

**Response from the meeting of the Executive on F&A and O&S Committees'  
Comments – 21 August 2019**

Item no.	5	Title	Newbold Comyn – Update and Approach to Engagement	Requested by	Labour Group
<b>Reason considered</b>		<p>Correction needed: Page 1- Wards directly affected should not list Newbold as this doesn't exist anymore. Newbold Comyn now sits in Clarendon Ward.</p> <p>1. On page 4, 3.8, states "A high level assessment of options, on assumed most commercially favourable model suggested that the right mix of uses in the right layout could generate a significant income for the Council."</p> <p>In a briefing at the Town hall on Newbold Comyn it was said that the residents online survey concluded that an important factor in any development was that it should not be too commercial.</p> <p>The Council's premise given to SLC as a basis for the study does seem at odds with this. Surely other factors are important when issues such as Health &amp; Well-being are being considered? Consultation needs to be heard and considered for it to be of value and meaningful?</p> <p>2. Page 4,3.9, further states This has informed three masterplan options,</p> <p>As it appears: Layout 1 includes five golf type options, new adventure play area, new outdoor activities area (high ropes, low ropes, zip wires, climbing etc), new 3G artificial turf pitch, visitor centre/cafe and additional parking.</p> <p>Layout 2 Excludes four of the golf options but doesn't actually refer to Adventure golf. Larger extension to nature reserve...</p> <p>Layout 3 Again excludes four golf option but doesn't actually refer to adventure golf. outdoor activities are left unspecified, slightly extended nature reserve...</p> <p>If options are listed as above in the masterplan it would certainly skew selection to Option 1 (more commercial route, as it seems to offer items difficult to say no to, however including ALL of these would not necessarily be a positive addition for Newbold Comyn. Particularly when upholding survey results?</p> <p>I would hope options would be presented in a fair way, Eg. Why do four golf items hang together as all in or all out? One of our Observers recalled the cross party Member Reference Group during previous administration, felt other benefits need to be considered not just commercial. It is disappointing that both the premise and tone of SLC study and options as listed above seem to contradict this.</p> <p>3. Car Park for 170 spaces in Option 1. Presumably this is driven by high level commercial/income premise attracting significantly more visitors? Is this our aim? Does this reflect our Declaration of a Climate Emergency? Especially as no other greener transport options discussed. At the moment, the online survey said, people access on foot equally as much as drive. Further development of smaller access road would also cause more traffic</p>			

	<p>disturbance at Newbold Comyn and surrounding area?</p> <p>4. Section 6, page 9, Risks not mentioned here: Reputation of WDC if this site becomes overdeveloped and too commercial, particularly for frequent local users.</p> <p>5. Health &amp; Wellbeing Group (Michael Bunney) not mentioned as Interested Parties List, Appendix 2, Page 4.</p> <p>I do think a full result of online survey should have been included in the appendices. It did have a very significant response.</p> <p>I think Appendix 2, Page 17, Question 14 should say "listed in Q9"?</p>
<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview & Scrutiny Committee voted unanimously to support the recommendations in the report.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The recommendations in the report were approved, subject to an amendment to recommendation 2.1 in the report, to add at the end of the sentence <i>"to deliver the greatest public benefit"</i> .

Item no.	7	Title	Warwick District Leisure Development Programme – Kenilworth Facilities	Requested by	Green & Lib Dem Groups
<b>Reason considered</b>	<p><b>Green Group:</b></p> <p>1. We do not consider that the report provides sufficient evidence as to why the proposals for a new outdoor pool, strongly advocated by a number of Kenilworth residents, have been rejected. People still feel the case for an outdoor pool has not been properly considered and that their wishes have not been properly taken into consideration. We ask that the data on which this decision was made, in term of comparative costs, feasibility of construction (including constraints on the site), and anticipated demand and usage is made public as soon as possible. Will this be done in an evidenced statement?</p> <p>2. We welcome the new information in Appendix B which includes specific detail on advancing net zero carbon by the list of additional technologies promoting energy efficiencies (Item 7 Appendix B/p17).-However, the comparison between (Item 7 /Appendix B/para 6.9 p20) is in our view flawed because the comparison should be based on the advanced design standards set out in para 6.8 of the same report, rather than on the current mix and cost of energy resources. i.e if renewables are used, what does that do for the costs? Why are these not being used to make the business case?</p> <p><b>Liberal Democrat Group:</b></p> <p>To seek an understanding as to why there is to be no further wider public consultation with all of the information on the swimming facility schemes being to the same standard of detail. The running costs are not comparing like for like on each of the options.</p> <p>To question the work done on the impact of the proposed access to the Castle Farm site and any proposed mitigation measures to be put in place for local residents who will be affected by the increase in traffic and pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>To explore in more detail why new accesses have been discounted.</p>				

<b>Scrutiny Comment</b>	The Overview & Scrutiny Committee noted the report.
<b>Executive Response</b>	The recommendations in the report were approved. Note: The Executive would support and encourage Kenilworth Town Council if it was minded to consider putting forward a proposal for an outdoor lido in Kenilworth.

**Response from the meeting of Council 4 September 2019 in respect of Executive Recommendation to Council made by the Executive on 10 July 2019**

<b>Item no.</b>	11	<b>Title</b>	Role of the Chairman of the Council – Task & Finish Group
<b>Background</b>	<p>The Executive considered a report from Democratic Services bringing forward recommendations on the role of the Chairman of the Council following a Task &amp; Finish Group Review as agreed by the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 2 April 2019.</p> <p>A Task &amp; Finish Group was formed in October 2017 by the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee to undertake the review as set out within the defined scope, attached at Appendix 1 to the report. The Membership of the Group was established as Councillors Ashford, Mrs Knight and Margrave. The Group concluded its work in spring 2019 and its recommendations were supported by the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee on 2 April 2019.</p>		
<b>Executive Response</b>	<p>The Executive:</p> <p><b>Recommended</b> to Council that</p> <p>(1) the proposed revisions to Article 5 of the Constitution as set out at Appendix 3 to the report, be made, subject to an amendment to Appendix 3, Section 6, on page 11 in the report, to read “to host or attend events or functions they determine appropriate.”, and remove the rest of the paragraph after the word “appropriate”.</p> <p><i>(Council will consider this on 4 September 2019.)</i></p> <p><b>Resolved</b> that</p> <p>(1) the current budget for supporting the Chairman is appropriate, but that in light of the underspend on their allowance over each of the last four years, this should be reduced by £1,500 per annum as part of the 2020/21 budget, be accepted;</p> <p>(2) in the event of relocation to a new HQ, a room is not dedicated solely for the chairman's use, but a suitable room be made available to the chairman for use when inviting guests or meeting with staff, be agreed;</p> <p>(3) the updated guidance/protocol for leading on events as set out at Appendix 7 to report, be welcome;</p> <p>(4) a review of the current civic gifts with the Chairman's office will be undertaken with a view as to how these can be made more publically</p>		

	<p>accessible or if appropriate disposed of, be noted;</p> <p>(5) the Chairman be asked to undertake a review of the purpose and arrangements for Annual Council, including who is invited and they report on this to Council by no later than November 2019;</p> <p>(6) a report will be brought back to Scrutiny in July 2020, by officers in liaison with the Chairman of the Council and Chairman of the Overview &amp; Scrutiny Committee, that reviews the impact of these recommendations, if they are agreed by Council, be noted; and</p> <p>(7) in addition to (5) above, the Executive would expect this report to include details of the events, including fundraising events, that the Chairman had attended and the cost of attending those events.</p>
<b>Council Response</b>	Council approved the recommendation made to it by the Executive.