

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Thursday 3 October 2019 at the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa, at 6.00pm.

Present: Councillors Cooke, Day, Falp, Hales and Matecki.

Also present: Councillors: Nicholls (Chairman of the Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee); Davison (Chair of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee); Boad (Liberal Democrat Group Observer); and Cullinan (Labour Group Observer).

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Grainger, Norris and Rhead.

48. **Declarations of Interest**

Minute Number 58 - Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Scheme (RUCIS) Application

Councillor Falp declared a personal interest because the application site was within her Ward and did not vote on this item.

49. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21 August 2019 were taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Part 1

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

50. **Fees and Charges 2020/21**

The Executive considered a report from Finance detailing the proposals for discretionary Fees and Charges in respect of the 2020 calendar year. It also showed the latest Fees and Charges 2019/20 income budgets, initial 2020/21 and the actual out-turn for 2018/19.

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 2020/21. Discretionary Fees and Charges for the forthcoming calendar year had to be approved by Council.

In the current 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 to generate additional income for the service areas concerned and others in response to new legislation. (Animal Welfare – boarding, pet shops, hiring of horses), Bowls (Commonwealth Games related). These were highlighted in Appendix A to

the report and also in paragraphs 11.4, 12.4, 12.5 and 13.1 of 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). Budget Managers had been tasked with seeking to achieve additional income of 3%.

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. New fees were also being proposed to cover new responsibilities.

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 had reduced due to the transfer of the LLC1 fee to the Land Registry Service. There had been a corresponding fall in staffing costs and payments to WCC to reflect this. Income and expenditure were carefully monitored to avoid creating a large surplus (or deficit) 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 now by Everyone Active. The contract definition stated that 'The Contractor shall review the (following) core products and prices each year and submit any proposed changes to the Authority for approval (the "Fees and Charges Report")'. Everyone Active were expected to request an increase on some of these prices in line with the Retail Prices Index (RPI). The current prices for the core products and prices were shown at Appendix B to the report. Previously, when the leisure centres were operated by the Council, most years the charges were increased by around RPI. It was recommended that, provided the changes proposed by Everyone Active to the core products and prices were within the September RPI, that the Heads of Culture and Finance, in consultation with the relevant portfolio holders, could accept the changes. In reviewing the proposed increases, officers would consider previous years increases to avoid automatic year on year increases in prices.

Not all of the new parking locations that were being opened for the proposed closure of Covent Garden car park had come into operation, due to the delay in the closure of Covent Garden (although extra spaces had been created at Court Street, Bedford Street and Chandos Street). However, Riverside House had been open at weekends to provide additional parking for the town. Consideration was being given to the introduction of free parking for electric vehicles in council car parks. This would be subject to a future report to the Executive, which should include details of how this would be funded.

In terms of alternatives, the various options affecting individual charges were outlined in the main body of the report, at Sections 8 to 16.

Fees and Charges for 2020/21 remained static i.e. remained at the same level as for 2019/20, 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 noted that Everyone Active had 18 core prices on which they had held the price of seven last year and had informally indicated that four of these would be held again this year. It was also noted that officers would seek a contract amendment with Everyone Active, so that the proposed fees could be considered earlier.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee did not scrutinise the report, other than the pest control charges in Appendix A to the report (page 39). The Committee asked the Portfolio Holder to confirm that the charging reductions applied for mice infestation would also apply to the new charge for rat infestation.

If this was not the case, the Committee formally recommended to the Executive that the reductions should be applied. The Executive were required to vote on this if the charging reductions did not apply because it then formed a recommendation to them.

However, after the meeting of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, officers explained to Members that the reductions applied for mice infestation would also apply for rat infestations. As a result, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee withdrew its recommendation to the Executive.

Councillor Hales proposed the report as laid out.

Recommended to Council that

- (1) the Fees and Charges proposals set out in Appendix A to the report, to operate from 2 January 2020 unless stated otherwise, be approved; and
- (2) provided the changes proposed by Everyone Active to the core products and prices from January 2020 are within the September RPI, authority be delegated to the Heads of Culture and Finance, in consultation with the relevant portfolio holders (Cllrs Grainger and Hales), to accept the changes.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Hales)
Forward Plan Reference 1,046

Part 2

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

51. **Safeguarding Adults and Children Policy**

The Executive considered a report from Housing seeking approval for a new Safeguarding Adults and Children policy, attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

The Council had an existing safeguarding policy which included adults but not children. Cultural Services had its own separate safeguarding policy for adults and children but it was specific for that service area. The new policy had been developed to include comprehensive safeguarding guidance for adults and children in one document.

