



| | |
|--|--|
| Title | Comments from the Executive |
| For further information about this report please contact | Graham Leach, Committee Services Officer, 01926 456114 or committee@warwickdc.gov.uk |
| Service Area | Members' Services |
| Wards of the District directly affected | N/A |
| Is the report private and confidential and not for publication by virtue of a paragraph of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972, following the Local Government (Access to Information) (Variation) Order 2006 | No |
| Date and meeting when issue was last considered and relevant minute number | 15 November 2011 |
| Background Papers | Executive Minutes – 16 November 2011 |

| | |
|--|----|
| Contrary to the policy framework: | No |
| Contrary to the budgetary framework: | No |
| Key Decision? | No |
| Included within the Forward Plan? (If yes include reference number) | No |

| | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|
| Officer/Councillor Approval | | |
| With regard to officer approval all reports <i>must</i> be approved by the report authors relevant director, Finance, Legal Services and the relevant Portfolio Holder(s). | | |
| | Date | Name |
| Relevant Director | | |
| Chief Executive | | |
| CMT | | |
| Section 151 Officer | | |
| Legal | | |
| Finance | | |
| Portfolio Holders | | |

| | |
|--|-----|
| Consultation Undertaken | |
| N/A | |
| Final Decision? | Yes |
| Suggested next steps (if not final decision please set out below) | |
| | |

1. **SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report informs the Committee of the response the Executive gave to their comments regarding the reports submitted to the Executive in November.

2. **RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 2.1 The responses made by the Executive are noted.

3. **REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATION**

- 3.1 This report is produced to create a dialogue between the Executive and the Overview and Scrutiny Committee. It ensures that the Overview and Scrutiny Committee are formally made aware of the Executive's responses.
- 3.2 Where the Overview & Scrutiny Committee have made a recommendation as opposed to a comment the Executive are required to respond to the recommendation(s) made, including whether or not they accept the recommendation(s).

4. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 4.1 This report is not produced and presented to the Committee.

5. **BUDGETARY FRAMEWORK**

- 5.1 All work for the Committee has to be carried out within existing resources.

6. **POLICY FRAMEWORK**

- 6.1 The work carried out by the Committee helps the Council to improve in line with its priority to manage services openly efficiently and effectively.

7. **BACKGROUND**

- 7.1 As part of the new scrutiny process, the Committee is no longer considering the whole of the Executive agenda.
- 7.2 On the day of publication of the Executive agenda all Councillors are sent an e-mail asking them to contact Committee Services, by 09.00am on the day of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting to advise which Executive items they would like the Committee to consider.
- 7.3 As a result the Committee considered the items detailed in appendix 1. The response the Executive gave on each item is also shown.
- 7.4 In reviewing these responses Committee can identify any issues for which they would like a progress report. A future report, for example on how the decision has been implemented, would then be submitted to the Committee at an agreed date which would then be incorporated within the work programme.

