

Executive

Minutes of the meeting held on Wednesday 28 November 2018 at the Town Hall, Royal Leamington Spa, at 6.00 pm.

Present: Councillors Mobbs (Leader), Butler, Coker, Grainger, Phillips, Rhead, Thompson and Whiting.

Also present: Councillors: Boad (Liberal Democrat Group Observer), Mrs Falp (Chairman of Overview & Scrutiny Committee); Quinney (Chair of Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee); and Naimo (Labour Group Observer).

94. **Declarations of Interest**

Minute 95 – Europa Way Progress Update and Next Steps

Councillor Butler declared an interest because he was a Life Member of the Leamington Cycling and Athletic Club.

Councillor Mrs Falp declared an interest because she was a Warwickshire County Councillor.

Minute 97 –Budget Review to 30 September 2018

Councillor Butler declared an interest because he was a Board Member as the Council representative for Chase Meadow Community Centre Ltd.

Minute 101 –Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) Licence Conditions and HMO Licencing Cycles – Private Sector Housing

Councillor Thompson declared an interest because he was part of the HMO Task and Finish Group.

Minute 103 –Creative Quarter – Draft Masterplan

Councillor Thompson declared an interest because he was a Royal Leamington Spa Town Councillor.

Minute 107 – Compulsory Purchase Order

Councillor Whiting declared an interest because his wife was a Governor of Kenilworth School and left the room whilst the item was discussed.

Minute 100 –Whitnash Community Hub

Councillor Mrs Falp declared an interest because she was a Whitnash Councillor and left the room whilst the item was discussed.

Minute 104 –10, 12 & 14 Chapel Street, Warwick

Councillor Grainger declared an interest because she was a Trustee of the Warwick School Foundation.

95. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 31 October 2018 were taken as read and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

Part 2

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

96. **Europa Way Progress Update and Next Steps**

The Executive considered a report from the Chief Executive which provided Members with an update on the Europa Way project and also asked them to agree to a number of steps to progress the project forward.

These steps were detailed in full in the report but in summary they included:

- supporting the proposal for a new Secondary School on land off Oakley Wood Road instead of on land to the rear of Myton School, provided a number of points were incorporated, including the provision of dual use of the sports facilities and changes in the proposed country park;
- agreeing to bring a Community Investment Package for the village and parish of Bishop's Tachbrook to help it cope with the proposal above;
- using the land off Europa Way so freed to be used as a primary school for special education needs and for community/education sports facilities i.e. relocation of the Council's athletics track from Edmondscote;
- using the land originally intended for use as a primary school as land for other development including housing;
- agreeing a masterplan for the whole of the area of land to the west of the proposed spine road through the land north of Gallows Hill, as the basis for Planning Applications on this site;
- making an offer to Warwickshire County Council to buy the land referred to above and to obtain a long lease;
- agreeing to sell the five acres of land fronting Gallows Hill for commercial use noting that the sum offered along with another receipt would be enough to pay for the proposed community football stadium;
- agreeing to market the other land that was not required physically for the proposed community stadium;
- agreeing to use part of the existing athletics track and adjoining Council owned land as a new public park and to market part for development, potentially in association with development of the adjoining Guide Dogs establishment;

- agreeing to commence the procurement process in order to progress to RIBA Stage One for the design of the community football stadium and to agree the sum to fund such work;
- agreeing to negotiate with Warwickshire College, South Warwickshire General Hospital Foundation Trust (SWGHT) and with Leamington Football Club (LFC) on design components and cost contributions for the elements they sought to be incorporated within the stadium;
- agreeing to an options appraisal for the delivery of a Gypsy and Traveller site on the existing LFC site;
- agreeing to the principle of creating a new public park at Edmondscote and footpath/cycleway linkages connecting Warwick and Leamington; and
- approving the project timetable, project governance and risk register.

The reasons for each recommendation were provided at Section 3 of the report and additional information was available in the relevant appendices along with a breakdown of each appendix which was detailed at the end of the report.

Recommendation 2.1 of the report related to the progress made on the scheme to date. Members were reminded what the underlying aim of the proposal was and that work had been continuing to progress the Community Football Stadium project and its associated elements. The purchase of land had not yet been completed but it was now expected that the purchase would be completed before Christmas 2018. The main cause of delays had largely been various highway issues that had required resolution prior to purchase in order to mitigate a variety of risks for various, if not all, parties. The Council had also agreed terms for securing an option on the Heathcote Hill farmhouse (previously reported) to help to amalgamate the land ownerships in this vicinity to enable a better form of development and to maximise receipts. A proposal to assist the early delivery of the spine road had also been agreed. Work on the spine road was due to start no later than May 2020 and would be completed a year later.

Both Leamington Football Club (LFC) officials and WDC Officers had continued to progress work on the likely content of the Stadium physically and in service delivery terms. LFC had agreed a partnership with Warwickshire College to develop an Academy and the partnership had, in principle, now extended to the College wanting to develop courses using the facility relating to hospitality and events and some sports components.

In addition, the South Warwickshire General Hospital Foundation Trust (SWGHT) had also expressed a strong interest in both taking space and making a contribution towards the cost for a range of out-patient activities and services which were commensurate with the facility being as much a health and well-being centre as a sports one. This included physiotherapy, podiatry, district and specialist nurses, amounting to 1500m² of space.

The County Council land sale was to two parties – to WDC west of the spine road and to Waterloo Housing Group (WHG) to the east. The spine

road was to be built by WHG and its Development Partner Galliford Try Partnerships (GTP) but would become a public highway. The outline planning permission for the site only required 35% affordable housing but Waterloo would develop the site for 40%, so regaining 5%. The Council had an opportunity to try to regain the remainder of that lost on the Myton Green site to the north where the affordable housing provision required on site was only 33%. Other later sections of the report highlighted the opportunities to do so. In addition, these opportunities also highlighted where the Council may exercise a role as house builder.

Recommendations 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4 of the report related to the issue of the proposed new Secondary School and its impacts. Plan 6 illustrated the proposed extension of Warwick, Leamington and Whitnash by way of amalgamating all the masterplans for the sites approved for development in the Local Plan and now mostly having planning permission.

The proposal involved land to the west of Oakley Wood Road and south of Harbury Lane near the crossroads of those roads with Tachbrook Road, Whitnash. The secondary school would have a sixth form and there would also be a primary school.

The land for these purposes would be enabled to be provided free of any cost to the council taxpayer as adjoining land to the north would be developed for housing.

Plan 6 to the report illustrated how the proposal would change the overall masterplan for the area south of Warwick, Leamington and Whitnash. The significant public benefits of the proposal were:

- a site that would enable the full education provision to be made for the area now and would have some capacity for the future;
- the country park would enable most of the new development and the village of Bishop's Tachbrook to gain access to the school via footpath and cycle route off road;
- the country park would link directly to the village and to the new parts of the parish including the development of the Asps;
- the site could be delivered free of any direct cost to the council taxpayer; and
- re siting the secondary school in this location would enable a more appropriate re-use of the seven hectares reserved for education purposes on land off Europa Way/North of Gallows Hill.

Officers had worked with local Warwick District Council and Warwickshire County Council Councillors and the Parish Council to discuss and consider the proposal and to seek to maximise the community benefits and minimise the community impacts. Issues arising included mitigating traffic through the village via new village centre traffic calming scheme, ensuring the approach to the village along Oakley Wood remained rural in appearance and feel, keeping School buildings and structures to the north of the ridge on the site, ensuring community access to the sports and community facilities via a dual agreement etc.

Some elements of the above would be addressed by way of S106 Agreement and / or CIL, but in order to give assurance to the local community that in supporting the proposal its concerns were understood and would be addressed, it was proposed that officers and local Members worked with Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council to prepare a Community Investment Package. This would be reported to the Executive for approval at a later meeting.

Recommendation 2.5 of the report related to the approval of the Masterplan. On the basis of the proposed secondary school proposal coming forward on land off Oakley Wood Road, it allowed the new primary school on land north of Gallows Hill (which was also required) to be located on the seven hectares close to Myton School, on the land which up to now had been allocated for use as a new secondary school. This change freed up the whole of the land to the west of the spine road and the north of Gallows Hill for the Community Stadium and enabling development. Although the seven hectares had been identified for secondary school use, the S106 agreement also allowed the land to be used for primary education, special needs education and community/sports usage.

In June 2018, the Executive agreed to procure a masterplan/development brief for the land to the west of the spine road on land north of Gallows Hill to be funded from the Local Plan Implementation Reserve. This work was subject to a procurement exercise and FWP (Frank Whittle Partnership) were appointed. FWP with Warwick District Council and Warwickshire County Council officers had involved a wide range of organisations. That work had led to the Master Plan shown as Appendix A to the report. The adoption of the Master Plan as the basis for Supplementary Planning Guidance would provide the policy template for the uses of the land and was crucial to the successful development of the site and construction of the Community Stadium. Much of the rest of what was proposed in this report flowed from the acceptance of the Master Plan for the site.