As the new policy would need to be updated from time to time with minor changes to reflect changes in legislation and good practice, it was recognised that it would be more practical for these changes to be agreed by the Head of Housing and/or the Head of Health and Community Protection following consultation with the Member Champions for Safeguarding, rather than formal approval by Executive.

The current safeguarding policy had originally been produced in conjunction with four other Warwickshire district and borough councils, with the latest revision in August 2015. This policy included guidance and procedures for safeguarding adults with care and support needs only.

The need to develop one corporate safeguarding policy for both adults and children, rather than having separate service-specific policies had become apparent given that safeguarding was everyone's business and a high-profile issue.

The Council had a statutory duty to co-operate with section 11 of the Children Act 2004 to safeguard and promote the welfare of children. The Care Act 2014 also placed a duty to protect adults at risk of abuse or neglect.

The new policy had been developed after consultation with Warwickshire County Council's Legal Services team, Prevent Officer, Safeguarding Warwickshire (this was a new partnership which combined Warwickshire Safeguarding Children Board and Warwickshire Safeguarding Adults Board), together with feedback from the Council's Safeguarding Group and the four local district and borough Councils.

No alternative options had been considered.

Councillor Falp proposed the report as laid out.

Resolved that

- (1) the Safeguarding Adults and Children policy at Appendix 1 to the report, be agreed; and
- (2) authority be delegated to the Head of Housing and/or the Head of Health and Community Protection, in consultation with the Member

Champions for Safeguarding for any future minor changes.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Falp)
Forward Plan Reference 1,033

52. **Draft Business Strategy 2019-2023**

The Executive considered a report from the Deputy Chief Executive (AJ) seeking Executive agreement to a consultation with all Council Members on the draft Business Strategy 2019-2023 and requesting that officers sought feedback which could be used to produce a final Strategy for endorsement.

At its meeting of 10 July 2019, the Executive agreed the Council's programme of work for 2019-2020 following adoption of the Service Area Plans. However, there was recognition that the detail of the strategic direction of the new administration was still being developed:

"Officers are in the process of developing a Council Business Plan with the Plan's strategic direction being steered by the Executive. The Plan is currently at an early stage but will shortly move to draft stage. Once this point has been reached, consultation will take place with Group Leaders and the respective Groups to garner Councillors' views on the document. It is hoped that a consensus can be reached as to the Plan's content."

Work had continued on the development of a Business Strategy (previously referred to as a Business Plan) and the latest draft could be seen at Appendix A to the report. The Strategy had been constructed around five key themes:

- responding to the Council's Climate Emergency declaration;
- transforming the Council's working practices and business processes, utilising technology and enabling digital services to reduce costs;
- maximising income by taking a more entrepreneurial approach to income generation and developing new income streams;
- investing in the Council's built assets to enhance service delivery and / or increase the financial return; and
- supporting the local economy to produce high quality jobs and increase the prosperity of the District.

At the Council meeting of 27 June 2019, Members voted unanimously to declare a climate emergency. It was agreed that within six months of the vote, an action plan would be produced by a group led by the Portfolio Holder for Business & Environment. The work on this plan had commenced, although given the vastness of its potential scope, outside assistance was being sought. The outcomes from the work of this group would have a major impact on what the Council did over the coming years but that did not preclude officers from starting on initiatives in advance of the group's report. Therefore, specific ideas had been put forward at this point for Members' consideration.

The next three themes were to some degree inter-related and were proposed in the context of a Council that was providing, and would continue to provide, high quality services, which had great ambition and a programme of work in-train to enhance the District, but which had seen the amount of grant it received from Central Government now cut to zero. Consequently, the Council had to continue to develop the efficiency and effectiveness of its services whilst at the same time maximising the income it received so that major cost reduction programmes were not needed, which could have negative impacts on service delivery.

The fifth theme of supporting the local economy was fundamental to the prosperity of the District and in turn the success of the Council. If the District was attractive to individuals and businesses, investment in the District would increase with positive financial consequences for local shops and services. This would lead to a positive impact on the Council's income streams such as business rates, council tax, parking income and planning fees all of which could then be re-invested in the delivery of high quality services.

At Section 5 to the report, the Council's current financial position and outlook was described. The content of the Business Strategy was designed to increase the resources available to the Council. Should Members agree to the proposed strategic approach, then officers would put detail on the programmes of work so that the Business Strategy could be signed-off in tandem with the Budget 2020-21.

