

# Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 26 September 2018 at the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa, at 6.00 pm.

**Present:** Councillors Mobbs (Leader), Coker, Grainger, Phillips, Rhead, Thompson and Whiting.

**Also present:** Councillors; Boad (Liberal Democrat Group Observer), Naimo (Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Committee); Quinney (Chair of Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee); and Wright (Conservative Observer).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Butler.

## 64. **Declarations of Interest**

There were no declarations of interest made in relation to the items on this agenda.

## 65. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meetings held on 25 July 2018 and 30 August 2018 were not available and would be submitted to a future meeting.

### **Part 2**

(Items upon which the approval of the Council was not required)

## 66. **Leisure Development Programme Phase Two – Kenilworth Facilities**

The Executive considered a report from Cultural Services regarding Phase two of the leisure development programme. Phase one of Leisure Development Programme was very nearly completed. The initial public reaction to the new-look Leisure Centres at Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park exceeded expectations and financial performance had also exceeded initial expectations.

It was agreed at the start of the Leisure Development Programme in 2015 that Kenilworth facilities would form a Phase 2 of the Leisure Development Programme, once the Local Plan gave more certainty as to the future development of the town. The Local Plan was in place and so it was appropriate to begin Phase 2 of the Leisure Development Programme.

The report sought the approval of the Executive for the various options to be presented to stakeholders and members of the public as part of a RIBA stage 1 consultation.

Once the initial consultation had been completed, a further report would be provided to the Executive in December 2018 in order to report back on the consultation, to detail the financial position on the project and to

identify the proposed design option to be taken forward into the RIBA stage 2 design process.

The public's reaction to the nearly completed facilities at Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park Leisure Centres had been very good, and income and attendance levels were exceeding expectations. Sport England (who provided grant funding for both schemes) had decided that both Centres represented examples of best practice. It was agreed in 2015 at the beginning of the Leisure Development Programme that the facilities in Kenilworth would form Phase 2 of the Programme once the Local Plan was adopted, as this would set the context for the work in Kenilworth. The Local Plan had been adopted, and a number of other planning documents were being prepared.

It was time to commence Phase 2 of the Leisure Development Programme. It was important that Kenilworth should have the same sort of aspirational, successful and modern facilities as the Council had provided at Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park. The community in Kenilworth would be encouraged by such excellent facilities to adopt an increasingly healthy lifestyle. The Council could renegotiate the concession fee from Everyone Active in light of the improved facilities and therefore would receive an improved concession fee as attendance and income would rise. The newly constructed or refurbished facilities would be up to modern design standards, making them more environmentally friendly and cheaper to run. The facilities would be prepared for use for another 30 years.

Castle Farm Recreation Centre and Abbey Fields Swimming Pool between them provided the majority of the general sports and leisure provision in Kenilworth. The Meadow Community Sports Centre at Kenilworth School was open to the public during non-school hours and provided a valuable resource for sport and leisure in the town. This provision, and its potential move with the school to a new location, would be factored into considerations of sport and leisure in the town and the north of the District. Local Sports Clubs were vitally important to sports provision in the town and they also formed an important part of the strategic planning for sport. The Castle Farm and Abbey Fields facilities were geographically close together and they offered complimentary and non-conflicting activities. It was therefore appropriate to consider the re-design of the two sites as one project, as any design decision made at either site would influence the demand and facility provision at the other.

The Kenilworth Wardens Community Sports Club was intending to sell its current site for development and move to land next to the Castle Farm Recreation Centre. Officers had been working closely with Wardens to consider how the two projects could be delivered in a co-ordinated way with minimum disruption to residents and users of the facilities. The proposed move was being factored into the design process for the Castle Farm site in terms of traffic, parking, site layout, impact on the Green Belt and so on.

Sport England's Facility Planning Model was the accepted modelling tool to enable Local Authorities to predict the likely demand for sports and leisure facilities in any given community. This model allowed for future growth in population. This model had been applied to Kenilworth and the north of the District and it had identified two relevant short-falls in provision for the population expected in the area by the end of the current Local Plan period in 2029. It stated that there would be a need for sports hall space equivalent to two badminton courts and also a need for additional water space which was the equivalent of 1.8 lanes of a 25 metre swimming pool. This could be provided in a number of ways. Both of these elements were included in the new Indoor Sports Strategy that was completed in the summer of 2018 and which would be brought to members together with the updated Playing Pitch Strategy in early 2019.