It was intended that the relocated Athletics Track and the adjoining school facilities and to a degree the stadium/school car parking could be run in a fashion so that the opportunities for the community and for local schools could be maximised. Given the proximity to Myton School, there was the opportunity to create a second pedestrian/cycle access to the school and to the existing dual use sports facilities, as well as an opportunity to enhance its facilities. It was suggested that this dialogue be pursued and reported upon further.

Recommendations 2.6, 2.7 and 2.8 of the report related to the consequences of the relocation of the athletics track and to maximising the opportunities that the consequences gave rise to.

Within the next ten years, in order to keep the existing athletics track up to its current standard, a significant amount of money would need to be spent. This arose from the recurring damage it had suffered over the years from flooding and general wear and tear. However, the track was not as well used as it might have been and a large part of that was due to its relatively inaccessible location. Whilst schools used it for special

events, it was not used on a regular basis by them. Discussions with the groups using the track revealed strong support for relocating the track to this new, more accessible location and one where it would be more open to school/day time use. It was suggested therefore that in principle, the relocation of the current athletics track to land north of Gallows Hill, as shown in the Masterplan, be agreed.

The relocation of the athletics track raised the question of the Council's future intentions for the current site. The site was largely within a flood plain and would not be able to be developed. It was also an attractive site adjoining another public open space, albeit one not well landscaped or used. The Council owned land on the other side of the river and owned open space on the other side of the adjoining site to the west. In between, there was land owned by the Guide Dogs Association. Plan Two to the report illustrated the land concerned.

The Guide Dogs Association had indicated that it wanted to explore the possibility of relocating their operation elsewhere within the District and to redevelop their current site. This opened up the possibility of a joint redevelopment of part of the athletics track site – i.e. that from the pavilion to the north and west, with the upper part of the Guide Dogs site then the larger part of the athletics track and the riverside part of the Guide Dogs site could be brought together with other Council owned land to the east and west to form a new continuous riverside park. This could lead to a complete off-road footpath/cycle route between Warwick and Leamington; and indeed beyond to the east, using the existing national cycleway route to the old railway line where (once a bridge was restored over the Fosse Way), this would give an off-road route all the way to Draycote Water and then on to Rugby, with a spur to Southam. If a route through Castle Park could be secured, then there would be an opportunity to create a footpath/cycle toward Stratford. Via a link to the canal system, such a route could be extended north westward toward Hatton and Lapworth. It was suggested that the principle of the creation of a new riverside public park as shown on Plan Two to the report, be agreed.

Recommendations 2.9, 2.10 and 2.11 of the report related to the commencement of the implementation of the Community Football Stadium scheme.

It was proposed that programme management, design and associated work for the Community Stadium should be commissioned to go to RIBA Stage One up to a maximum of £100,000. This work would be tendered. It was proposed that this be funded from a sum of £190,000 previously allocated to the Europa Way Strategic Opportunity from the Community Projects Reserve.

In addition, in association with LFC, the Council would now need to negotiate how the other parties e.g. Warwickshire College and South Warwickshire General Hospital Foundation Trust (SWGHT) would contribute to the scheme. It was proposed that this process commenced and a report be brought to a subsequent meeting of the Executive.

Recommendations 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15 and 2.16 of the report sought to implement those aspects of the Masterplan which were outside of those elements needed to implement the Stadium proposal.

In order to implement the Masterplan, the Council would need to seek a long lease at a peppercorn rent from Warwickshire County Council to accommodate the athletics track; it would also need to negotiate School/community access for that facility and also of the adjoining school facilities including vehicular access and parking rights; continue a dialogue with Myton School and agree to market the remainder of the land it would have assembled from Warwickshire County Council and the farmhouse. On this issue, the Council could consider either developing the housing itself in view of its affordable housing ambitions or seeking a higher than 40% level of affordable housing, either of which would have a downward impact on land values.

Recommendations 2.16 and 2.17 of the report related to land not forming part of the Masterplan but which did relate to aspects of the scheme in its entirety and would help to deliver the key elements relating to a new public park, a gypsy and traveller site and to bringing more land forward for affordable housing.

In moving the athletics track from its current site off Edmondscote Road to a location close to the Stadium, it would be possible to sell part of the Edmondscote Road site. The most likely use for this land would be for housing. The site was not land-locked, as there was access off River Close. However, the land would be likely to be more valuable if it was marketed jointly with land on the adjacent site, which was currently owned by the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association.

The Guide Dogs for the Blind Association was discussing the matter with the District Council and was open to the idea, as it wished to rationalise its land-holdings in the District, as well as nationally. If a joint marketing exercise and sale could be arranged, then the higher land on both sites could be sold for housing, whilst the lower parts of both sites would be used to create a new public park beside the Rivers Leam and Avon. Such a park would link up several existing land ownerships of the Council, and make a significant contribution to the creation of continuous public open space alongside the rivers of the District. It was proposed to continue these discussions to agree terms for a joint marketing exercise, to undertake it and then to report the outcomes to a subsequent meeting of the Executive.

One of the wider benefits of the proposal to relocate LFC's home on Harbury Lane to the proposed Community Football Stadium was that once the new stadium was complete and transferred to LFC, it would then be possible to use its existing site as a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site, which had been a planning priority for the Council for some years. The Council and the Club had agreed that the Council could purchase the Harbury Land site from the Club when the Community Stadium was ready for their use. As the project was now moving forward, it was considered appropriate for the Council to proceed with examining options on how it would seek to deliver such a use and the likely costs involved.

Recommendations 2.18, 2.19, 2.20 and 2.21 of the report related to the project governance, project plan, risk register and member involvement.

The Project Timetable showed the key milestones in order to deliver the project in 2022. This would be reviewed regularly throughout the programme, and particularly on the appointment of the external project management company.

The Risk Register was an important document in the management of this complex and inter-dependant project. This would also be regularly reviewed and updated so that it could remain a dynamic document and central to the control of risk within the project.

A robust Project Governance structure was required to ensure the project stayed on track and all key Stakeholders and Consultees were engaged with the project and clear about roles and responsibilities. The proposed structure that was shown as Appendix F to the report sought to ensure proper engagement and clarity of process and communications.

This project was a very high profile project for the Council and carried a significant prospect of enhancing the reputation of the District Council and the District. However, there was also a significant reputational risk to this project, and national experience showed that it was particularly important to get all the critical details right in a Community Football Stadium project. It was therefore important that Members maintained a close scrutiny of the progress of the project. It was proposed to establish a Members' Working Group for the Community Football Stadium, with membership determined in accordance with the group proportions plus the lead Portfolio holder.

It was made clear that all of this work on the proposed Community Football Stadium would be undertaken in very close association with LFC.

Recommendation 2.22 of the report sought to promote openness and transparency.

Some time ago when the project was first being discussed, a Freedom of Information request was received about the sums of money being proposed to bid for the site being purchased from Warwickshire County Council. At that time, it was considered that such information was still commercially sensitive as the negotiations had not then been concluded. The matter was taken as far as the Information Commissioners Office (ICO). The Council did agree to make that information available once the negotiations had been concluded, i.e. the agreements signed and sealed. It was proposed that this approach be agreed in advance for all the transactions.

With regards to Recommendation 2.23 of the report, it was clear that this area of work contained many different elements. All were closely related and a number of them were of a significant size and complexity. All contained significant reputational risk for the Council. The Council had previously agreed to the appointment of a Community Stadium Project Officer, who took up his post on 21 May 2018 and who was closely involved in this project. However, the main focus of the job description

was to deliver a successful Community Stadium and it would not be possible for him to concentrate on this key aim if he was attempting to deliver all the elements of the work stream described in this report.

It was therefore proposed to agree in principle to the creation of a new, fixed-term post for an officer to work with the Community Stadium Project Officer to help co-ordinate and deliver the broad spread of work described here. They would also help with other aspects of the Leisure Development Programme, according to where the key work streams and pressures were at any given time.

As this was a new post, it was proposed to wait until the production of the budget report in February 2019 in order to agree a source for the funding for this post in the annual budget process. The appointment was obviously subject to the approval of the Employment Committee for the temporary increase in establishment. The delay until the new financial year would also enable this approval to be sought.