Members were therefore asked to consider the draft Business Strategy and discuss the content in their respective Groups. It would be helpful if each Group Leader could nominate a Member to provide feedback to officers on behalf of their respective Group.

No alternative options were considered as it was essential that the Council was clear about its priorities and how it would go about achieving them.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee noted the report. It was felt that this was a positive, high level report and that more details would be required.

Councillor Day proposed the report as laid out.

Resolved that

- (1) officers undertake a consultation exercise with all Council Members in respect of the draft Business Strategy 2019-2023 at Appendix A to the report, be agreed; and
- (2) officers submit a further report to the February 2020 Executive to seek agreement of a Business Strategy 2019-23 which reflects consultation responses to the draft Strategy, be agreed.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Day)
Forward Plan Reference 1,063

53. Charges for Lifeline Services - New Tenants of Designated Properties

The Executive considered a report from Housing bringing forward a proposal to make consistent the service provision and the charging structures for tenants who lived in age-designated properties within the District. The report presented a second proposal to give a more focused service to the Council's older customers living in designated and age appropriate stock. This also involved a change to the letting restriction for two blocks, which were currently age designated, to general needs.

To comply with legislation to achieve designated status, a property was required to be provided for a particular community and to offer facilities as standard, over and above that of a general needs property. Most commonly, the facilities offered by housing providers included for an alarm. The current policy was that tenants who lived in designated properties that were not part of a scheme could opt out of the lifeline service. Whilst this was attractive in terms of customer choice, it brought into question whether the properties could be classed as designated.

If it were successfully argued that a property was not designated, the Right to Buy would apply. Whilst the concept of older people purchasing their home was welcomed, it led to problems later on when that property was subsequently sold. There were examples of younger people buying these properties and a consequence of different lifestyles had led to older people feeling at the least disturbed to feeling afraid and fearful of their surroundings and possible increase in anti-social behaviour. By having the Lifeline service in the property permanently, an enhanced support offer could be delivered for those residents. This could mean that residents might be able to stay in their homes longer, rather than move to a property with additional support. It would also help people be discharged from hospital more quickly as the service would be in place from when they moved in.

It was proposed to reintroduce the charges as current tenants moved on. Therefore, there was no adverse impact to the current residents. However, no further tenants would be permitted to opt out of the scheme.

A full list of properties to be classed as designated could be found at confidential Appendix 1 to the report, agenda item 15, minute number 63.

It was proposed that the Council would provide an enhanced property owner offer for residents living in age designated and sheltered scheme properties. This would include working with those residents in the community to facilitate activities where those communities requested them. It was proposed that the Council would develop several tiers of service available to residents, to those living in sheltered scheme, to those living in schemes with community centres and to those living in age designated properties. It was proposed that housing staff would be more

visible at these schemes and estates and would work with the community to help develop a further sense of community, linking in with other residents in nearby properties. This would support a wider housing strategy for older and disabled people.

This offer involved the consideration of properties that were age designated and whether this was the correct way to manage the stock that Warwick District Council had. Therefore, a removal of the letting restriction was proposed for the properties at Stamford and Radcliffe Gardens. These were both high-rise tower blocks and classed as age restricted properties, and were let only to tenants over the age of 55. Due to changes in demographic, properties available and issues with access in the block, it was proposed that this age restriction was now removed. To manage the block more effectively and to reduce the risk substantially would be to change the resident profile to those with less vulnerability, meaning to remove the age restriction. Warwickshire Fire and Rescue Service had indicated that it was a concern for so many vulnerable people to be located in a high-rise accommodation. It was proposed that this change happened organically and there was no wholesale decant of the blocks. The Council would work with its current residents to carry out a series of moves to more appropriate age related designated stock amongst its sheltered or age designated housing properties.

A full list of properties at Stamford Gardens and Radcliffe Gardens can be found at Confidential Appendix 2 to the report, Agenda Item 15, Minute Number 63.

In terms of alternatives, Warwick District Council could continue how it currently operated and leave designated property tenancies with the option of taking the lifeline service. This would negatively affect potential income and possibly leave the Council open to challenge about the nature of the stock. It would not offer the best protection for older and vulnerable people.

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

Recommendation 2.2 in the report was withdrawn prior to the meeting.

Councillor Matecki proposed the report as laid out.

Resolved that that the Lifeline basic service be provided as a standard feature in all designated properties attached as confidential Appendix 1, Minute 63, but that the service is introduced on a gradual basis as the current tenants move on.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Matecki)
Forward Plan Reference 967

54. **Project Initiation Document for the replacement of various software**

The Executive considered a report from the Deputy Chief Executive (AJ) seeking approval for the Project Initiation Document (PID) for replacement of software (Civica APP, IDOX, Acolaid & GGP and a range of bespoke in-house developed solutions) used by Health & Community Protection (HCP), Neighbourhood Services (NS), Private Sector Housing (PSH) and Development Services (DS).