The project would follow the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) project stages model, in order to manage resources effectively and report back throughout. The model was shown as Appendix E to the report. The professional services and design team had been procured and Mace had been appointed as Project Managers with Darnton B3 as the architects. The proposed programme was shown as Appendix D to the report.

The design processes involved in RIBA stage 1 (Preparation and Brief) had been completed. This process included a matrix analysis of the various options available. This assessed such elements as the design quality, flexibility, customer requirements, operational effectiveness and value for money. This led to the rejection of a refurbishment option at Castle Farm Recreation Centre because the existing building had a number of severe design constraints. These included:

- The floor to ceiling heights were too low for installing studios and gyms, so these would need to be in new wings alongside the old and levels would not be the same.
- The structure of the pillars in the four court sports hall meant that it would not be possible to create one six court hall, as proposed. It would be necessary to retain the current four court sports hall, which would be smaller than current Sport England standards, and then to build a separate two-court sports hall alongside, which would restrict operational flexibility.
- The substantial oak tree to the north east of the current building would restrict the construction of a larger refurbished building on the same footprint, and would need to be incorporated into the design.
- Sticking to exactly the same location could reduce the flexibility to improve vehicle movements around the site.
- The fabric of the existing building was not up to contemporary insulation and environmental standards and this could not be corrected in a refurbishment.
- Anticipated costs of substantial refurbishment were less than 3 per cent lower than the anticipated cost of re-building, but the outcomes were substantially less appropriate.

The RIBA stage 1 design process rejected any large scale expansion at the Abbey Fields Swimming Pool site. This site was extremely sensitive as it was part of the Scheduled Ancient Monument of the Kenilworth Abbey

Fields. Any large scale expansion of the footprint of the existing building would run the considerable risk of damaging archaeological remains. Historic England would be consulted closely on this site, and would have a view as to the appropriateness of any proposed development.

A number of options had emerged from the stage 1 design process and matrix analysis. The resultant drawings were presented as Appendix A of the report. One of the purposes of the proposed public consultation exercise was to establish the public appetite for introducing each of these potential options.

At Castle Farm, there was one main proposal. This was to demolish the current Castle Farm Recreation Centre and replace it with a brand new 'dryside' facility. A dryside facility was a sports centre with sports hall, gym, studios and other facilities but no swimming pool. At Castle Farm this would be likely to constitute a sports hall large enough for six badminton courts (a 'six court hall'), a gym with perhaps 80 'stations' or items of fitness equipment and one or two studios for dance, fitness and other exercise. Other facilities could be added as identified by current demand and through the public consultation. The increase in the size of the sports hall from four to six badminton courts fulfilled the local requirement for additional courts, as identified by the Sport England Facility Planning Model.

The main choice to be made at Castle Farm was whether or not the Scouts organisation should be located on the same site or a different one. As the Recreation Centre would be rebuilt, the current facility for the Scouts would no longer be available. It would be possible to build a new, purpose-built building on the Castle Farm site for the Scouts and associated organisations. This would have the benefit of meaning that the Scouts and the Leisure Centre could function independently. Alternatively, the Scouts could be accommodated on a different site within the town. The Council was committed to ensuring that the Scouts retained a facility within the town.

At Abbey Fields, the proposal was to retain the existing 25 metre indoor swimming pool. However, there were two main options for the remainder of the site. Firstly, it would be possible to replace the current outdoor fun pool and paddling pool with an indoor teaching pool that could be used to teach swimming to children and adults all year round. This would increase the number of people who could learn to swim, and increase revenue. It would also provide formal water space equivalent to 1.8 lanes of a 25 metre pool. This additional amount of formal water space was needed to cope with additional demand created by an increased population, as identified by Sport England's Facility Planning Model.

Alternatively, it would be possible to retain the existing outdoor fun pool and paddling pool at the site. This would therefore continue to provide a venue for recreational swimming outdoors. Unfortunately, outdoor pools did not count towards the Sport England Facilities Planning Model as their use was largely seasonal in nature.