In terms of alternative options, the Council could decide not to proceed with some or all of the elements proposed in the report. However, each element proposed sought to maximise the strategic benefits of the opportunity presented by the site to the west of the spine road and north of Gallows Hill and these benefits would be lost if any proposal is rejected.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report and suggested the inclusion of an amendment to recommendation 2.21 in the report, which the Portfolio Holder agreed he would bring forward to the Executive meeting. Councillor Mrs Falp had not voted on this item at Overview & Scrutiny Committee because she was a Warwickshire County Council member.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report whilst noting that marketing of the consultation was key and needed to be persuasive and well explained. In addition, Members highlighted the importance of setting up the capital accounting to avoid future complexity of year end processes and requested that resources were investigated to ensure this happened.

Councillor Phillips thanked the Overview & Scrutiny Committee and the Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee for their support.

It was explained by the Chief Executive Officer that although this item was included as a Part One item, on reflection, this should have been included in Part Two and not Part One because there would be a subsequent report providing further financial implications on this matter.

The Portfolio Holder for Housing & Property agreed the amendment as proposed by the Overview & Scrutiny Committee, to delete everything after *set out for this project* at recommendation 2.21 in the report.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that

- (1) the progress on the Community Football Stadium project generally and in particular the purchase of the land from the County Council, the intended inclusion of health and education service activities within the proposed community football stadium complex, the earlier delivery of the spine road and the prospect of enhancing the affordable housing provision, are noted;
- (2) the principle of locating the new planned secondary school on a site at Oakley Wood Road, Bishop's Tachbrook (Plan One) to replace the proposal on land to the rear of Myton School, provided that a number of key aspects are included such as: securing dual use of the sports/community facilities; position of buildings north of the ridge; and access/integration with adjacent public open space; as set out in paragraph 3.3.7 of the report, is supported;
- (3) continuing the dialogue with Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council to develop a Community Investment Package to address a range of community impact issues and opportunities connected to the Secondary School proposal as set out in the report and to report to a later meeting of the Executive for approval, is agreed;
- (4) the recommended responses to the 29 recommendations contained within the WYG report, as set out in Appendix Three to the report, are agreed, and authority is delegated to officers to submit a planning application for up to 80 spaces at Riverside House to be made available for public parking on weekdays during the displacement period;
- (5) the Master Plan for the land west of the spine road and north of Gallows Hill as shown in Appendix A to the report as the basis for Planning Applications for this area, is adopted;
- (6) the relocation of the athletics track and ancillary facilities currently located at a site off Edmondscote Road to a new site as shown on

the Masterplan at Appendix A to the report, is agreed in principle;

- (7) the creation of a new public park on the floodplain land next to the Rivers Leam and Avon on the land shown on Plan Two to the report, is agreed in principle;
- (8) a detailed business case on the recommendations (6) and (7) is to be prepared for approval at a future meeting of the Executive to be funded by a sum of up to £50,000 to be taken from a virement from a sum of £190,000 previously allocated to the Europa Way Strategic Opportunity from the Community Projects Reserve;
- (9) spending up to £100,000 from a sum of £190,000 previously allocated to the Europa Way Strategic Opportunity from the Community Projects Reserve in order to progress to RIBA Stage One for the design of the Community Football Stadium to include procuring of professional services including architects and external project management, to cover legal costs and to undertake essential surveys of the relevant site, is agreed;
- (10) the procurement and appointment of professional services including architects and external project management for the Community Football Stadium project is undertaken and design work commenced;
- (11) negotiations be entered into with Warwickshire College and South Warwickshire General Hospital Foundation Trust (SWGHT), in association with Leamington Football Club, on the content of their elements within the Community Football Stadium and a report be submitted to the Executive at a subsequent meeting;
- (12) a long lease is negotiated from Warwickshire County Council for part of the seven hectares allocated for educational use in order to relocate the District's athletics track and ancillary sports facilities for use by the community, local schools and Leamington Football Club as shown on the Masterplan at Appendix A, on terms to be agreed by the Chief Executive, Head of Cultural Services and

the Head of Finance in consultation with the Portfolio Holders for Housing and Property, Culture and Finance and to report to the Executive for final approval;

- (13) the terms for school/community access of the relocated athletics track and school facilities and for mutual vehicular access/parking with WCC, Schools and existing sports clubs, are agreed;
- (14) a dialogue will continue with Myton School on the potential for enhancement of their facilities and for achieving school/community access of any new facilities and vice versa on the athletics track and report will be submitted to the Executive at a subsequent meeting;
- (15) marketing the land shown on the Master Plan (Appendix A) in the report in appropriate parcels, in order to establish the preferred purchaser(s), based on the offers made and to report the conclusions of this exercise to a subsequent meeting of the Executive, is agreed;
- (16) authority is delegated to the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Housing and Property and Finance portfolio holders, to enter into negotiations with the Guide Dogs for the Blind Association for the joint marketing of land off Edmondscote Road; to carry out the marketing; and a report on the conclusions of the marketing be submitted to a subsequent meeting of the Executive for approval;
- (17) the Council will explore options on how to bring forward a permanent Gypsy and Traveller site at land at Harbury Lane currently owned by Leamington Football Club and shown on Plan Five and will report on the conclusions to a subsequent meeting of the Executive;
- (18) the Project Timetable to develop the Community Football Stadium and associated commercial development land attached as Appendix D to the report, is approved;

- (19) the Risk Register for the project attached as Appendix E to the report, is agreed;
- (20) the Project Governance Structure for the project attached as Appendix F to the report, is agreed;
- (21) a Members Working Group made up of representatives of all political groups plus the portfolio holder for Housing and Property Services is set up for this project;
- (22) following the conclusion of negotiations the main details of land purchases and disposals, i.e. sums of money involved will be made publicly available, ; and
- (23) funding for a Sports and Leisure Projects Officer to work with the Leisure Development Programme team for a period of four years, to assist with the delivery of the complex and inter-related work programme described in this report, subject to funding being agreed in the Annual Budget Report in February 2019, is agreed in principle, subject to Employment Committee approving the amendment to the establishment.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Phillips)
Forward Plan reference 962

Part 1

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

97. Budget Review to 30 September 2018

The Executive considered a report from Finance regarding the budget review to 30 September 2018. Since the Budgets were reported on to Executive in August 2018, various changes had been identified and were now presented to Members for their approval and to inform them of the latest financial position for both 2018/19 and in the medium term. The Medium Term Financial Strategy was also included in that report –the purpose of this Report was to update Members on changes since August.

This was the second report updating Members on the 2018/2019 Budgets since they approved the Original Budgets in February 2018.

The Accountancy team had worked with the Budget Managers and several Variations had been identified with the Budget being amended accordingly. A table showing those variations reported for quarter one was included at Section 3.1.1 of the report.

Appendix D to the report detailed the salary variations (£77,800 adverse) currently being reported.

The Housing Revenue Account revenue had changed from a forecast underspend of £49,700 to an adverse variation of £139,000, made up of several variations detailed at Section 3.3 of the report.

With regards to the Contingency Budget, Appendix A provided details of the allocations out of this budget with a balance of £140,000 (at 30 September 2018). The full details regarding Chase Meadow Community Centre – Emergency Funding were detailed at Section 3.4 of the report.

Appendix B showed a detailed breakdown over several years of the Council's Major Income Budgets. The first six months' actuals had been profiled to project the potential out-turn for 2018/19, based upon prior year.

Recommendation 2.4 of the report related to Earmarked Reserves Requests upon the 2017/18 closure of Accounts which had been approved under delegated authority by the Head of Finance in conjunction with the Finance Portfolio Holder. These Earmarked reserves were attached as Appendix C to the report and showed expenditure to date equating to just under 30% of the budget.

Recommendation 2.5 outlined a number of proposed changes to the Capital Budget, as identified in Section 3.7 of the report.

Recommendation 2.6 requested that Members note the latest forecast savings (£659,000) to be identified and achieved by 2023/24. Full details were supplied in Sections 3.8.1 – 3.8.13 of the report. This included a table summarising the first quarter changes reported in August and a table showing the profile of savings requirement.

Members would be kept informed of further changes as part of the January and February Budget Setting Reports.

Within the Final Accounts report to Executive in July 2018, the surplus for the year was reported at £938,000. The surplus was allocated to the General Fund Balance for appropriation during 2018/19. The figure was subject to the on-going work to finalise the Statement of Accounts and the audit thereof. With the audit virtually concluded, the adjusted surplus for the year was £914,000.

It had been recognised that the Shared Information Governance Manager Role with Stratford District Council was working well for both Councils. There was an initial two year agreement to trial this to ensure it worked successfully. Reviewing this, both Councils now wished to make the arrangement permanent via an agreed Service Level Agreement. Therefore, half of the service was sought which at this time was £20,000.

The report also recommended to Council that Low Volatility Net Asset Value Funds (LVNAV) be added to the Council's Investment Counterparty list with immediate effect and the reasons for this were outlined in paragraphs 3.11.1 to 3.11.3 of the report.

Monitoring expenditure and income and maintaining financial projections was good financial management and part of good governance. Accordingly, to propose otherwise was not considered.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report.