At Appendix A to the report, the PID for procuring and replacing software (Civica APP, IDOX, Acolaid & GGP and a range of bespoke in-house developed solutions) used by HCP, NS, PSH and DS was provided. Within the PID, the rationale for the proposed changes was detailed. To assist with Members' understanding of the initiative, an Executive Summary was provided at Appendix B to the report.

Ordinarily, Members would not be asked to approve PIDs as this was usually done at Project Board level. However, in this instance, the proposed technology upgrades impacted upon a number of high profile Council services and it was essential that Members fully understood what was being proposed.

In order to maintain the delivery of high quality services, the business case argued that investment in improved technology had to be made. Whilst this technology upgrade would in itself enable a positive impact on service delivery, there would also need to be changes in the way that staff operated if the maximum advantage was to be gained by the enhancement. The initiative was referenced in the draft Business Strategy (also being considered on tonight's agenda) as an area where service could be improved whilst costs were reduced. Further work on the opportunity for cost reduction needed to be undertaken and an update on progress would be reported to the February 2020 Executive meeting when it was anticipated that the Business Strategy would be approved.

Members noted from the Summary that in order to take this project forward, extra staff resource would be required in the form of a Project Manager. It was recommended that the Project Manager post was established for an initial period of two years (agreed under the Chief Executive's delegated powers) as this aligned with the upgrade of the software used by HCP, NS and PSH. DS's current contractual position meant that it could not upgrade until 2022 and so whilst the Service was minded to change suppliers, it was considering its options.

Pre-market engagement had commenced including demonstrations by software suppliers and visits to sites which currently used potential solutions. No decision would be reached upon which product to purchase until a Project Manager was in place and full project governance arrangements were up-and-running. However, this initial work strongly suggested that there were products that could improve significantly the way the Council operated. Once a preferred supplier had been identified, a

further report would be submitted to the Executive detailing the full costs and savings associated with the project.

In terms of alternatives, the Council was required to undertake a procurement exercise so no alternative options were considered as the process needed to be properly managed and resourced.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report. The Committee recommended that the Project Manager referred to in 2.2 should review the PID and advise how the Overview & Scrutiny Committee could assist the Project Board through an oversight role. The Executive were required to vote on this because it formed a recommendation to them.

The Executive endorsed the recommendation of Overview & Scrutiny Committee as they recognised this would be a key project and the skills the Committee had would add value to the project.

Councillor Falp proposed the report as laid out.

Resolved that

- (1) the Project Initiation Document (PID) at Appendix A to the report, be endorsed, with extracted Business Case at Appendix B to the report, for the replacement of software used by HCP, NS, PSH and DS;
- (2) the release £15,000 from the Business Rates Volatility Reserve to employ a Project Manager for 2019/20 and that the remaining cost of the two-year post is addressed in the Budget Report 2020/21, be agreed; and
- (3) the Project Manager reviews the PID and advise the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, as part of its work programme report, how it can assist the Project Board through an oversight role

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Falp)
Forward Plan Reference 1,067

55. Canalside Development Plan Draft Document (DPD) – Request to Consult

The Executive considered a report from Development Services requesting approval to consult on the Canalside Development Plan Draft Document (DPD).

The Warwick District Local Plan 2011-2029 was adopted in September 2017 and contained a commitment to bring forward a Development Plan Document (DPD) for the canalside.

A further commitment was made in the Local Development Scheme to produce relevant DPDs outlined in the Local Plan, such as The Canalside attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

The adopted Local Plan stated in policy DS17 'Supporting Canalside Regeneration and Enhancement' that the Council would prepare and adopt a DPD identifying areas for regeneration in the urban area suitable for other uses and areas for protection throughout the canal network. The document set out policies for the assessment of planning applications in the canalside area.

Part of the commitment for the protection of the canal and surrounding areas had already been addressed through the designation of a Canal Conservation Area in January 2019.

The Local Plan also proposed three older areas of canalside employment for consideration for residential use, these being: Sydenham Industrial Estate, Cape Road/Millers Road and Montague Road. Development of part of the Sydenham Industrial Estate for residential use had already taken place with the area to the west of Sydenham Drive and immediately adjacent to the canal given over to new housing.