Whether an indoor teaching pool or an outdoor fun pool was selected, there were also opportunities to remodel and refurbish existing parts of the building to optimise the use of the building, to maximise income, to ensure that the building was up to modern standards and that it was ready for another 30 years of use.

It was proposed to consult stakeholders and the public on these potential options and to ask them what facilities they would like to see included. The process to be used for this stakeholder and public consultation was shown as Appendix B to the report. The purpose of this public consultation was to establish the views of stakeholders and the public on the options available. It would be made clear to all consultees that the results of the consultation would be considered carefully by officers and Members, and would be an integral part of the decision as to which options to select. However, it would be made equally clear that the results of the consultation would not be binding on the Council, who could decide not to select the option that received the most support during the consultation, if there were good reasons for selecting a different option.

The stakeholder and public consultation would not include a discussion of the costs of the various options. Work on the likely costs of each option was being conducted at the time, as part of the work of Mace Cost Consultancy, who were a part of the professional services team. Once the public had indicated their views of the options presented, these would be combined with the results of the current costing exercise in order to advise Members on the two options (one for each site) to take forward to the next stage of the design process. Clearly, this decision would need to take into account affordability. The professional services and design team would then draw up one final recommended scheme for each site in order to conclude RIBA stage 1 (Preparation and Brief). RIBA stage 1 drawings illustrated the general layout of the proposed building, but did not present any detail of the building. These proposals would be reported back to the Executive in December 2018 for approval. Once final approval of the RIBA stage 1 drawings had been given, the design team would begin RIBA stage 2 (Concept Design), which considered the designs in much more detail, including construction methods and details of the various spaces within the building.

In terms of alternative options, it would be possible to not undertake any improvements to the facilities at Castle Farm and Abbey Fields. If this decision was to be made, Kenilworth would not have the same sort of aspirational, successful and modern facilities as the Council had provided at Newbold Comyn and St Nicholas Park. The community in Kenilworth would not be encouraged by such excellent facilities to adopt an increasingly healthy lifestyle. Income from the contract with Everyone Active would not be increased because attendance and income would not be enhanced. The opportunity would be lost to bring the buildings up to modern design standards, making them more environmentally friendly and cheaper to run. The buildings would not be prepared for use for another 30 years.

Some design options for the sites were rejected as part of the design process in RIBA stage 1. These were discussed more fully in paragraphs 3.7 and 3.8 of the report.

The Executive welcomed members of the public and Ms Jane Green addressed the Executive on behalf of Friends of Kenilworth Outdoor Pool with regards to the outdoor swimming pool provision in Abbey Fields.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report.

It was proposed by Councillor Coker and seconded by Councillor Mobbs to approve the item as set out in the report.

The Executive, therefore,

**Resolved** that

- (1) the stakeholder and public consultation process be undertaken for the RIBA stage 1 consultation process for Phase 2 of the Leisure Development Programme, as shown in Appendix B of the report, including the design options to be presented as part of this consultation process, as shown in Appendix A of the report; and
- (2) the programme timetable for Phase 2 of the Leisure Development Programme, as shown as Appendix D of this report is noted.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Coker)  
Forward Plan reference 938

**Part 1**

(Items upon which a decision by Council was required)

**67. Fees and Charges 2019/20**

The Executive considered a report from Finance which detailed the proposals for Fees and Charges in respect of the 2019 calendar year. It also showed the latest Fees and Charges income 2018/19 budgets, initial 2019/20 and the actual out-turn for 2017/18.

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 2019/20. Discretionary Fees and Charges for the forthcoming calendar year had to be approved by Council.

The report highlighted the fact that, given the financial climate, it was important that the Council carefully monitored its income, eliminated

deficits on service specific provisions where possible and therefore minimised the forecast future General Fund revenue deficit.

Some additional fees had been created in order to generate additional income for the service areas concerned and others in response to new legislation. These were highlighted in Appendix A to the report. Other charges had been deleted due to legislation changes or changes in the way the service was provided. A 2% increase in Fees and Charges income had been allowed for in the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS). The Regulatory Manager had to ensure that licensing fees reflected the current legislation. The fees charged should only reflect the amount of officer time and associated costs needed to administer them.