The Portfolio Holder, Councillor Whiting, emphasised the fact that the Council needed to find extra savings in order to preserve the assets in the Council's care, in addition to the savings already being planned and made.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that

- (1) the latest variances for the General Fund budget, the projected outturn on budget and approve the budget changes detailed in paragraph 3.1 of the report, are noted;
- (2) the latest variances for the Housing Revenue Account, the projected outturn and approve the budget changes detailed in paragraph 3.3 of the report, are noted;
- (3) an emergency payment of £11,500 to Chase Meadow Community Centre Ltd is approved from the Contingency Budget for 2018/19 to cover staffing and service charge costs up to the end of this current financial year;
- (4) the spend to date on Earmarked Reserves brought forward from 2017/18, paragraph 3.6 of the report, is noted;
- (5) changes to the Capital Programme, including the slippage to 2019/20 and the saving for 2018/19, paragraph 3.7 of the report, are agreed;
- (6) the latest forecast savings (£659,000) to be identified and achieved by 2023/24 as shown within the Medium Term Financial Strategy, paragraph 3.8 of the report, are noted;
- (7) the £914,000 2017/18 surplus is allocated as in section 3.9 of the report;

- (8) the recurrent revenue costs for the Shared Information Governance Manager and the one off cost for the Committee Management System are agreed; and

RECOMMENDS that

- (9) Low Volatility Net Asset Value Funds (LVNAV) are added to the Council's Investment Counterparty list with immediate effect as outlined in paragraphs 3.11.1 to 3.11.3 in the report.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Whiting)
Forward Plan reference 983

Part 2

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

98. Covent Garden Displacement Plan

The Executive considered a report from Neighbourhood Services providing an update on the progress made in implementing the proposals agreed by Executive on 7 February 2018 and the recommendations made by the independent parking specialists (WYG), jointly commissioned by the Council and BID Leamington to review the draft displacement plan proposals.

Members were aware from the statements made at Council on 14 November 2018 that the final consideration of the Head Quarters (HQ) relocation project would no longer be considered on the agenda for this Executive meeting. It was now intended to present these to an Executive meeting in January and any funding proposals would be considered by Council in February, on dates yet to be arranged. Consequently, it was now unlikely that the Covent Garden car parks would close before March 2019.

The Council had given a commitment to local businesses that its displacement plan would be finalised, widely communicated and that the supporting staffing and signage arrangements would be in place before the car parks closed.

Members were reminded that the Executive approved proposals to create additional public car parking provision on Warwick District Council land at Court Street, Archery Road, Princes Drive and Riverside House. Planning applications had subsequently been submitted and considered by the November Planning Committee in respect of the first two sites, with the latter two due to be considered by Planning Committee on 11 December 2018.

The application for the creation of a formal 66 space car park at Archery Road, to replace the existing informal area which had capacity for 47 vehicles, was refused by the Planning Committee contrary to officer recommendation. Officers were currently reviewing the reasons for refusal and were planning to re-submit an application for the lighting associated with a smaller, formalised car park for consideration by the January Planning Committee. Some works could be carried out under permitted development rights.

The application to extend the existing surface car park at Court Street, with the creation of an additional 42 parking bays was granted. Construction work was underway, managed by the Council's specialist construction consultant, and it was anticipated that this would be completed by the end of January 2019.

The application for the proposed extension at the existing Princes Drive car park, at the western end of Victoria Park would, if approved, create a further 30 parking spaces in addition to the existing 64 bays.

The planning application for the Riverside House car park was to allow it to be used for public car parking at weekends during the whole of the displacement period. This application had been submitted by the Council's Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) 'PSP Warwick LLP' rather than the Council itself. Subject to approval, it would provide a minimum of 260 public parking spaces at weekends.

The LLP had requested that, to allow it to deliver its S106 obligations in respect of the planning consents it obtained for the Riverside House and Covent Garden sites, changes be made to the existing parking arrangements at St. Peter's multi-storey car park with, as previously reported, increased prioritisation for short-stay visitors.

The Council had agreed that dedicated short stay parking would be made available at the point that the Covent Garden car parks closed. It was currently proposed to dedicate the lower floors of the car park to short stay car parking (maximum stay of three hours) with the remaining floors being available for unrestricted, all-day parking and for season ticket holders. However, it was proposed that this initial allocation of floors would be reviewed throughout the displacement period, allowing future variations of short stay/long stay designation to be made, based on actual demand.

To facilitate this, flexibility of use the Pay on Foot management system would be temporarily removed and replaced by Pay and Display machines when the proposed changes were implemented in the New Year. Design work on the location of payment machines and new car park signage was being progressed. All necessary work would be ready in advance of the closure of the Covent Garden car parks.

The July Executive approved proposals to recruit additional front line and back office staff to support the implementation of the displacement plan.

A permanent Project Manager had been appointed and was in post, and would be lead officer for the development and delivery of the Displacement Plan. Two additional Rangers had also been recruited to provide resilience during the displacement period and would be in post from December 2018. Interviews had taken place for the Business Support Officer posts and one person had been appointed so far. Further rounds of recruitment would take place to fill the remaining vacant posts.

Comprehensive and clear signage of the locations of car parks would be a critical element of the displacement plan. A specialist traffic management company had been engaged to devise an appropriate signage strategy. They had proposed that a series of information signs be erected at the locations, set out at Appendix One to the report, and retained throughout the duration of the closure period for the Covent Garden site. The signs were currently being prepared and would be erected prior to the date of the closures, once that date had been finalised. In addition, advanced warning signs would be installed at key locations prior to the Covent Garden car parks being closed to provide advanced public notice regarding the timescales for closure.

In addition, Warwickshire County Council's (WCC) Traffic and Road Safety Group had been commissioned to design and install new permanent highway signage to complement the temporary signage. Permanent changes to the highway signage would be made in advance of the proposed closure of Covent Garden car parks.

The provision of clear information, made widely available to local businesses and visitors, before and during the displacement period was of the utmost importance to the success of the Plan.

The draft communications strategy, set out at Appendix Two to the report, recognised that a comprehensive plan was multi-disciplinary, required input from external stakeholders and was multi-stranded. The draft shown was illustrative only and both the content and dates within it would change as it was developed further. To support this, a work Communications Group had been established, comprising officers from the Economic Development and Events teams within Development Services, the Car Parking team within Neighbourhood Services and the Media team within the Chief Executive's Office. External stakeholders such as WCC, BID Leamington, Leamington Chamber of Trade, bus companies and other relevant partners would also be invited to join this group.

The further development of the draft communications strategy would be guided by the appointment of an external specialist as detailed in section 3.2 of the report.

BID Leamington and other stakeholders had recommended that the Council engage a locally based independent marketing expert to review the effectiveness of the current proposals for the communication of the displacement plan, given the importance of ensuring that communication was timely, appropriate and effective.

This constructive suggestion had been welcomed and, at the time of writing, the process of engaging a local company was underway.

The brief for the appointed company was attached in Appendix Four to the report.

Members were reminded that, following concerns raised by stakeholders as to the adequacy of the proposed displacement plan, independent transport management specialists, WYG, had been jointly appointed by Warwick District Council and BID Leamington to review the draft proposals.

WYG had undertaken an extensive analysis of the impact of the Covent Garden closure, assessed how the current capacity lost at the site (468 parking spaces) could be replaced elsewhere in the town and made a series of recommendations as to how the draft Plan could be strengthened prior to its implementation.

The WYG report's Executive Summary was available on the Council's website and a link was available in the report.

In broad terms, the WYG report concluded that the proposed displacement plan would replace the loss of spaces from Covent Garden in full but that there would be an imbalance between short and long-stay provision. It also highlighted the change to the geographical distribution of parking with limited displacement capacity available in the north of the town centre.

In their report, WYG made 29 recommendations on how additional capacity could be created during the displacement period, how the imbalance of provision they had identified could be addressed, with signage improved and a robust communication strategy implemented to ensure that the Plan addressed the needs of different users and effectively managed parking in the town during the temporary closure period to minimise its impact on visitors to Leamington and for the local business community.

If all the recommendations within the WYG report were adopted in full, the impact on the available capacity within the town would be as shown in Table 1 in the report. This was based on average parking space availability at peak times (1pm on weekdays and 1pm at weekends). Additionally, the WYG assessment of alternative car park supply provided both a 100% and 85% sensitivity test. At 100% it assumed every car park space was used, however, guidance from the Chartered Institute of Highway Transportation suggested 85% was a more appropriate target to limit search time for spaces. The table set out the position at the start of the proposed displacement period, i.e. prior to the opening of the 100 space public car parking provision at Station Approach in November 2019. The supply figures for the alternative provision available included a (prudent) estimate of spare capacity in existing on-street and off-street parking locations, the new provision envisaged in the initial draft Plan and the additional capacity that would be created were all the WYG

recommendations to be adopted. The resultant position was shown in Table 1 in the report.