Canals as a topic didn't appear in the previous Local Plan which illustrated the decline in the use and interest in the canals at that point. It was now recognised that the canals formed a useful resource and as well as providing a network of tow paths that joined towns and countryside and providing a backdrop for leisure pursuits, they were also a valuable resource in providing places of peace and tranquillity supporting the health and wellbeing of all who used them.

Examples of regeneration elsewhere and particularly in the bigger cities, Birmingham for example, demonstrated how the resurgence of interest and investment in the canals can assist with the regeneration of surrounding areas providing a catalyst for new uses to be found for vacant land and buildings and raising awareness of the opportunities provided by the canals.

The submission draft of the DPD attached as Appendix 1 to the report dealt with these issues provided responses to these with policies that would be utilised by officers dealing with planning applications. Specific policies dealt with the redevelopment of redundant sites for residential use and a series of other opportunity sites had been identified, examined and assessed for suitability to be taken forward for this and other appropriate uses.

As a DPD, the document would need to follow the same procedure as the Local Plan in that another stage of formal consultation would be required on the submission document before it was placed before an independent inspector at public examination. The report of the inspector would be binding on the Council and any amendments would be made to the DPD before it was brought back to Executive for adoption, at which point it

would carry the same weight as the Local Plan and became part of that planning framework for development.

In terms of alternatives, the Executive could decide not to pursue publication of a Canalside DPD. This would, however, be contrary to the commitment made in the Local Plan and would not provide officers with a solid policy basis for decision making with regard to the future development of canalside sites.

Councillor Cooke proposed the report as laid out.

Resolved that

- (1) the content of the consultation document attached as Appendix 1 to the report, the accompanying SA/SEA report attached as Appendix 2 to the report and the Executive Summary of the SA/SEA attached as Appendix 3 to the report, be noted and approved for a six-week public consultation, in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI); and
- (2) following the public consultation, a submission version of the DPD will be brought before them with a report of public consultation, to be approved for a further period of consultation before the DPD is submitted to an independent planning inspector, be noted.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Cooke)
Forward Plan Reference 1,055

56. Supporting Leamington Town Centre

The Executive considered a report from Development Services setting out proposals to supplement the seed funding agreed as part of the successful Future of the High Street Fund Bid through funding arrangements that would allow projects for Leamington Town Centre to be developed over a two-year period.

In March 2019, the Council made an Expression of Interest to the Future of the High Street Fund (FHSF). This was a Government fund which sought to support the transformation of town centres in the context of changing consumer patterns and changing expectations about the role of Town Centres. Originally, the total fund was for £675m, although in a recent announcement it had been confirmed that this had now been extended to £1bn.

The process for accessing the funds was in two stages:

- The first stage was the Expression of Interest. At this stage, town centres were assessed on the need for funding by looking at nature of the challenges the Town Centre faced and the strength of a shared vision for the future of the town centre. Essentially, this stage was about the challenges faced by the Town Centre and the strength of the vision for addressing those challenges. It did not set out specific proposals or projects, nor did it request a specific sum of money. Warwick District Council made an Expression of Interest (EIO) for Leamington Town Centre in March 2019 and had had confirmation in August 2019 that this EIO had been one of approximately 100 that had been successful. This gave the green light to progress to the second stage.
- The second stage would require specific proposals to be developed through to project plans and business cases. These would be assessed to allocate the £1bn fund to each Town Centre that was successful in the first stage. To help work up proposals, projects and business cases, Warwick District Council would be allocated some seed funding. At present, we have not had confirmation as to how much this would be. It was expected that it would be at least £75,000, but could be as much as £150,000.

Working up proposals to ensure the Council was successful in attracting funds through Stage 2 of the Future of the High Street Fund (FHSF) process would be a high priority. These proposals would need to:

- deliver the vision, summarised in Appendix 1 to the report;
- be based on extensive engagement so that support for proposals is shared with our partners;
- be feasible and viable; and
- tie in with other Council priorities.

The Council had been given some guidance on preparing Business Cases and would be provided with support from MHCLG over the coming months, with an inception meeting in October 2019. The guidance indicated the following timetable:

- capacity and resource grant to be paid September 2019;
- further business case guidance circulated September 2019;
- commence inception meetings October 2019;
- early draft business case submission 15 January 2020;
- final business case submission date 30 April 2020; and
- successful bids announced Summer/autumn 2020.

The key date in this was that the business case submission needed to be made by 30 April 2020. This was a tight timescale. Ahead of this it would be necessary to undertake stakeholder engagement to help shape project proposals; work up detailed proposals; consider costs, delivery mechanisms, viability and sources of funding; and gain approval for specific business cases.

