

**Response from the meetings of the Executive on F&A and O&S Committees'
Comments – 13 July 2020**

Item no.	3	Title	Review of Local Government Structure in Warwickshire	Requested by	Green and Lib Dem Groups
Reason considered	The reason for calling in this item is to get a better understanding of the impact of the proposals.				
Scrutiny Comment	<p>Both Committees supported the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>They highlighted the Council needed to keep focused on the overall strategic advantages of working with Stratford and from possible local government reorganisation. Therefore, it should be mindful, on this twin track approach, that the project on working with Stratford does not pre-determine the possible shape of local government reorganisation or preclude possible working with other boroughs and districts where that would be beneficial for residents and provide value for money.</p>				
Executive Response	<p>The recommendations in the report were approved, subject to the addition of the following two recommendations:</p> <p>2.4 That £35,000 is provided from the Service Transformation Reserve to fund the Council's contribution to the joint study and for additional support in respect of communications.</p> <p>2.5 That the Cabinet of the County Council is asked to reconsider its informal decision to commission a separate business case for a single unitary council and instead to participate in the joint study with the other Borough and District Councils to look at all options and to listen to the public's views.</p>				

Item no.	6	Title	Final Accounts 2019/20	Requested by	Labour Group
Reason considered	To understand the context and latest information from Richard and Mike concerning the current year and MTFS in the light of the Covid-19 crisis and announcements from government. Otherwise the final accounts, since they look back in time, give a partial view of the upcoming decisions to be taken by the Executive later this year. It will also give those members to ask any questions about that context.				
Scrutiny Comment	The Committees thanked the Head of Finance and his Team for the work on producing the draft financial statements for 2019/20 so promptly.				
Executive Response	The recommendations in the report were approved.				

Item no.	7	Title	Warwick District Leisure Development Programme – Kenilworth Facilities	Requested by	Lib Dem and Green groups
Reason considered	Various questions required answers.				
Scrutiny Comment	<p>The Committees noted the recommendations in the report and requested that additional work be undertaken on; vehicle and active transport access to the leisure centres; and on their carbon neutrality.</p> <p>(Councillors Redford and Grey requested that their support for the recommendations in the report be noted and Councillor Milton requested his objection to the recommendations in the report be noted.)</p>				
Executive Response	The recommendations in the report were approved.				

Item no.	9	Title	Community Stadium and Associated Developments	Requested by	Lib Dem Group
Reason considered	Given that the Kenilworth Leisure Centre project is displaying all the hallmarks of a distressed project (over budget, over time and changing scope), what additional governance should the Council put in place in order to ensure the success of the Community Stadium project, which is if anything, an even more complex project?				
Scrutiny Comment	The Committees supported the recommendations in the report.				
Executive Response	The recommendations in the report were approved, subject to the following amendment to recommendation 2.2, to read that “The Executive recommends to Council approval of a sum of up to £345,460”.				

**Response from the meetings of the Executive on F&A and O&S Committees’
Comments – 30 July 2020**

Item no.	2	Title	Requested by	All
Reason considered	Because of its importance to the District.			
Scrutiny Comment	<p>The Committees supported the recommendations in the report but wanted to draw a number of points to the attention of the Executive that needed to be carefully monitored.</p> <p>The Committees had concerns about the large remit of each PAB and how they would cope looking at such large areas of work. This was a specific concern that the listed areas were just projects and did not cover other work the PABs would look at, such as refinements to or creating new policies.</p> <p>The Committees shared concerns that with the change to scrutiny of service provision, the development of and quality of service provision might not be adequately picked up by the scrutiny of RAG and KPIs that had been developed and which would be adopted.</p> <p>They noted the dates in 2.2 and 2.7 for review should be combined so they were the same, and that the remit of the review should be produced in agreement with both Scrutiny Chairs.</p> <p>The Committees appreciated clarification that the presumption would be for briefings to remain in the evening, in line with the protocol for arranging meetings with Councillors, but accepted this may mean some needed to be held at the same time as other meetings.</p> <p>The Committees made a general comment on the resources for Civic & Committee Services, that this proposal should be work neutral and therefore this element needed to be closely monitored and fed back on as part of the 6, 12 and 18-month review.</p> <p>In addition, some Members of the Committee raised concerns about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the loss of Shadow Portfolio Holder meetings and highlighted this could lead to more work for officers through more frequent questions/contacts from Councillors; and • for providing an SRA for the role of Chairman of a PAB. 			
Executive Response	<p>In response, the Executive thanked all Councillors who had participated in the series of Governance Review meetings that had taken place earlier in the year. It was explained that the approach was an attempt to emulate the successful shared working that was done previously by the Climate Emergency Group and the way that had brought forward talent from across the Council, often in a non-political way to deliver an important programme.</p> <p>It was stated that the constitution of each PAB would begin with the selection of the Chair for each Board, and the Leader of the Council would meet with Group Leaders and bring back recommendations to the Leadership Coordinating Group from all Groups across the Council to Chair each Board. Selections would then be made in the hope of giving</p>			

opportunity for the individual to grow and offer expertise to each individual Board. All Members, excluding those on the Executive and Chairs of Committees, would be invited to nominate on a first come first served basis for which PAB they wished to join.

The Executive explained that the size of each PAB had been chosen to keep each Board manageable, maintain good dialogue and so that one PAB group was not disproportionately bigger than another in order to spread opportunity.

The Executive emphasised that they would be relying on the cooperative work done through the Leadership Coordinating Group, with Group Leaders and Members of the Executive in order to monitor the work done and make any necessary adjustments to the approach. The aim was to ensure Councillors could have a more meaningful and worthwhile experience, and grow skills and leadership qualities that would be valuable for themselves and for their community.

The recommendations in the report were approved, subject to the amendment to the following condition:

2.7 The Executive approves an independent assessment of these arrangements is undertaken in February 2022 and officers are asked to bring back an outline proposal for this, in consultation with the Chairs of Scrutiny, in December 2021 along with proposed funding arrangements.