

Pre-Scrutiny Questions and Answers – Cabinet Agenda 10 July

Report title: - Low Cost, Low Carbon Energy Programme

Report Author(s): Dave Barber – Programme Director for Climate Change & Councillor Williams – Portfolio Holder for Climate Change

Councillor Armstrong:

Thanks for the excellent strategy document, it's great to see this progressing. I have a couple of questions/suggestions in advance of the meeting:

1. Risks - one risk not mentioned would be a lack of engagement by council tenants, general residents, and businesses. By that I mean that with the best retrofitting offer in the world we will still need take up by homeowners/businesses, and a willingness to engage by tenants. Could you comment on this issue and any early mitigation strategy (e.g. effective comms).
2. Section 3.3 (3) - the secondary metric of pre-offset CO2 from new council-led housing developments. It seems the baseline to compare against is other local developments? Is there any reason not to use a national baseline, or wider regional? Using local developments may lead to low numbers at concurrent times, and is slightly odd in that we have influence as a council over local developments, even non Council-led ones.

Response (Councillor Williams):

I'm very pleased that you are supportive of the strategy. Dave Barber and his small team have worked hard to set this out clearly and in a manner which will allow us all, as Councillors, to transparently monitor progress. That said, I'm very keen that words turn into action, and quickly. Subject to comments from O&S and Cabinet approval, I am looking forward to moving swiftly into the action phase of this strategy. In this respect, there is much work going on behind the scenes and I look forward to presenting this to both the Programme Board and the Programme Advisory Group shortly.

On your questions, engagement by tenants, residents, and business is a very valid risk that will need to be addressed in the risk register associated with the relevant project(s), including Council housing decarbonisation and the project looking to upscale retrofit for homes/businesses across the district. The reason it is not explicitly mentioned in either the LCLC Energy Strategy or the Cabinet report is because the risks we mentioned are high-level, programme scale risks, looking across the breadth of the programme. Each individual project with the LCLC Energy Programme, such as those mentioned above or the decarbonisation of public buildings for example, will need an extensive risk register specific to that project, which will be developed as projects get underway, and the risk around engagement with residents/businesses so that they are keen to participate in retrofit is one at the forefront of our minds and will definitely be included for relevant projects. But it is helpful that you raise this point, which we will be mindful of.

As for 3.3 (3), for expediency the thinking is to make a comparison with other houses built in district as they will have to provide relevant data to comply with the DPD. The DPD sets a reasonable standard which we aim to exceed. This measure is one of five 'supplementary measures' which sit under the six primary indicators. We will, of course, pay attention to regional and national data as it becomes available.

Councillor Syson:

Will the PAB minutes be made available to Councillors? When PABs were originally formed the minutes were circulated to other Councillors to keep everyone in the loop.

I assume that at least one of the officers supporting the PAB will be from Finance - am I right? [Yes, an officer from Finance will be in attendance at the next Programme Board and will support as required going forward.](#)

Will the PAB or the Members Group be able to draw on the experience of other authorities who are taking the same path, or other experts? [Yes, of course, we will actively seek out and explore best practice and engage experts in support of our Low Cost, Low Carbon Energy Programme. This approach is already evident, for example through the work of the housing team in partnership with Parity Projects and use of their sector leading Portfolio tool in assessing the retrofit needs of housing](#)

From para 1.6 I see that the PAB has the responsibility of "ensuring the right resources and partnerships are in place" It would appear from a recent report to O&S that Housing are faced with many tasks including this one - will they be given the resources to cope? [Yes, within the funding available to us we will ensure resources are allocated appropriately to support both the delivery of the LCLE Strategy and the housing team's challenges. I should stress that resources are extremely tight,](#)

and that creative solutions that maximise resources will be sought, such as via grants and retrofits that tackle damp and mould. We will be very mindful of our statutory responsibilities at all times.