However, officers had concluded that not all the recommendations made by WYG were either capable of implementation, nor would it be prudent to do so. The recommendations and the proposed WDC responses to them were set out at Appendix Three to the report.

In summary, the recommendations relating to the creation of new car parking capacity that could not be implemented were:

- the creation of an additional 19 parking spaces at Archery Road. The refusal of the application to create a formal 66 bay car park by Planning Committee now meant that circa 47 spaces could be made available at this site. Due to seasonal demand from park users, these spaces would only be available during autumn and winter months, therefore these figures had not been included;
- the recommendation for ten new on-street parking spaces at Leam Terrace had been ruled out by WCC following consultation;
- the recommendation in respect of changes to the on-street parking provision at Newbold Terrace had been ruled out due to a need to ensure sufficient levels of long-stay parking availability;
- the recommendation in respect of changes to the on-street parking provision at Newbold Terrace East was being progressed through a pre-planning process presently but was subject to some significant potential challenges due to its location. As such was considered prudent not to include the figures in capacity forecasts at this point.

The impact of these proposed responses was shown in Table Two in the report.

However, officers had also identified options to create additional capacity that did not feature in the WYG report figures but had been included in Table Two in the report. These included the 50 spaces to be provided at Riverside House in the week for use by season ticket holders, the creation of an additional 20 spaces through changes to the layout of the car park at Riverside House, and some additional spaces at Chandos Street Car Park.

In addition to the options being explored, a detailed assessment of the potential to create additional, temporary, parking capacity at the Edmonscote Track was proposed.

It was estimated that the site could potentially provide circa 80 additional spaces, although planning consent would be required. Initial discussions had identified potential concerns regarding the current open aspect of the site and its relationship to the flood zone but it was considered feasible to bring forward a temporary application even if the site would need to be restored to current use at the end of the temporary period.

If temporary provision could be created at the site, it could assist with the summer seasonal pressure identified in the WYG report by providing a

short-term seasonal parking option during August when the National Bowls was taking place and 'Park and Stride' public parking for major events such as the Peace Festival, Food and Drink festival and Art in the Park.

However, the main benefit would be to free up capacity for additional long stay parking provision throughout the displacement period. Offering this site to Warwick District Council staff as a 'Park and Stride' option would free up additional weekday public parking provision at Riverside House, over and above the current proposal for a minimum 50 public spaces for season ticket holders.

It was, therefore, recommended that, subject to the successful conclusion of the necessary feasibility work, a planning application be submitted as soon as possible.

However, this location was unlikely to provide suitable parking during the Christmas shopping period, the other period of seasonal pressure identified during the WYG report. It was, therefore, proposed that officers explore the provision of a free to use weekend only Park and Ride service during the Christmas 2019 period to bring shoppers into Leamington town centre.

Discussions were progressing with Warwickshire College, which could provide circa 500 spaces, but other locations would also be investigated.

The proposals regarding the implementation of some of the new proposals contained within the WYG report's recommendations and the cost of any suitable works at Edmondscote Track would fall outside the existing budget provision made available following previous reports on the displacement strategy.

The estimated costs of ground reinforcement works and lighting at Edmondscote Track were estimated at £60,000 and the cost of marking out of on-street parking bays at Portland Place East and Portland Place to create circa 70 additional spaces was estimated at £20,000.

The potential cost of a seasonal, free to use, Park and Ride service for the Christmas/New Year period 2019/20 was estimated at £50,000.

It was proposed that these costs be met from the Car Parks Repairs and Maintenance Reserve but it would be prudent to allow for a small contingency of £20,000 for costs arising from any of the work proposed for the Displacement Plan.

However, there was also one other significant expense associated with the WYG recommendations, relating to the potential upgrade of the existing variable message signs (VMS), owned by WCC, to support roads users to find available and appropriate parking spaces.

The opportunity to upgrade the VMS to incorporate adaptable free text signage would allow for greater flexibility in the highways messaging

provided on key routes into the town centre. This would not only be of benefit during the displacement period, but would also provide an on-going benefit during future years when major events were taking place and, of course, during the lead up to and delivery of the Commonwealth Games events.

The estimated cost of this upgrade was circa £175k which was not currently funded. Officers were refining the business case for this work and would submit a proposal for consideration prior to the closure of the Covent Garden car parks.

The Council had given a commitment to local businesses that its Displacement Plan (except relating to the new Station Approach car park; Newbold Terrace East additional parking; and the park and stride facility at the Edmondscote Track; none of which were accounted for in Table Two in the report) would have been finalised, widely communicated and that the supporting staffing and signage arrangements would be in place before the car parks closed.

A further report confirming that all the necessary arrangements were in place would, therefore, be presented as part of the decision making process on the relocation project.

In terms of alternatives, the option to implement all of the recommendations from the parking consultant had been considered but this was not considered to be achievable or necessarily desirable upon consideration of advice from partner agencies and the impact adoption of the declined recommendation would have on the availability of short and long stay parking capacity.

Suggestions had been made by Councillors and by the local Chamber of Trade regarding the timing of any decision on the HQ scheme and closure of Covent Garden car park and by extension, of the Displacement Plan. However, as the Covent Garden car park had Alkaline Silica Reaction (ASR) and the monthly testing indicated that this was spreading, there was a real risk that a deferral could see the car park having to close because the ASR had spread to an extent that made the whole facility unsafe. Therefore, regardless of the decision on the HQ proposal itself, the work on the Displacement Plan should proceed in any event. It would, of course, also add circa 300 additional parking spaces to the town's stock on a permanent basis.

An addendum circulated at the meeting advised of revisions to recommendation 2.4 and paragraphs 3.3.11 and 3.3.12 in the report.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee and the Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committees supported the recommendations in the report.

Councillor Mrs Grainger thanked the officers for the work they had put into getting the report ready and she stated she now felt comfortable with the proposal. The Portfolio Holder proposed the recommendations with the amendments laid out in the addendum.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that

- (1) the progress made on the previously agreed proposals, last considered when an update report was presented to the July Executive, is noted, in respect of:
 - the provision of additional public car parking capacity at WDC owned sites at Archery Road, Court Street, Princes Drive and Riverside House;
 - the revised allocation of long and short stay car parking spaces at the St. Peters multi-storey car park;
 - the recruitment of additional staff to support the management and delivery of the car parking displacement plan;
 - the delivery of an effective signage strategy to ensure smooth traffic flows and clear information on parking options;
 - the development of a communications plan to ensure there are clear messages about parking availability and Leamington being “open for business” during the displacement period;
- (2) an independent marketing specialist is being commissioned to assist the Council to develop the marketing and communication strategy for the displacement period;
- (3) the findings of the specialist parking consultant, WYG, jointly engaged by Warwick District Council and BID Leamington to review the effectiveness of the Warwick District Council’s draft Displacement Plan., and the recommendations they have made on how this should be strengthened, as set out in section 3.3 of the report, are noted;
- (4) the recommended responses to the 29 recommendations contained within the WYG report, as set out in Appendix 3 to the report, are approved, and authority is delegated to officers to submit a planning application for up to 80 spaces at Riverside House to be made available for public parking on weekdays during the displacement period;
- (5) the provision of additional temporary car park capacity at the Edmondscote Track is explored

in detail and that the necessary planning consents are submitted, subject to the outcome of the current feasibility work, and the provision of a seasonal park and ride service is explored further, as set out in section 3.4 of the report, is agreed;

- (6) releasing funding of up to £150,000 from the Car Parks Repairs and Maintenance Reserve to fund the delivery of the additional recommendations not currently within the proposed Displacement Plan, is agreed; and
- (7) the commitment given by the Council to local businesses that the Covent Garden car parks will not be closed until the Displacement Plan has been finalised and that a further update on progress will be provided as part of the final reports that will be presented to Executive and Council in early 2019 on the outcome of the Stage One work on the relocation project, is noted.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Mrs Grainger)
Forward Plan reference 979

99. **Recording & Broadcasting of Council Meetings**

The Executive considered a report from Democratic Services informing the Executive of the outcome of investigations carried out by Officers into the feasibility of recording Warwick District Council Executive, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings and broadcasting them digitally via the internet.

The Town Hall was managed by the Council's Arts Section and was primarily used by the Council for its public meetings. The Council Chamber was also used for other Warwick District Council functions such as planning inquiries which used the Audio Visual (AV) system to record meetings. The Council Chamber and Assembly Hall were also hired by Royal Leamington Spa Town Council for annual council meetings and mayor making. When rooms at the Town Hall were not in use by the Councils, they were hired for events.

