the report as laid out.

**Resolved that:**

- (1) the new arrangements for health and well-being in the Coventry and Warwickshire sub region, as set out at Appendix 1a and 1b to the report, be noted;
- (2) the proposed arrangements for health and well-being set out in this report for the South Warwickshire Place, as set out at Appendix 2 to the report, and in particular the terms of reference for the Place Partnership Board (PPB), asset out at Appendix 3 to the report; Place Delivery Group (PDG), as set out at Appendix 4 to the report; and, Population Health Delivery groups (PHDGs), as set out at Appendix 5 to the report, be agreed;
- (3) authority be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Homes, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Holder to agree any minor amendments to the terms of reference of the PPB, PDG and PHDGs; and
- (4) the contents of Appendix 6 to the report demonstrating the progress on outcomes in South Warwickshire Place, be noted.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Matecki)

**70. Urgent Item - Princes Drive Rail Bridge Refurbishment and Public Art Project**

The Cabinet considered an urgent report from the Chief Executive which sought approval for funding of up to £121,000 as a contribution to Network Rail towards the additional costs associated with refurbishing the highway span (DCL 140A) and pedestrian span (DCL 140) of the Network Rail owned rail bridge on Princes Drive, Royal Leamington Spa with unique, locally designed art patterns.

Network Rail would undertake repair and refurbishment of the Princes Drive rail bridge in Royal Leamington Spa in advance of the Commonwealth Games, however the scope of works was limited to operational and functional improvements.

It was recommended that funding was provided to Network Rail to cover the additional costs associated with refurbishing the rail bridge with unique, locally design art patterns covering the full span of the bridge.

The additional improvements to the rail bridge would provide a significant enhancement to the public realm and provide an uplift to the amenity of the local area in advance of the Commonwealth Games that would benefit visitors to the town and residents in the short-term and longer-term.

The proposed improvements aligned with investments being made in Royal Leamington Spa in preparation for the Commonwealth Games, the District Council's Creative Framework and strategic development projects being developed in Royal Leamington Spa.

Cabinet could choose not to provide funding to cover the cost of the additional works specified by Network Rail. If no additional funding was allocated to the project, the scope of works would be limited to repairing, cleaning, and painting (in a single colour) the highway span of the bridge and repairing the footpath span with no painting.

The Finance and Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report. Members were satisfied for the reasons for the late circulation of the report.

In response to questions from Members, the Chief Executive stated that he could not give an absolute guarantee of the longevity of the design. However, the artist had previously done similar work which lasted long-term. Councillor Day also noted that Network Rail agreed to cover the future maintenance costs. The Chief Executive also responded to concerns about whether the project would be completed in time for the Commonwealth Games 2022, saying that this tight time frame was the reason that this report had been submitted as urgent. A response to Network Rail was required by 6 November 2021.

In response to a question from Councillor Grainger, Councillor Day reassured Members that the Council had not lost sight of its other projects, including the plans to make changes to Warwick Railway Station. He stated that this project was mainly about building a good relationship with Network Rail, which would benefit the other plans further down the line.

Councillor Bartlett echoed Councillor Day's sentiment, and proposed the report as laid out.

**Resolved** that the allocation of up to £121,000 from the Service Transformation Fund be agreed to cover the additional costs arising from extending the scope of works to include unique, locally designed art patterns across the Network Rail owned rail bridge on Princes Drive, Royal Leamington Spa subject to necessary agreements and approvals.

(The Leader agreed to take this an urgent item because a decision needed to be made by 5 November 2021, and this agreement could not be signed without the

funding being agreed by Members first. Necessary permission for this item to come forward had been obtained from the Chief Executive, Monitoring Officer, Head of Finance, and Leader and both Scrutiny Committee Chairs.)

**71. Public and Press**

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

Minutes Numbers	Paragraph Numbers	Reason
72, 73, 74	3	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

The minutes of the following Items will be detailed within the confidential minutes of the Cabinet

**72. Lillington Health Hub / Valley Road Car Park**

The Cabinet considered a confidential report from Development Services.  
The recommendations in the report were approved.

**73. Confidential Appendix to Item 9 – Riverside House Development Brief**

The Cabinet considered a confidential report from Development Services.  
The recommendations in the report were approved.

**74. Minutes**

The Cabinet considered the confidential minutes of the meeting held on 23 September.

(The meeting ended at 7.12pm)

CHAIRMAN  
9 December 2021