

**Response from the meeting of the Executive on Overview and Scrutiny Committee Comments –
6 January 2011**

Item no.	Title	Requested by	Reason	Comment to Executive	Executive Response
10	Scoping of High Speed 2 Impacts on Warwick District	The Labour Group The Liberal Democrat Group	Given the importance of the issue for the District, members wished to discuss the Council's response. Because of the need to understand better the rationale behind the funding request given the considerable expertise available within the Alliance of Action Groups and the extensive work the Alliance of Action Groups has already carried out.	The Committee recommended to Executive that Warwick District Council should be asked to match fund any money put in by Kenilworth Town Council up to the value of £50,000. This was because Kenilworth as the town by far the most affected by High Speed 2 and therefore likely to want fund the help and support needed to protect their residents. The Committee had concerns that the excellent and professional work undertaken by the Alliance of Action Groups would be duplicated and that this would not give best value from public money.	Members felt it would be unfair to seek a contribution from one town when it was the whole district that would be affected by the scheme. Although it was recognised that Kenilworth would be largely influenced, members were mindful that the Council represented the District as a whole. Therefore, the Executive agreed to reject the Overview and Scrutiny Committee's recommendation.
11	Local Plan, Annual Monitoring Report & Review of Local Development	The Liberal Democrat Group	Because of the need to understand better the impact of the Localism Bill and its effect on the timing	The Committee agreed that Executive needed to consider the implications of the regulations that would come in	The Executive thanked the committee for their comments and the Portfolio Holder,

	Scheme		of any Local Plan.	through the Localism Bill for the development of the Local Plan. They felt it would be a benefit if a presentation was given to Members regarding any new information and regulations once the implications of the Bill become clearer.	Councillor Hammon supported their suggestion of a presentation at a later date.
13	Recommendations of the Grants Review Panel on Future Funding of the Voluntary and Community Sector	The Labour Group	The recommendations represent a significant change from previous arrangements, about which members had a few questions.	The Committee supported the report and felt it was a fairer way of allocating the money. They also commended the working party for producing the report and the Portfolio holder for all the work they put in. of the community and that smaller groups spread across an area may attract more people and then these could feed back to the main Forum.	The Executive thanked the committee for their comments.
15	Portfolio Holders Statement	The Liberal Democrat Group	Because of the potential importance of these statements, it is important that the Committee fully understands how the new system will operate.	The Committee welcomed the new statements which were an improvement to the information previously received but were concerned at the lack of consistency in the way information was displayed meaning it was not easy to understand. The	The Executive thanked the Overview and Scrutiny Committee for their comments.

				Committee noted that the revised arrangements meant that the Shadow Portfolio Holders needed to report back frequently to their groups.	
16	South West Warwick (Chase Meadow) Community Centre Development	<p>The Labour Group</p> <p>The Liberal Democrat group</p>	<p>Members had some questions about the proposed arrangements.</p> <p>Because of the considerable amount involved and ensuring it comes from a suitable budget.</p>	<p>The Committee had a concern regarding the money coming from the capital investment reserve and felt that this should come from this municipal year's unspent Rural Initiatives money.</p> <p>The Committee recommended that the Executive seeks clarification whether the £98,000 commuted sum for ongoing maintenance can be used as a contribution towards the capital cost of building the centre before the section 106 is finalised.</p>	<p>The Executive thanked the committee for their comments and in response to the Overview & Scrutiny Committees' suggestion regarding Rural Initiatives money, the Portfolio Holder, Councillor Caborn stated that this was an urban situation and therefore not applicable for a Rural Initiatives Grant. In addition, having taken advice from senior officers, it was stated that the developer was happy for the £98,000 commuted sum for ongoing maintenance to be used as a contribution towards the capital cost of building the centre before the section 106 was finalised.</p>