The current AV system had been in use in the Town Hall Council Chamber for over twelve years. When originally installed, the system comprised of three operational cameras (two of which could move their focus and track to pre-programmed points in the room and one fixed view camera). The two tracking cameras were based on a pre-set digital ground plan of the Council Chamber and mapped to specific locations in the room where microphones were placed. This had limited value because it required fixed locations and should the microphone be moved or the room set up changed, the camera did not track to the new position. In addition, these two cameras ceased to be operational over five years ago as the

technology to support the modes became obsolete and they subsequently failed.

The ability of the AV system in the Council Chamber to record meetings was now limited to a single fixed point camera mounted by the data projector under the public gallery which, while it had a wide angle lens, did not capture the whole of the room. The recording quality of the camera was not sufficient to operate in low level lighting conditions (for example during presentations to Planning Committee). The audio functionality of the system was restricted because the microphone base stations used a wireless bandwidth that was very narrow and therefore was susceptible to interference from other Wi-Fi networks within the vicinity of the Town Hall and Town Centre. Despite its age, the system remained useable in its current form due to the current support contract that was in place.

The majority of common issues experienced with the AV system could be attributed to the inconsistent volume of those addressing the meeting or users not speaking directly into the microphone, so their voice could not be picked up and amplified. This latter problem may not be fully resolved by introducing a new system and would require a greater understanding of microphone technique by those addressing meetings.

Council meetings video recordings that were held in the Council Chamber were recorded onto a hard drive from which DVDs were created. These were then held on a master file with Democratic Services for twelve months before being securely destroyed.

The current AV system could be used to transmit a video and audio feed through to the Assembly Hall. This had been used on several occasions when demand to attend Council meetings had been greater than the capacity of the public gallery (a maximum of 35 people). However, upon assessment from two of the industry's leading suppliers, the current system could not be used or adapted to securely broadcast meetings to the internet.

The Council did not have any recording / broadcasting facilities within Rooms 21, 18 or 11. In order to enable this, either a purpose built system would need to be installed, or a small, table-top recording device would have to be used. Democratic Services officers had experimented with the latter option but it would not be of a sufficient standard to broadcast to the public. It was also considered that due to the significantly poor quality of these solutions, they would not be appropriate for use by the Council unless in an emergency situation i.e. for an urgent licensing panel when the Council Chamber was unavailable. The addition of more advanced recording/broadcasting facilities in these rooms had not been considered at this stage on the advice of external suppliers, as the associated costs would be prohibitive.

With regard to the Assembly Hall, only the microphone base stations could be transferred from the Council Chamber. There was no method of

recording either the audio or visuals of meetings that took place in the Assembly Hall.

Before purchasing its own AV solution, Warwickshire County Council (WCC) had experimented by broadcasting their meetings live to the internet via 'Periscope' (a third party social media video streaming platform). It was understood that these recordings were undertaken using a tablet computer. This option was considered by Officers. However, during discussions with WCC and after inspecting their Twitter account, it became clear that they had received multiple complaints from the public regarding the quality of the video. It was not always possible to see the relevant Councillor speaking and it was therefore unclear as to who was speaking. The audio quality was of an extremely poor standard and an example recording of a WCC scrutiny committee made using this technology was available to view online. In addition to this, at least one dedicated member of staff was required to undertake the recording for the duration of the meeting.

The Warwick District Council Media team had considered the potential benefits and disadvantages of utilising this technology. It was concluded that while this method would provide some assurance to the community regarding openness of Council meetings, the quality of the broadcast would not enhance this or the Council's overall reputation for delivering high quality information.

Warwick District Council officers had also considered the ability to broadcast or upload its current recordings via online video sharing sites, such as YouTube. However, due to the recording format currently used, this option was also found not to be possible.

As part of the response to the notice of the motion, Officers held informal talks with two suppliers about the potential to broadcast meetings from the Council Chamber at the Town Hall, between now and the move to the new HQ. Both suppliers advised that there would be a need to update the current system and that there was an additional cost for the broadcast or hosting of the meetings online. In both instances, the costs for the period up to January 2021 were over £70,000. The suppliers and exact cost had not been named in the report because this information was considered to be commercially sensitive.

Indicative discussions were also held with suppliers about either upgrading the current system and then transferring this to the new HQ, or installing a new system and transferring this to the new HQ. Both suppliers advised against this because the system should be designed for the room(s) it would be used in and by the time the Council was due to move in January 2021, the system would be at half-life, which could lead to complications in embedding within any wider technology provision within the new HQ.

No discussions had taken place with the regard to installing recording and broadcasting of meetings form within the Assembly Hall, Room 21, Room 18 or Room 11 at the Town Hall because this would require a new PA system to be installed, as well as cameras (either permanently or

temporary/transferrable between rooms) for which there would be further cost.

As requested by Council, officers had investigated what neighbouring authorities did in terms of broadcasting meetings. These included Coventry City Council, Warwickshire County Council, Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council as well as the other District/Boroughs within Warwickshire.

All of these authorities, apart from Rugby and North Warwickshire Borough Council, broadcasted some or all meetings online. In summary, the viewing figures from the authorities we were provided with were variable. Stratford District Council had circa 30 to 90 views per meeting; Solihull, between December 2015 and August 2016 had had between 25 and 250 depending on the subject matter (but average circa 100 views); Coventry City Council were only able to broadcast meetings of Council held in the Council Chamber and normally had around 20 views per meeting but had one meeting with 94 views. WCC were unable to confirm numbers as they were hosted via Periscope, on Twitter and the new system, and at the time of writing, had not been in use for a full cycle of meetings to provide a comparison.

The volume of requests for Warwick District Council meetings to be broadcast or recordings from local residents had not been significant. While no direct records were kept, only a limited number of enquiries had been received, via Twitter, asking if Planning Committee was available to watch online but there was no record or recollection of requests to watch any other meetings within the last four years. The Council had provided 59 copies of recordings of 37 meetings out of a potential 137 meetings that were recorded since May 2015. Nearly all of the recordings that had been provided had been of Planning Committee.

Members were reminded of the decision from the former Minister for Communities and Local Government, Eric Pickles, which encouraged members of the public to comment live from Council meetings and clarified the law that the public and press were entitled to record, broadcast, take photos, take notes or comment on social media live from public meetings, so long as it did not interfere with the meeting. The guidance also made it mandatory to make facilities available to enable this to happen. In essence, this was to ensure a reasonable number of chairs were provided as well as a table for leaning on to make notes where practicable. Officers were aware of occasions where this had occurred in Council meetings and this did pose a small risk because individuals could, as they were entitled to, edit and broadcast parts of a meeting they wish to, for which the Council could not provide contrary evidence. While this risk was minimal, it was increasing with the popularity of social media. (This could be mitigated by certain systems that host the video).

On balance and considering the significant costs, at a time when the Council was seeking to maintain a balanced budget, officers were of the opinion that the costs were prohibitive at this stage, given that the Council was due to relocate its meetings within two and half years. However,

there was significant merit in a full business case being brought forward for the new HQ outlining costs over a five year period for the Executive to consider, at the appropriate time following the HQ approval process.

In terms of alternative options, the Council could decide to invest in a new PA system for the Council Chamber now but this would significantly increase costs.

The Council could consider moving some of its public meetings away from the Town Hall in advance of the new HQ move to other locations which could provide broadcasting/recording facilities as standard. However, there would be additional costs to consider which were not currently budgeted.

For rooms 21, 11 and 18 the Council could utilise a small recording device. However, this had been tested in some Licensing & Regulatory Panels when the Council Chamber had not been available but had provided mixed results and was not of sufficient quality to broadcast.

During the process of producing this report, Stratford District Council had moved to using their current equipment to broadcast live via YouTube. At this stage, this process had been discounted by officers because the Warwick District Council's equipment would need to be upgraded to enable this and officers had not been able to verify the costs of this approach.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that

- (1) the indicative costs associated with upgrading the current Audio Visual (AV) system in order to broadcast meetings from the Town Hall Council Chamber via the internet, are noted;
- (2) the advice regarding the broadcast of meetings using handheld devices via third party channels such as 'Periscope', is noted;
- (3) a detailed business case be brought forward by Officers, as part of the development of the new Council Headquarters to explore the potential to record and broadcast all Warwick District Council Executive, Committee and Sub-Committee meetings via the internet; and
- (4) the Capital Budget of £45,000 currently allocated to the upgrade of the AV system, will be transferred to Revenue to fund the repair of the current AV system, should it begin to fail before Council meetings are relocated to the new Headquarters.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Coker)
Forward Plan reference 840
(Councillor Mrs Falp left the room)

100. **Whitnash Community Hub**

The Executive considered a report from Cultural Services describing the current financial position for the Community Hub project based at Acre Close, Whitnash, and proposing further financial support from the District Council to enable the Hub to be constructed.