**Response from the meeting of the Executive on Overview and Scrutiny
Committee Comments –
16 November 2011**

| Item no. | 4 | Title | Dog Control Orders | Requested by | Labour Group Lib Dem Group |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------------------|
| Reason considered | <p>Questions about the implementation</p> <p>Because of the need for some clarification on play areas and dog control areas in general.</p> | | | | |
| Scrutiny Comment | <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee noted that the list in the report at paragraph 7.4 should include Eagle Recreation Multi Use Games Area, Leamington, instead of Kennedy Square Multi Use Games Area.</p> <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee were disappointed that some areas clearly demarcated by surfacing had not been included, such as The Holt and the main play area at Victoria Park, and felt that these should be brought forward as soon as possible for addition to the areas excluded.</p> <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee agreed to establish a Task and Finish Group to review the orders in 12 months, to consider such matters as issues that had arisen and the number of breaches of the orders, by area and type of order reported and acted upon.</p> <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee recommended that the Executive respond to the following points to provide clarity for all parties:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is the timetable for installation for signage in original areas? 2. What is the timeframe for introducing these new areas and signage? 3. What is the definition of clearly demarcated areas? 4. What is the completion date for the introduction of these areas? 5. How are the areas being demarcated? 6. Have the public been informed of how areas will be demarcated and how enforcement will operate? | | | | |
| Executive Response | <p>The Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services, Councillor Coker advised that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The signage would be printed to coincide with the order coming into effect on 21 November 2011. 2. With regard to the timeframe for introducing the new areas and signage, it was agreed that these would only be included after consideration by the Scrutiny Committees and Executive. Some areas would be implemented straight-away but Parish Councils would be written to for their opinion on any areas that fell in their rural area. In addition the short list would be listed in the minutes of the meeting and officers would like to examine these areas prior to them being printed in the newspapers. 3. A clearly demarcated area was one that was completely fenced off or where a boundary was clearly shown. 4. The completion date for the introduction of the areas would be approximately two to three weeks or as soon as the posts were in position. 5. Areas would be demarcated by a clearly defined boundary and signs. | | | | |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>6. The Public would be advised by easily distinguishable signage in the area, through some enforcement and by details in the Press.</p> <p>Councillor Coker apologised for the absence of The Holt play area in the report and encouraged any member to indicate suitable areas to him and the officers. He agreed to the amendment of the wording in paragraph 7.4 of the report and advised that the Head of Environmental Services, Richard Hall, would write to the Overview & Scrutiny Committee addressing the points that they had raised.</p> <p>Councillor Coker also welcomed the idea of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee creating a Task and Finish Group to assess that the process was running smoothly.</p> <p>The Executive agreed that the recommendations should be agreed as printed.</p> |
|--|--|

| Item no. | | Title | Requested by |
|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| | 8 | Strategic Principles for Tourism and the Visitor Economy | Labour Group Lib Dem Group |
| Reason considered | <p>Tourism is extremely important to the District's economy and Members had some questions about the report</p> <p>Because of its importance to the economy of the District.</p> | | |
| Scrutiny Comment | <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report but expressed disappointment that Members had not had the opportunity to see the addendum referred to in recommendation 2.2.</p> <p>Overall, the Overview & Scrutiny Committee were pleased with the work but disappointed that there was not the opportunity for greater Member involvement in the draft tourism strategy. All Councillors were encouraged to send views to the Economic Development Manager on potential inclusions.</p> <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee asked for a presentation on the Tourism Strategy, to inform Members of its content before it was confirmed.</p> <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee asked the Executive to consult with Town and Parish Councils as early as possible, regarding potential contributions towards the provision of tourism, to ensure this could be incorporated in the setting of their precepts in January/February.</p> | | |
| Executive Response | <p>The Executive decided to agree recommendation 2.5 in the report.</p> <p>It was felt that member involvement in the creation of the strategy should be maintained and the Scrutiny Committees should be used to their full advantage.</p> <p>Councillor Doody, expressed his pleasure at the projects being moved forward and hoped that the co-option with other partners would help to create a thriving industry for the residents, visitors and businesses of Warwick District. He also highlighted that support from the Town</p> | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>Councils was vital and expressed his desire to encourage Royal Leamington Spa Town Council to participate.</p> <p>The members were broadly supportive of the draft strategic principles and hoped that it would create a greater sense of integration allowing all partners to deliver more with less.</p> |
|--|---|

| Item no. | Urgent | Title | Disposal of 21 Church Street, Warwick | Requested by | |
|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|---------------------|--|
| Reason considered | | Because it was an urgent report, the Chairman agreed to take this as it had not been included within the Executive papers. | | | |
| Scrutiny Comment | | <p>The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee felt the proposal was sensible and supported the recommendations in the report.</p> <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report and appreciated why it needed to be presented as an urgent item.</p> <p>The Overview & Scrutiny Committee asked for opinion on the potential for creating a footpath through the car park to the rear of this property, in line with the Warwick Town Centre Action Group, to see if it was financially viable.</p> <p>A minority of members of the Overview & Scrutiny Committee expressed the opinion that this money should be ring fenced for use in Warwick.</p> | | | |
| Executive Response | | <p>Members felt this was a good offer which needed acting on quickly.</p> <p>With respect to the opinion that money should be ring fenced for use in Warwick, this was felt to be too parochial as the District Council is made up of numerous towns, villages and rural areas.</p> <p>There was some discussion regarding the viability of creating a footpath from New Street Car Park into Old Square but it was felt that this could be detrimental to the offer because it could encroach onto the development curtilage.</p> | | | |