Bereavement – new cremation fees were proposed to meet potential new or differing customer requirements.

Land Charges and Building Control fees were ring fenced accounts: Income levels for Land Charges were still relatively high and it was recommended that fees should not increase to avoid creating a large surplus on the Land Charges Control Account, which should break even. Building Control was subject to competition from the private sector and had to set charges that were competitive with this market.

Management of the Council's Leisure Centres was by Everyone Active. The contract definition stated that 'The Contractor shall review the (following) core products and prices in September of each year and submit any proposed changes to the Authority for approval (the "Fees and Charges Report")'. Everyone Active were seeking an increase in line with the Retail Prices Index. The current prices were shown in Appendix B to the report. The contract stipulated that they would be increased by up to September 2018's RPI figure in 2019, which was likely to be around 3%.

New parking locations were being opened for the proposed closure of Covent Garden car park. Fees for those new locations were shown in Appendix A to the report. Parking had also introduced a new fee for Bath Place to reduce the number of spaces being taken by commuters, who parked there all day.

The various alternative options affecting individual charges were outlined in the main body of the report, sections 8 to 16.

Fees and Charges for 2019/20 remained static i.e. remained at the same level as for 2018/19, which would increase the savings to be found over the next five years unless additional activity could be generated to offset this.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee thanked the officers for the detailed response to the questions submitted in advance. Two addendums were circulated in order to answer the questions. The Committee sought clarification on a number of smaller points which the Head of Finance looked at and provided detail for the Executive. The questions and answers were included in the two addendums.

In addition, the Committee asked the Executive to consider if the concessionary prices for people on benefits, both Core Everyone Active prices and in other areas such as Recreational & Sport (Pages A13/14), Environmental Health (Page A35) and Waste collection (Page A55) could be held at the current prices in 2019/20 with standard prices being increased further if necessary to cover the reduced price for concessions. This view was taken based on the freezing of most Benefits nationally in cash terms from 2016 to 2020.

An addendum was circulated at the meeting which proposed the following changes to the Fees & Charges 2019/20:

The commuter tariff (proposed for Bath Place £8) would also apply to Archery Road, from January 2019, and needed to be added to the list of charges for that car park. The Archery Road Peak commuter tariff would operate Monday – Friday. All day tickets purchased between 6am-8am would be £8 with the normal tariffs applied outside of these times.

The charge for Circuses and Fairs for 2019 should read:

<u>CIRCUSES AND FAIRS - up to seven days</u>	£2,000
(Exempt from V.A.T.)	
Each additional day or part thereof	
(subject to negotiation and agreement by Heads of Finance and Development)	£340

The Leader agreed to consider the potential to freeze some fees for those on benefits and bring forward a paper or decision at Council if possible.

The Executive therefore,

**Recommended** that

- (1) Council approves the Fees and Charges proposals set out in Appendix A, to operate from 2 January 2019 unless stated otherwise. The recommendations in the report were approved subject to the inclusion of:
  - The commuter tariff (proposed for Bath Place £8) will also apply to Archery Road, from January 2019, and needs to be added to the list of charges for that car park. The Archery Road Peak commuter tariff will operate Monday – Friday. All day tickets purchased between 6am-8am will be £8 with the normal tariffs apply outside of these times.
  - The charge for Circuses and Fairs for 2019 should read:



CIRCUSES AND FAIRS - up to seven days  
£2,000 (Exempt from V.A.T.)

- Each additional day or part thereof  
(subject to negotiation and agreement by  
Heads of Finance and Development) £340
- Page A37 licence fee proposed for dog  
breeding kennels with over 11 bitches be  
£150

- (2) Council approves Everyone Active's request to  
increase 'Core' fees and charges by  
September 2018's RPI in the 2019 calendar  
year.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillors Whiting)  
Forward Plan Reference 926

## **Part 2**

(Items upon which the approval of the Council is not required)

### **68. Events Strategy**

The Executive considered a report from Development Services which provided an update on the action plan arising from the Events Review agreed by Executive in February 2018. Specifically, it addressed the first point in the action plan which was to *"develop an events strategy to clearly establish the Council's approach to directly supporting and funding events"*.