The business plan for the project had been refreshed to reflect recent project progress and was presented at Appendix A to the report.

The report recommended that the District Council underwrote an additional £500k grant. Based on the extensive cost work that had been undertaken, this would enable Whitnash Town Council to construct its new Community Hub.

The additional finance for the project would be funded from the Community Projects Reserve. This reserve consisted of grant received from the Government's New Homes Bonus scheme and was used to fund projects for the benefit of the community within Warwick District. Members were reminded that Whitnash had experienced significant housing growth which had thereby generated large sums of New Homes Bonus monies.

Recommendation 2.2.3 in the report limited the District Council's additional financial support for the project to £500k. In the event that there was expenditure not currently budgeted for, it would be the responsibility of Whitnash Town Council to meet the shortfall.

Recommendation 2.3.1 protected the Council's financial exposure by limiting the time period when the funding and underwriting would be available to the Town Council to 48 months. In practice, this meant that the funding needed to be expended by November 2022.

Recommendation 2.3.2 required that the construction work was appropriately certificated by the professional services team. This would ensure that payments were only made by the Town Council once agreement had been reached by the employer's agent and contractor on the value of the work completed. The process for payments would be in accordance with existing agreed processes for the pre-construction phase, whereby the Town Council provided copy invoices to the District Council to evidence the work undertaken, following which the District Council made a payment to the Town Council to cover the project costs incurred.

Recommendation 2.3.3 required that ongoing funding bids were agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive (AJ). This would ensure that the level of activity to secure external funding remained visible and could therefore be monitored. This would also include a report on the progress of existing bids, including the Sport England bid for £150k to the Community

Investment Fund. Following the recent approval of planning permission for the project, the bid was currently being considered by Sport England and initial feedback was encouraging. The Project Steering Group would be establishing a sub-group to focus on the continuing work to secure external funding. This steering group would comprise Whitnash Town Council Councillors with support from ATI Projects Ltd (previously commissioned to assist the Town Council in the earlier phases of the work).

Recommendation 2.3.4 would ensure that District Council's support for the project was visible to the local community, meaning that the District Council's involvement was transparent to residents.

The Town Council was currently consulting with residents on an increase of the Council tax to raise £250,000 from the Public Works Loans Board (PWLB). The consultation period was due to end on 20December 2018. Assuming that local residents supported an increase to the Town Council precept, the Town Council would apply for a loan from the PWLB. It was expected that the Board would inform the Town Council of the outcome of the application in early January 2019, meaning that the Town Council would then be in a position to confirm that it had successfully secured this funding.

In accordance with recommendations agreed by Executive for the earlier report on WDC funding for the Whitnash Community Hub, it would be necessary to agree a schedule for the release of funding to assist with the Council's financial planning.

With regards to recommendation 2.5, the Leisure Development Programme sought to provide top quality sports and leisure facilities across the District. The Programme had already created vastly improved and expanded facilities in Leamington and Warwick and was currently planning improvements in Kenilworth. The Whitnash Community Hub would provide the opportunity for the benefits of the Leisure Development Programme to be realised within Whitnash Town.

Following the approval given by Executive in June 2017 for funding of up to £500,000 for the project, considerable work had been undertaken and milestones achieved. These were detailed in section 3.6.1 in the report.

This work followed on from a previous initial, high level cost estimate provided by the design team in March 2018. This first cost estimate indicated a project cost of £1,609,397.

Upon their appointment in 2018, Pulse provided interim cost estimates based on the evolving design of the building as the design team progressed the detailed design. The initial cost estimates produced by Pulse indicated that costs had risen from the March 2018 estimate. The reasons for the increase of costs from March 2018 to the present time were as follows:

- the addition of a number of items previously excluded from the initial cost estimate such as inflation, playing pitch related works and hard landscaping;
- a more accurate understanding of each element of the building based on the full specification; and
- increases in construction costs in the wider economy.

In response to the predicted increase in costs, the design team undertook a value engineering exercise with the Town Council to identify elements of the design which could be amended or omitted without having a negative impact on the building. This exercise resulted in a reduction in costs of £87,000.

Pulse had now completed the final pre-tender estimate which indicated a total project cost of £2,220,307. This figure included allowances for construction, professional fees, risk and contingency, inflation and client "direct" costs including items such as works required to relocate the football and rugby pitches.

In December 2017, the estimated available funding for the project was reported as £1,611,729. The revised project budget now showed an estimate £1,573,824 of funding available. The funding estimate had been reduced to reflect the changes to the criteria around landfill grants, meaning that it was no longer possible to apply for grants until construction was completed and that applications could only be made for stand-alone/non fixed items. The landfill grant allowance had therefore been revised to £60,000 – which represented 50% of the initial budget allowance.

The increased estimated project costs and the revised reduced project funding created an estimated budget deficit of £646,483. The proposed method of funding this deficit was shown in Section 5 of the report.

An alternative option would be to not request additional funding from the District Council. This had been discounted on the basis that without additional support from the District Council, it was highly likely that the scheme would not be able to go ahead.

It would also be possible to significantly reduce the scope of the project, in order to comply with existing available funding. However, this would so compromise the size and quality of the building that it would not be appropriate to proceed with the project.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report. The Committee's support for investing in community hubs, and in particular Whitnash given growing local needs, was confirmed. Main concerns expressed were about the very large increase in project costs, and the potential risks of further capital overruns and how they would be funded. Members noted that the contribution from the community would be through a loan facility, funded by an increase in the local Tax precept; and that no significant local fundraising had so far taken place.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that

- (1) the Business Plan relating to the new Whitnash Community Hub, detailing how the future running costs will be met and how community access will be maximised in the future, available online as Appendix A to the report, is noted;
- (2) Warwick District Council will underwrite £500,000 to allow the construction of the Whitnash Community Hub, following a request from Whitnash Town Council;
- (3) the above sum will be funded from the Community Projects Reserve;
- (4) no more funding than the sum requested (£500,000) will be forthcoming in the event of any cost overrun;
- (5) the funding and underwriting is only available for 48 months from the date of this Executive before being drawn down in whole;
- (6) payments for construction work are only to be made in supply of verified Architect's Certificates and invoices of work;
- (7) ongoing funding bids will be agreed by the Deputy Chief Executive (AJ) and officers will be kept up to date with the progress of those bids thereby reducing the Council's extent of underwriting, should bids be successful;
- (8) public acknowledgement of the District Council's support for the scheme will be given publicity at all stages, as agreed by Whitnash Town Council;
- (9) Confirmation that Whitnash Town Council has successfully secured Public Works Loan Board funding of £250,000, is noted;
- (10) authority is delegated to the Section 151 (S151) Officer and Deputy Chief Executive (AJ), in consultation with the Leader and Portfolio Holder for Health & Community Protection, to agree the schedule for the release of funding; and

- (11) the alignment of this ambitious project with the District Council's Leisure Development Programme, which has achieved substantial improvements to leisure facilities elsewhere in the District, is noted. The provision of a new Community Hub in Whitnash will provide the town with a modern, high quality sports and leisure facility to meet the growing needs of the Whitnash Community.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Coker)
Forward Plan reference 969

101. Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) Licence Conditions and HMO Licencing Cycles – Private Sector Housing

The Executive considered a report from Housing which brought forward revised Housing in Multiple Occupation (HMO) licence conditions and a proposal to enable a shorter HMO licence period for landlords who had been subject to various enforcement action, below the level of a prosecution in the Magistrates Court.

The Council's HMO licence conditions had remained largely unchanged since HMO licencing was introduced in 2006. Due to changes in legislation affecting the private rented sector, they now needed to be reviewed.

The five year gap between HMO licenses was a long time if landlords started to cause concern. Therefore the report brought forward a policy as resolved by the Council to introduce flexibility in the HMO licencing process by allowing shorter licence cycles and higher licence costs for landlords causing concern.

A shorter two year HMO licence period would give the landlord the opportunity and the time to demonstrate that they had addressed the concerns. This approach fitted in with the principles of the Regulators Code and the Council's Enforcement Policy.

Due to the discretion required in some cases, to enable the policy to be applied quickly and efficiently once adopted, it was proposed that the Head of Housing Services should be granted the authority to decide on the use of a shorter two year HMO licencing period in individual cases.

In terms of alternative options, not reviewing the 2006 HMO licence conditions in the light of housing legislation changes affecting the private rented sector was not an option.