From experience can one predict roughly the % of our tenants who are likely to decline the improvement works? [Not at this stage. We recognise positively engaging tenants as a major piece of work.](#)

Appendix 1

E) Explore multiple, innovative approaches to make it easier for others in the district to reduce their energy needs.

Where work is to be done on a number of social housing properties in a road will any consideration be given to offering owner occupiers of similar properties in the road the same work at a suitable price? [This is a helpful suggestion which we will explore, although first thoughts are it could be a little tricky as currently the Council Housing Decarbonisation and Energy Efficiency Programme and private retrofit upscaling projects are being handled separately and will have separate contracts or methods for delivery. However, anything we can do to encourage uptake amongst residents of our district should be explored, so we will take this idea into careful consideration. Thank you.](#)

2.5 refers to choices to be made -"However, where choices need to be made between the different goals, a balance will be struck taking account of the potential "size of the prize" and our confidence in being able to deliver that "prize". Who or what committee will make those important choices? [It depends on the decision at hand. The LCLE PB will make decisions within their delegated responsibility, in consultation with the Members Group where appropriate. Otherwise, decisions will be referred to Cabinet and Full Council if and when required.](#)

3. Measuring progress

3.2 New housing developments led by the Council "Indicator to be developed potentially drawing on data from the newly adopted NZC DPD". Will the indicator be developed in house or by an external person/organisation? [Currently we intend to develop the indicator in-house but drawing on the support and guidance of external experts and best practice.](#)

3.4 Programme Dashboard - will this be made available to other Councillors? [Yes, of course.](#)

Does the Council have a show house, or part of one, anywhere to demonstrate to residents in general what can be done and the approximate costs and savings? [No, but thank you for this suggestion, which we will consider carefully. My first thoughts](#)

are that because retrofit is tailored to the specifics of a property, a show home might not be the best means of showcasing the benefits. However, we could consider, as alternatives, the use of case studies and/or creating opportunities for would-be retrofitters to talk with residents who have experience of implementing low carbon low energy solutions in their homes. Thank you again for the suggestion.

Response:

Graham Leach - Thank you for your email, the Cabinet are keen for all Councillors are kept informed and the point you raise below is due to be discussed at the Groups Leaders meeting on 15 July 2024.

Councillor Williams - Many thanks for your questions and suggestions, which are most welcome. In Dave's absence (he is on annual leave) please find responses (in blue above). I'd be very pleased to meet up with you to discuss any of these issues further

Councillor Yellapragada:

Residents have contacted me frequently expressing concerns about increased traffic and parking issues on Fusiliers Way, particularly in relation to the football stadium and other nearby developments. Currently, there is no parking on Fusilier's way which has two large parks on either side of the road. People on the side roads have complained quite a few times that cars are being parked on the side roads and residents are worried that if the new stadium and other developments are built there would be more people parking on the side roads.

What measures are being planned or implemented to address these concerns?

Response:

The Project Team are very conscious of the problem of people parking on side roads during football matches and when undertaking visits to the various sites for other purposes as well. People trying to avoid the formal parking arrangements are known as 'Park and Hide' rather than 'Park and Ride'.

The first step in avoiding this problem will be to ensure that sufficient parking spaces are provided on the site to cover the expected number of visitors to the site. Most visitors will attempt to park as closely as possible to their destination and so will always park on site if they can. We are already talking to transport consultants to make their predictions as to how many parking spaces will be required for the various uses. We do have one advantage which is that many of the different uses on the site will have different demand patterns. For example, the demand for parking for football crowds will be very predictable, and will tend to occur when other uses (such as the school run) are not so busy.

During football matches a number of parking facilities will be made available. As well as the parking around the stadium (which will be sufficient for normal crowds) a number of other options are being investigated. These include –

Coming by train to Warwick or Leamington Station and walking (favoured by many away fans at other grounds)

Walking and cycling using the green transport network

Parking on the Warwick Technology Park and walking up on the Myton Path.