Following the completion of the Events Review, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee had asked for an opportunity to review progress on delivering the key elements of the Action Plan. A copy of the Action Plan together with a review was attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

As reflected in Appendix 1, one of the key actions agreed in the Events Review was to "Develop an events strategy to clearly establish the Council's approach to directly supporting and funding events".

It should be noted that as part of the normal operational role in managing and supporting events, the Council was already providing support to all events. As well as officer support and advice, this included the following:

- Use of parks/open spaces/streets;
- Waste provisions;
- Taxi rank relocations;
- Toilet cleaning;
- Street cleansing;
- Extra grass cutting.

The issue raised by the Events Review was that, from time to time, the Council was asked to provide additional financial assistance to (usually major) events. Recent examples included the Women's and Men's Cycling Tours of Britain. Requests for additional funding support for these events would continue to be brought before Members on an individual basis in the normal way. The Review established that it would be desirable if a set of criteria could be agreed to allow officers to assess requests when these were received. The Review was clear that there should be a priority towards supporting events of national or regional significance, and ensuring that any criteria were fair and consistent.

To enable Members to consider a robust and fair set of criteria, it was important to understand the economic impact of events. Some events carried out their own Economic Impact Assessments (EIAs), however this was not always done in a consistent manner and most events did no EIA at all. Therefore, officers would wish to commission independent consultants to undertake a series of EIAs for the major events that were taking place in the District. This would focus on those events that were likely to attract at least 5,000 attendees and would consider matters such as how many people attended the event, their dwell time and their overall approximate spend in the area. Once completed, these EIAs would allow the Council to have a better understanding of the impact of these events on local communities, towns and the wider district.

In order for these to be independent and not to place a (possibly unreasonable) burden on event organisers, it was recommended that these were funded by the Council. It was proposed that £30,000 be made available for this and that these EIAs be carried out over the next 12 months. In terms of which events were subjected to EIAs, this would be decided by the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Business Portfolio Holder and would, as stated above, focus on those events likely to attract at least 5,000 attendees.

It was further recommended that, once these EIAs had been completed, a further report be brought to Executive to propose a list of criteria and a process by which requests for funding bids could be considered. This would be done before the end of 2019 and would enable any budgetary implications for this to be considered as part of the budget setting process for 2020/2021.

It was further recognised that the District may receive a request to host an event similar to the Tour of Britain or Women's Tour, over the next year before the EIAs had been completed. Where this happened, officers would bring reports to Members in the normal way as had been the case in the past.

It should also be noted that some events lay outside the scope of this report. This was because separate budgetary provision already existed for these events. These were the following:

- Smith Street Party: Smith Street offered a unique business opportunity and shopping experience in Warwick. However,

recognising its challenging geographical location meant that it required specific business support with promoting and marketing. In recent years this support had taken the form of funding and organising responsibility for the Smith Street Party. This support would continue, recognising that this could change, if the traders wished to promote the street differently.

- Bands in the Park.
- Christmas lights.

An alternative option would be to financially support all events that took place in the District. This was not recommended as it would not be in accordance with the agreed outcome of the Events Review.

Another alternative would be to not financially support any events. This was not recommended because the Events Review had highlighted that a process to support events is required.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report but made the following comments:

- A standardised EIA, the format of which had been defined by the Council, should be completed for all events.
- Event organisers should be encouraged to ensure the use of recyclable materials for all disposable items, e.g. plastics.
- Parish and Town Councils should be sent a copy of the events manual once it was published.
- All events organisers should receive a copy of the events manual.

The Executive agreed that these comments would be sent round to officers, for them to consider as part of this process.

It was proposed by Councillor Mobbs, seconded by Councillor Grainger, that the recommendations in the report were approved.

The Executive, therefore,

**Resolved** that

- (1) the updates to the Events Review action plan in Appendix 1 to the report, be noted;
- (2) a budget of £30,000 is allocated to provide an initial round of Economic Impact Assessments (EIAs) on major events in the District and that any decision on which specific events are subject to EIAs is delegated to the Head of Development Services in consultation with the Business Portfolio Holder;
- (3) a further report be brought before the end of 2019 once the EIAs have been completed to

agree a set of criteria and a process for considering funding bids for events; and

- (4) if an opportunity to host a major event comes before the Council before these EIAs have been completed, a report may be brought to the Council if a request for funding is made.