To achieve the work required within this timescale meant the submission would need to be a high priority for the Council over the coming months. This would be time consuming and challenging work and would require

extensive partnership work. The Council did not have the capacity to do this through existing staff resources, and indeed the government money provided for this stage implicitly recognised that new resources were likely to be needed. Therefore, part of the money that the Council would receive to prepare the Stage 2 proposal would be utilised to bring in additional support either through recruiting to a post or by entering in to a contract with an experienced consultant.

Whilst the Council would be keen to ensure that any proposal aligned with a range of related ambitions and initiatives for the Town Centre, delivering a Stage 2 proposal was likely to be the sole focus until April 2020 to ensure proposals that had a strong prospect of success.

However, officers considered that the FHSF bid should be a launch pad for a range of inter-related proposals for Leamington Town Centre.

Recognising this, any proposals that were supported by the FHSF would form only part of the Council's ambitions for Leamington Town Centre and it was therefore important that resources were available beyond the submission of proposals for Stage 2. In particular, there would be a need for ongoing engagement with stakeholders and coordination of projects and proposals as diverse as Bath Street Transport Improvements; Covent Garden Regeneration; the Creative Quarter; Air Quality Initiatives; Sustainable Transport Options; The Commonwealth Games; Revised Parking Strategy; Wayfinding and the Local Plan review. At this stage, it was not possible to prioritise initiatives for inclusion in the FHSF bid, but what was clear was that whatever funding was agreed through the bid would be no more than a starting point for investment in the Town Centre.

At this stage, agreement only in principle was sought for the second year funding. The source of this funding was still to be finalised. It would be part of the remit of the post holder/consultant to identify possible sources of funding for the second year including the potential for further funding from the FHSF and other grants. However, if no external funding was available, the fall-back position would be for the Council to fund the second year. Recommendation 2.2 in the report therefore sought agreement for the Council to effectively underwrite the costs for the second year up to a total cost £75,000.

In terms of other options, an alternative would be limit funding to one year only. This would have the advantage of being affordable within the seed funding allocated from FHSF. However, this option was not recommended principally because the FHSF initiatives should be seen as a starting point to encourage investment in other initiatives and as a result, funding for one year was likely to have only a limited impact. The work involved in the first year would inevitably require significant further work in future years and it was suggested that this should be recognised from the start.

Consideration had been given as to whether the additional capacity required to support this work should be through the establishment of a new post, through a contract with a consultant or a mixture of both. There were pros and cons of all these options and officers had been mindful of the need to gain momentum quickly; to retain expertise within the

Council; to ensure initiatives were perceived in a spirit of cooperation at the same time as ensuring the Council demonstrated leadership; to ensure value for money and affordability; and to ensure the level of expertise and resilience delivered the outcomes needed. Taking these factors in to account, it was suggested that initially an internal recruitment exercise was undertaken to assess whether there were existing Council employees who could undertake this work and who could ensure early momentum. If this was unsuccessful, then consideration might be given recruiting an external consultant.

Councillor Boad congratulated officers and thanked them for their hard work.

Councillor Day proposed the report as laid out.

Resolved that

- (1) Warwick District Council's Expression of Interest to the Future of the High Street Fund for Leamington Town Centre has been successful and that specific projects for funding can now be developed, be noted. As part of this, Members noted that seed funding, expected to be in the region of £75,000, will be provided to support the development of specific proposals over the coming year that deliver the vision set out in the Expression of Interest attached as Appendix 1 to the report; and
- (2) underwriting funding to enable project proposals for Leamington Town Centre to be progressed over a two-year period, noting that first year's costs of up to £75,000 will be covered by the Future of the High Street Fund and that funding of £75,000 for the second year's costs will only be required if other sources of funding are not forthcoming, be agreed.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Rhead)
Forward Plan Reference 1,070

57. Significant Business Risk Register

The Executive considered a report from Finance setting out the latest version of the Council's Significant Business Risk Register for review by the Executive. It had been drafted following a review by the Council's Senior Management Team and the Leader of the Council.

The report sought to assist Members fulfil their role in overseeing the organisation's risk management framework. In its management paper, "Worth the risk: improving risk management in local government", the

Audit Commission set out clearly the responsibilities of Members and officers with regard to risk management, detailed in Section 3.1 of the report.

The Significant Business Risk Register (SBRR) recorded all significant risks to the Council's operations, key priorities, and major projects. Individual services also had their own service risk registers.