Parking in Myton School

Parking at Myton Fields (when ground conditions permit)

Using the Park and Ride (when installed)

As you know, we are proposing to set up a Local Councillor Liaison Group for these related projects, and so we will keep Members involved and informed on this work as it progresses.

Report title: - Masterplan for developments next to Fusiliers Way

Report Author(s):

Councillor D Harrison:

Firstly, I support the approach of the presentation of these development proposals into discrete packages , and the emphasis on the prioritisation of the different elements, which is helpful given the scale and scope of the proposals. Highlighting the financing and timetabling of the different stages is also welcomed.

1.1.7 Recommendation 4:

I fully support the idea of a Local Community Liaison Group, however, could the membership of this Group also include representatives from local residents' groups , from which I know 1 or 2 residents would be interested in participating and it would improve local engagement and support. [Happy to discuss representation to include a local resident rep.](#)

Also , would it require input / representation from Warwick School and Myton School?, whilst recognising the Group needs to be a manageable size! [Can do](#)

1.1.8 The wording "...it will be necessary to ensure that it has sufficient resources." is superfluous and can be removed from the first sentence. [Noted.](#)

Appendix 2 Table of Masterplan Elements:

The Myton Path.

Financing states "Current Situation" – not very informative (apart from the cognisenti !) . Why is this term used under most of the elements – some details here would be useful. [This report is not aimed at the financial aspects hence the circumspect references. The idea being that as we bring the specific schemes forward the financial elements will be set out in more detail.](#)

Neighbourhood Centre.

Whilst it may be referred to elsewhere, could a reference be made to the provision of a "Community Space or Hub or Meeting Hall". This needs to be highlighted in the report as residents of Myton Green and The Priors have frequently reminded Councillors of the importance of such a facility. Also, I have noted there is no mention of one in Appendix 1 The Masterplan schematic. [We can review to check and update.](#)

Also, regarding the timetable for the Neighbourhood Centre, it mentions that a further report will come forward to Cabinet in September . Given the short lead-time, is this date still realistic and has initial work already started on this report?

[We are in active discussion with a group who could deliver a community space adjacent to the neighbourhood centre. This may still be possible to report in September though accept that negotiations may lead to deferment to November. Happy to discuss this separately in more detail.](#)

Response:

[From Chris Elliott – in blue above.](#)

Report title: - The Myton Path and the new athletics facility

Report Author(s):

Councillor D Harrison:

The ownership and responsibility for the Cycle Path will be with WDC rather than WCC. Are there any risks with this? are there any previous instances of this? as cycle paths have typically been a WCC responsibility and asset. [WCC have shown keenness to own this project so given that it is WDC that has driven this scheme to date I would suggest that risks overall are less. Construction costs are little different between the organisations it is more the ongoing maintenance where there would be a difference. WDC does of course have responsibilities for footpaths and cycleway in many of its parks so it's not wholly unusual. WDC could of course seek to transfer responsibility once facility is built.](#)

1.3.2 Refers to negotiations for the transfer of land from Myton School. Has any indication been given about the certainty of this given, as I understand it, agreement has to be consented by the Department of Education (since the proposed route is on playing fields) . Or again this may be detailed in one of the later reports? [Myton School agree in principle but an](#)

application to the DfE will be needed. This does represent a risk but as it creates a new access for the school there should be a small risk of refusal the greater risk is more likely to be the time to get the consent.

1.5 Recommendation 4 to read Recommendation 5 **Noted**

4.3 Financials – would it be possible to provide a breakdown of these costs split across the 2 projects (Myton Path and Athletics Track) as they are separate projects ? **Not in public. The two were joined together so we could be public about overall cost but not give away our financial position to potential contractors.**

11.1 Discusses public consultation and states it will be described in further reports but I would like to request that the initial public events with residents are organised as early as possible in the timetable to avoid decisions and details being agreed in the absence of residents' involvement and views. **Agree, September?**

Response:

From Chris Elliott – in blue above.