(The Portfolio Holders for this item were Councillors Butler)  
Forward Plan Reference 916

#### **69. Continual Maintenance of Pay on Foot Equipment**

The Executive considered a report from Neighbourhood Services that sought approval for a provisional six month extension to the existing Pay on Foot maintenance contract at Covent Garden and St Peter's Multi Storey Car Parks (MSCP's).

The existing contract for the maintenance of the Pay on Foot equipment in the Covent Garden and St. Peter's multi-storey car parks was due to expire at the end of September 2018.

An extension to the existing maintenance contract had been previously granted by the Procurement team. An initial six months extension was proposed to the existing contract to assure the operational functionality of the Pay on Foot systems in the short-term pending a decision on the proposed redevelopment of Covent Garden MSCP and the potential implications of this decision on the future management of both the Covent Garden MSCP and St Peter's MSCP.

The report summarised the reasons for the recommendation and outlined the budget implications of the decision.

This proposal did not affect the planned upgrade of the Pay and Display machines across the remaining off-street car parks in Warwick District with a phased installation planned to be completed by the end of the financial year.

The existing contract for the maintenance of the Pay on Foot equipment in Covent Garden MSCP and St Peter's MSCP expired at the end of September 2018.

Consideration was being given to proposals to close the Covent Garden MSCP for redevelopment in 2019 with a decision on this proposal anticipated to be made by the end of 2018. A plan to manage the displacement of users from Covent Garden MSCP was being developed subject to this decision.

The current version of the displacement plan proposed that the Pay on Foot equipment at Covent Garden MSCP and St. Peter's MSCP would be taken out of operation upon the closure of Covent Garden MSCP. A Pay

and Display system would replace the equipment in St Peter's car park on a temporary basis.

A short-term extension of the existing maintenance contract for the Pay on Foot equipment was needed to ensure the Pay on Foot equipment remained operationally functional until a decision had been taken with regards to the redevelopment of Covent Garden MSCP.

Existing suppliers, Parkare, had agreed in principle to extend the existing contract.

If a decision was taken not to redevelop the Covent Garden MSCP as per the current proposals, a longer-term extension of the maintenance contract would be required. In this event, a review of the Pay of Foot equipment and maintenance of the equipment would be undertaken in conjunction with Procurement.

As an alternative option, the contract could be allowed to expire and repairs and maintenance could be paid on an ad-hoc basis. As the potential costs of work and response times were unknown in this scenario, this option was discarded.

Another option was that a competitive tender for maintenance of the equipment could be put out to the wider market. However, the officers' experience was that suppliers tended only to maintain their own equipment so the existing supplier was likely to be either the only and/or best priced respondent in this scenario. As such, a competitive tender was considered unnecessary if a short-term exemption could be applied.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendation in the report.

The Executive, therefore,

**Resolved** that a six month extension to the existing Pay on Foot maintenance contract at Covent Garden MSCP and St. Peter's MSCP, is approved.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Grainger)  
Forward Plan reference 950

#### 70. **Update – Bereavement Services Enhanced Service Provision**

The Executive considered a report from Bereavement Services which set out the proposal to increase the staffing budget of the Bereavement Services Team, which formed part of the Neighbourhood Services Portfolio.

Changes to the staffing structure of Bereavement Services were made in April 2017 to support a six day per week service offering. A significant increase in the number of cremations over the last twelve months (1,997 cremations in 2017/18 compared to an average of 1,836) had prompted a review of the team resources to ensure an excellent standard of service provision could be maintained, and further increases in demand accommodated. The outcomes of that review were approved by Employment Committee on 12 September 2018 and the report proposed the necessary budget to implement the increased staffing resources.

Although a temporary post was agreed by CMT in March 2018 to backfill a long-term sickness absence, the review had confirmed that additional resources were required to provide a stable structure that improved service resilience as any staff absences within the small but specialist crematorium team had a severe impact on the ability to deliver the service.