The SBRR was reviewed quarterly by the Council's Senior Management Team and the Council Leader and then, in keeping with Members' overall responsibilities for managing risk, by the Executive. The latest version of the SBRR was set out as Appendix 1 to the report.

A summary of all the risks and their position on the risk matrix, as currently assessed, was set out as Appendix 2 to the report.

The assessments of risk were judgemental, being based on an assessment of the likelihood of something occurring and the impact that might have. Appendix 3 to the report set out the guidelines that were applied to assessing risk.

In line with the traditional risk matrix approach, greater concern should be focused on those risks plotted towards the top right corner of the matrix whilst the converse was true for those risks plotted towards the bottom left corner of the matrix. If viewed in colour (e.g. on-line), the former set of risks would be within the area shaded red, whilst the latter would be within the area shaded green; the mid-range would be seen as yellow.

Any movements in the risk scores over the last six months were shown on the risk matrices in Appendix 1. There was one movement since the last report. This applied to Risk 7, the 'Risk of additional financial liabilities'. In the light of the new Business Strategy 2019-2023 not yet being finalised, SMT felt it was prudent to raise the impact level from 4 to 5. This meant that the risk was now in the red zone. Careful consideration would now be given as to how this risk could be reduced.

As part of the process of assessing the significant business risks for the Council, some issues had been identified which at this stage did not necessarily represent a significant risk, or even a risk at all, but as more detail emerged might become one. These had been mentioned in previous reports but as their status had not changed, they were included again for completeness.

- Brexit – already recognised as a potential trigger to some of the Council's existing risks, this issue would be kept under review so that as details emerged of exactly what Brexit might mean, generally for local government and specifically for this Council, the implications for the Council's risk environment could be considered further; and
- Funding – the Government had started consultations around changes to the Business Rate Retention scheme by Local Government and the Fair Funding Review, with both these changes due to be effective from

2020/21. Depending on how these proposals developed, there might be a substantial impact upon the Council's finances.

The EU referendum result and the possible implications of Brexit had been included as a trigger within Risks 2, 3, 6, 7. As the country moved closer to the (revised) departure date, there was concern as to what the Council ought to be considering by way of contingency planning for potential impacts on services and the local community. That had been, and still was, difficult to do without knowing the nature of the basis for the country leaving the EU.

One service issue that had already been identified related to the potential need to set up a Port Health Authority for Coventry Airport. The extent and impact of this would depend on the detail and nature of the exit. By way of explanation, Coventry Airport was currently a postal hub and was not classed as a Border Inspection Post. However, the implications of the exit from Europe might require the establishment of a Port Health Authority in order to deliver the range of controls which were required. These could include inspection, monitoring and implementation of: insects and rodents on board aircraft, food and sanitation waste, imported food controls, noise, dust, water and air quality and civil contingency responsibilities.

Other actions being taken in respect of Brexit included:

- a sub-group of SMT was meeting weekly to review the impact of Brexit and actions required;
- SMT had agreed an Action Plan, to which all Heads of Service had contributed;
- Supply Chains were actively being considered. A new column had been included within the Contract Register for contract managers to comment on the potential impact of Brexit on the contract and the supplier;
- an event to inform EU citizens in the District of their settlement status was arranged for 19 March;
- arranged for the use of the Government Funding awarded to Local Authorities to help prepare for Brexit (£35,000 over 2 years); and
- ongoing work for port health and imported food control. (The Council had received funding from the Food Standards agency –up to £28,000 in total would be paid upon conclusion of work and the delivery of a report to the FSA of our findings.)

There were two other significant actions that, for a period of time, were being undertaken:

- a lead officer was part of a weekly feed of issues up to government via a Local Authority regional representative and in turn was now receiving feedback from the government on various aspects of the proposed EU exit; and
- a lead officer was party to a weekly telecom of the Warwickshire Local Resilience Forum (LRF).

These had stopped now until further instruction was received from the government. It was anticipated that they would be restarted nearer the

time of departure from the EU (currently scheduled to be 31 October 2019).

The Government had started consultations around changes to the Business Rate Retention scheme by Local Government and the Fair Funding Review, with both these changes due to be effective from 2020/21. Depending on how these proposals evolved, there might be a substantial impact upon the Council's finances. However, recent national government events might cause a delay to the reviews with consequent impacts on resource allocations for Local Government as a whole.

In terms of alternatives, the report was not concerned with recommending a particular option in preference to others.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee noted the report.

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 10 of the report, be noted.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Day)
Forward Plan Reference 1,049

58. Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Scheme (RUCIS) Application

The Executive considered a report from Finance providing details of a Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Scheme grant application by Whitnash Sports & Social Club Lawn Bowls Section to remove the existing wooden supports underneath the bowling green ditch edges which were rotting and replace with concrete edges.