There was a legal requirement for the Council to ensure that the staff operating its' cremators were suitably qualified. Securing agency staff with the required qualification, to cover absences had proved problematic and costly (c£450.00 + travel per day), hence it was more cost effective to add to the staffing establishment.

The lodge house in Leamington Cemetery had been vacant since the last incumbent left; the caretaker post was subsequently deleted in the 2017 restructure and duties transferred to the ranger service. The Rangers were going to be under increased pressure dealing with car park displacement activities and removing the necessity to carry out caretaking activities in Leamington Cemetery would free up resource in the ranger service.

The rental income on the lodge house had been lost, and there were budget liabilities in relation to the property being empty, for example, council tax, and costs to maintain security, which outstripped the salary saving.

An alternative option was to continue with the existing levels of staffing resource. However, this was incompatible with the existing service offering and had therefore been discounted.

Another option was to reduce the service offering to remove the need for additional members of staff. This had also been discounted because the opportunities for additional income generation would be lost, customers would have less flexibility, waiting times would be increased and the service would be less competitive.

It was proposed by Councillor Grainger, seconded by Councillor Phillips, to approve the recommendations proposed in the report.

The Executive, therefore,

**Resolved** that

- (1) the Bereavement Services Staffing budget is increased by £36,700 per annum, in order to fund the establishment changes shown below:
  - Change in hours for Bereavement Officer (post no WD00662) from 0.8 FTE to 1FTE
  - Creation of an additional FTE Bereavement Officer post;
- (2) the reinstatement of the cemeteries caretaker position, is agreed. This position is self-financing as the rental income is greater than the salary; and
- (3) the increased staffing budget be funded from £32,500 increased income and £4,200 coming from the Medium Term Financial Strategy.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Grainger)  
Forward Plan reference 957

**71. Contract for management of shared accommodation provision for former rough sleepers**

The Executive considered a report from Housing seeking approval for a procurement exemption for a contract to provide supported housing funded by the Rough Sleepers Initiative.

The report set out proposed arrangements for the provision of specialist housing support for the accommodation project for former rough sleepers, previously agreed by Executive and funded by the grant awarded by the Ministry for Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG), that would allow it to be undertaken with certainty and efficiency.

The proposed approach required an exemption from the Code of Procurement Practice due to the delay in the MHCLG announcement of the 2019/20 element of the funding for this project.

On 31 May 2018, the Executive approved submission of a bid for funding from the MHCLG Rough Sleepers' Initiative to deliver a number of projects, including operating a shared supported housing initiative. For this project, the Council would provide properties to a voluntary sector partner for the provision of shared housing, with support for people transitioning from the streets.

Members would be aware that the bid for 2018/19 was successful and an announcement was being awaited over the bid for funding for 2019/20. The full amount of funding had been received for 2018/19, including £21,583 for the shared accommodation project for part of the year.

Members would also recall that should the bid for 2019/20 not be successful, the Executive had agreed to meet the costs of running the project for a further twelve months. In either event, the cost of the provision of the necessary specialist support, if delivered by Coventry Cyrenians, would take the full cost of the project to more than £50,000.

In order to proceed swiftly and meet the MHCLG objectives for the project, the Head of Finance agreed the selection of Coventry Cyrenians as the specialist providers to run the project for 2018/19 without formal procurement action, in accordance with the provisions of the Code of Procurement Practice. Work was nearing completion to finalise the terms of this appointment and appropriate preparations were being made to ensure the service was up and running imminently.

However, as the cost of running the project for 2019/20 through the same provider was in excess of £50, 000, the Executive agreement for a Code of Procurement exemption for the proposed extension would be required.

It clearly was extremely important that the same provider ran the project for its entirety, not least so that the clients of the project, all of whom would be vulnerable, would have stability and continuity as they made their journey towards accommodation in mainstream housing. It was also important to allow the provider to plan ahead and for the Council to know that a provider was in place without the disruption that would be created by a change, less than half way the project.

The Procurement team had confirmed that the value of the contract meant it was classified as a Light touch (CPV 75200000-8) contract. This meant that European regulations were unlikely to apply if the contract were to run beyond the initial proposed term.