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. Without the Lawn Bowl's section of Whitnash Sports & Social club, there would be fewer opportunities for the community, in particular older members of the community, to enjoy and participate in sporting and social activities which could potentially result in an increase in anti-social behaviour, an increase in obesity and disengage and weaken the community. If the project work was not carried out in the near future, the bowling green might eventually become unusable which would then

decrease opportunity for the community to enjoy and participate in sports and social activities.

In terms of alternatives, 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.

Members might choose not to approve the grant funding, or to vary the amount awarded.

Councillor Hales proposed the report as laid out.

Resolved that a Rural/Urban Capital Improvement Grant from the rural cost centre budget for Whitnash Sports & Social Club Lawn Bowls Section of 80% of the total project costs, as supported by Appendix 1 to the report, to remove the existing wooden supports underneath the bowling green ditch edges which are rotting and replace with concrete edges, as detailed within paragraphs 1.1, 3.2 and 8 of the report, up to a maximum of £6,320 excluding vat subject to receipt of written confirmation from Whitnash Town Council to approve a capital grant of £100 (if the application is declined or a reduced amount is offered the budget shortfall will be covered by Whitnash Sports & Social Club Lawn Bowls Section's cash reserves which have been evidenced through their annual accounts and the provision of a recent bank statement).

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Hales)
Forward Plan Reference 1,048

59. **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.

Minute Nos.	Para Nos.	Reason
63	1	Information relating to an individual
63	2	Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an

		individual
60, 61 62, 64	3	Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information)

The items below were considered in confidential session and the full details of these were included in the confidential minutes of this meeting.

Part 1

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

60. Affordable housing purchase – Spring Lane, Radford Semele

The Executive considered a confidential report from Housing recommending that the Council purchased 26 affordable homes on the Local Plan-allocated site at Spring Lane in Radford Semele for retention as Housing Revenue Account assets.

The Finance & Audit Committee noted the report and that the scheme was self-funding.

For the sake of clarity, the Committee requested a report at its next meeting to confirm the number of new Council houses, purchased or constructed since 2015, the cost of these and the money available within the HRA budget for such projects. The report should also detail the number of house types (i.e. social, affordable, or shared ownership) within each scheme.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee also took the opportunity to thank Mr Bruno for his work with the Council and wished him well for the future.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report and recommended that the Council determined the costs involved to improve the EPC energy rating to category A. The Executive were required to vote on this because it formed a recommendation to them.

Members thanked the Scrutiny Committees for their comments and accepted the recommendation from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

The recommendations in the report were approved for consideration by Council on 20 November 2019.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Matecki)
Forward Plan Reference 1,066

Part 2

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

61. **Regeneration of the Leper Hospital Site, Saltisford, Birmingham Road, Warwick (St Michael's Chapel and Master's House)**

The Executive considered a confidential report from the Deputy Chief Executive (AJ) regarding the regeneration of the Leper Hospital Site, Saltisford, Birmingham Road, Warwick (St Michael's Chapel and Master's House).

The Finance & Audit Committee noted the recommendations in the report.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report but recommended that the Council determined if energy efficiency improvements could be made and whether there would be ways to recover the costs of this.

The recommendations in the report were approved with the addition that a report be brought back to the Executive on the potential for this development to improve the energy ratings for the proposed development.

(The Portfolio Holders for this item were Councillors Cooke, Grainger and Matecki)

Forward Plan Reference 1,035

62. **Catering and Events Concessions Contract – Royal Pump Rooms and Jephson Gardens Glasshouse – Update Report**

The Executive considered a confidential report from Cultural Services updating Members on the Catering and Events Concessions Contract – Royal Pump Rooms and Jephson Gardens Glasshouse.

The Finance & Audit Committee noted the recommendation and that they would like to see a report following the first year of trading of the new arrangements.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee noted the report.

The recommendations in the report were approved.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Grainger)

Forward Plan Reference 1,071

63. **Private & Confidential Appendices 1 & 2 to Agenda Item 6, Minute Number 53 - Charges for Lifeline services - New Tenants of Designated Properties**

The Executive considered two confidential appendices to Agenda Item 6, Minute Number 53 - Charges for Lifeline services - New Tenants of Designated Properties.

The confidential appendices were approved.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Matecki)
Forward Plan Reference 967

64. **Minutes**

The confidential minutes of 21 August 2019 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

(The meeting ended at 7.21pm)

CHAIRMAN
13 November 2019