Under the Light Touch Regime, the Public Contract Regulations 2015 had very few explicit requirements and allowed contracting authorities to determine their own appointment procedures as long as the transparency and equal treatment principles and mandatory exclusions apply. The Procurement team had, therefore, agreed that the appointment of Coventry Cyrenians met these requirements.

As an alternative, the option of tendering for the service had been considered but had been rejected because of the disruption that this would cause to the service and the customers of the service.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendation in the report.

It was proposed by Councillor Phillips and seconded by Councillor Coker that the recommendation in the report was approved.

The Executive, therefore,

**Resolved** that an exemption from the Code of Procurement Practice, is approved to allow Coventry



Cyrenians, already selected as the Council's partner for the provision of specialist housing support for the accommodation project for rough sleepers, to continue to provide services during 2019/20.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Phillips)  
Forward Plan reference 954

72. **Rural and Urban Capital Improvement Scheme (RUCIS)  
Application**

The Executive considered a report from Finance regarding applications for Rural and Urban Initiative Grants.

The report provided details of a Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Scheme grant application by Lapworth Parish Council to update / replace playground equipment that had reached the end of its life span and to reposition the entrance gates to create easier access for wheelchairs and pushchairs.

The Council operated a scheme to award Capital Improvement Grants to organisations in rural and urban areas. The grants recommended were in accordance with the Council's agreed scheme and would provide funding to help the projects progress.

The project contributed to the Council's Fit for the Future Strategy - refurbishing the playground would increase opportunities for children within the community to enjoy and participate in physical activity which could, potentially, reduce anti-social behaviour and obesity. The project would provide new, modern, multi-purpose play equipment that would cater for a wider age-range and repositioning the entrance gates would also enable easier access for wheelchairs and pushchairs.

A well-used playground helped to engage and strengthen the community as it would bring together a wide range of people, such as young people, parents and grandparents. Without this playground, facilities within the village would be very limited. In addition, the bus service for residents without personal transport was rather infrequent. The existing play equipment was visually jaded and nearing the end of its lifespan. In order to avoid health and safety issues, there were increasing annual maintenance requirements incurring costs. For example, the ROSPA report identified the basket swings as being a 'medium' risk due to the proximity of the uprights to the swing of the basket. The project would resolve this issue.

The Council had only a specific capital budget to provide grants of this nature and therefore there were no alternative sources of funding if the Council was to provide funding for Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Schemes.

The Executive could choose not to approve the grant funding, or to vary the amount awarded.

It was proposed by Councillor Whiting, seconded by Councillor Thompson that the recommendation in the report was approved.

The Executive, therefore,

**Resolved** that a Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Grant from the rural cost centre budget for Lapworth Parish Council of 36% of the total project costs, be approved, to update / replace playground equipment and reposition the entrance gates, as detailed within paragraphs 1.1, 3.2 and 8 of the report, up to a maximum of £21,741 excluding V.A.T., subject to receipt of the following:

- written confirmation from Tesco Bags of Help to approve a capital grant of £4,000 (if a reduced amount is offered, the Parish Council will increase their contribution to the project from their cash reserves to cover the budget shortfall; these funds have been evidenced through their annual accounts and the provision of a recent bank statement);
- Providing proof of ownership of the land, as supported by Appendix 1 to the report.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Whiting)

### 73. **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 item 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.	Para Nos.	Reason
74	3	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

The item below was considered in confidential session and the full details of this will be included in the confidential minutes of this meeting.

**74. Europa Way – Spine Road**

The Executive considered a report from the Chief Executive that sought approval of a the proposal of the Council providing a loan to accelerate the construction of the spine road (public infrastructure) through the Europa Way site by providing funding; and to make the necessary delegations to proceed.

An addendum was circulated at the meeting, that provided responses to questions asked by Councillors ahead of Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee considering this matter.

The recommendations in the report were approved subject to an amendment to 2.1 to Council so that it confirms the maximum value and minimum interest rate. A minor amendment to 2.2 to explore further options, the full details of which will be available in a confidential summary of decision.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Phillips)

**75. Minutes**

The confidential minutes of the meetings held on 25 July 2018 and 30 August 2018 were not available and would be submitted to a future meeting.

(The meeting ended at 6.45pm)