Introducing a variety of HMO licencing periods and/or a probationary licence period with the associated fee structures would add complexity, and bureaucracy to the process, as well as the need for additional resources. The current resources would already be stretched dealing with

the extension of HMO licencing from 1 October 2018, which would double the existing licencing workload of the Private Sector Housing Team. In addition, it would not be an effective use of resources, as it would penalise the majority of landlords who did provide good, well managed accommodation, and it would not specifically target the landlords causing concern.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee strongly supported the recommendations in the report.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that

- (1) the revised HMO license conditions are approved;
- (2) the proposal for a shorter two year HMO licensing period, as set out in this report at paragraphs 8.8 and 8.9 of the report and in accordance with the process, criteria and additional cost, as set out in Appendix Three to the report, is approved; and
- (3) authority is delegated to the Head of Housing Services to make decisions about imposing a shorter two year HMO licensing period in individual cases.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Phillips)
Forward Plan reference 955

102. Support for Government Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme

The Executive considered a report from Housing seeking approval to assist with the resettling of up to five further families within the remaining life of the Government Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme.

In March 2016 the Government asked local authorities to consider assisting with resettling Syrian Refugees, to help it meet its commitment of finding homes for 20,000 refugees by 2020. By the end of 2017, Warwick District Council successfully met its original commitment to rehouse five families, three years ahead of schedule, and approval was sought to assist with the resettling of up to five further families within the remaining life of the scheme.

The Council had expressed a willingness to offer further support to the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme.

Whilst the scheme was originally going to run until 2020, the Home Office had recently brought forward the timescale so the scheme would now end in December 2019. There was ongoing consultation about what would replace the current scheme.

The time limiting of the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme, with partners not able to access government funding for families arriving after December 2019, severely restricted the ability to assist further families. It was highly likely that Warwick District Council would not meet a firm commitment to resettle five families in such a short time. Therefore, the report recommended a commitment to assist up to a further five families within the remaining life of the scheme.

In terms of alternative options, the authority could choose not to resettle any further refugees. However, this stance was likely to come under pressure from local groups supporting the scheme and the broader humanitarian situation.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that dependent on the continuation of the properly funded arrangements in place to manage and settle refugees, Warwick District Council approves the resettlement of up to a further five families within the remaining life of the Syrian Vulnerable Persons Resettlement Scheme.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Phillips)
Forward Plan reference 955

103. **Creative Quarter – Draft Masterplan**

The Executive considered a report from Development Services advising Members of the work that had been undertaken by the Council's Creative Quarter regeneration partner 'Complex Development Projects Ltd' since it was appointed in November 2017. The culmination of this work was the preparation of a draft masterplan for the Creative Quarter and Executive was asked to agree that this document would be put forward as the basis for public consultation.

Members were reminded that the Council undertook a procurement process starting in late 2016 and completed during 2017 to select a regeneration partner to work alongside it to bring forward proposals for a Creative Quarter in Royal Leamington Spa. Following this process, the Council formally appointed Complex Development Projects Ltd (CDP) as its partner in November 2017. CDP was a well-established development and regeneration company with a particular knowledge of, and expertise in, working with creative industries. CDP operated nationally but had carried out a number of schemes in Coventry, including Electric Wharf and Fargo Village. CDP had strong links both with the Historic Coventry Trust

(of which Ian Harrabin, the Managing Director of CDP, was Chairman) and the Coventry City of Culture team.

There were two phases to the partnership that the Council had now entered. In Phase One, CDP committed to completing a masterplan for the Creative Quarter and submitting this to the Council for approval. In Phase Two (and subject to agreeing the masterplan and thereby identifying a series of potential projects), the Council and CDP would seek to identify how these should be taken forward. In accordance with the Council's partnership agreement with CDP, the masterplan must be completed within two years of entering the partnership - i.e. by November 2019. The masterplan was to be resourced by CDP at its own risk and the Executive would have discretion whether to accept the masterplan when it was brought forward for final approval in 2019.

The Creative Quarter partnership was underpinned by a governance structure. At the heart of this was a Project Board which included representatives from CDP and the Council. This was supported by an officer team and an external Stakeholder Forum.

Since being appointed, CDP had undertaken extensive stakeholder engagement. It had organised a number of stakeholder events and had met with approximately 80 individuals and groups of stakeholders. This had included computer gaming companies, arts organisations, Leamington Town Council and events such as the Leamington Business Forum. CDP had also appointed two teams of consultants, Bryant Priest Newman and Metropolitan Workshops to advise them and prepare the draft masterplan that was being considered by Executive.

As the culmination of this work, CDP had prepared a draft masterplan. This had been agreed by the Creative Quarter Project Board and was now submitted to Executive to agree that it was put forward as the basis for public consultation. A copy of the brief was attached as appendix A to the report. In considering the report, Members were asked to have regard to several matters, such as the extent of the Creative Quarter as presented, a number of key objectives identified by CPD etc.

Subject to the Executive approving recommendations, it was proposed that the draft masterplan be subject to public consultation. Given that preparing the masterplan was a commitment by CDP under the partnership agreement, CDP would lead on the public consultation, with support from officers of the Council. In discussion with officers, and with the agreement of the Partnership Board, CDP proposed that the public consultation be undertaken over a seven week period from 3 December 2018 to 21 January 2019 and would include the following:

- static displays in the Spa Centre, Pump Rooms, Royal Priors Shopping Centre and (subject to agreement) in Leamington railway station;
- several "forum" events for businesses in Old Town; arts and cultural businesses, (iii) creative digital businesses and (iv) land and property owners;

- public open sessions in various locations;
- a meeting of the Leamington Business Forum; and
- a consultation website (www.learmingtoncreativequarter.co.uk).

The purpose of the consultation was twofold: to provide feedback to stakeholders and residents on the results of earlier consultation, and to enable stakeholders and freeholders to provide feedback on the masterplan vision, approach and to ensure all opportunities had been reflected in the masterplan.

Once this public consultation was concluded, the Creative Quarter Project Board would consider the comments made and seek to agree a "final" version of the masterplan. This would then be submitted to Executive for formal approval by the Council. It was intended that a final masterplan would be brought before Executive at its meeting on 6 March 2019.

Once a final masterplan was approved by the Council, this would mark the end of phase one of the Creative Quarter partnership. Subject to this approval, the partnership would then move onto phase two. This would involve the preparation of detailed proposals and a business case for specific projects within the Creative Quarter area.

The report advised that , at this stage. the approval of the masterplan did not mean that the Council had agreed to the details of any specific project or to the disposal of any assets that were covered by proposals in the masterplan. There would be a separate process, including the use of development and other legal agreements (as appropriate), and a separate decision by this Council, before any consent was given on any specific project. More guidance would be given to councillors at the point at which it was being asked to approve the masterplan. Any scheme would also have to be subject to the usual planning process as proposals came forward.

The Council could decide to request minor changes to the masterplan prior to it being issued for public consultation; however, under the partnership agreement with CDP, the Council would require CDP's agreement to any changes, which could delay the start of the public consultation. A more appropriate and timely approach would be to make any comments on the masterplan as part of the forthcoming public consultation.

An alternative option was that the Council could decide not to support the draft masterplan, however, this was not recommended. It was considered that the proposals within the masterplan represented a sound basis of a document that was in line with the Councils' broad aspirations when it sought to engage a partner to bring proposals forward. It was also the case that the Council was only approving this document for public consultation at the present time and as such it was not firmly committing to the principles contained within it. It would have a further opportunity to consider the masterplan when this was returned to Executive for final approval.

Another alternative option was that the Council could decide not to proceed with the partnership with CDP. This was also not recommended for the reasons set out in the report. The Council had nothing to lose at this stage in allowing the document to go forward for public consultation and there were no grounds for not proceeding with the partnership in terms of how CDP had performed to date.

An addendum circulated at the meeting advised of a number of corrections to the draft masterplan.

The Overview & Scrutiny Committee recommended that the public consultation period on the draft masterplan should be extended by a further four weeks, meaning that a final masterplan would be submitted to the new Council in 2019. The Executive were required to vote on this because it formed a recommendation to them.

In response, the Portfolio Holder Councillor Butler stated that there had been widespread comments received about the slow decision making regarding the regeneration of Old Town and the opinion that this area of the District had a tendency to be ignored. Whilst he felt that the recommendation from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee had merit, he did not feel that an extension to the consultation timeframe would improve the quality of the feedback being received. For these reasons he did not accept the recommendation. He did agree, however, that an additional recommendation should be added relating to the establishment of a cross party working group.

It was proposed by Councillor Butler and seconded by Councillor Mobbs to reject the recommendation from the Overview & Scrutiny Committee for the reasons stated above.

Following a suggestion from Councillor Naimo, an amendment to paragraph 2.3 was approved by the Portfolio Holder to read:

“That a Cross Party Member Working Group be established to enhance communication on this matter”.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that

- (1) the work undertaken by the Council’s regeneration partner Complex Development Projects (CDP) since its appointment to engage with stakeholders and prepare a draft masterplan, is noted; and
- (2) the draft masterplan attached as appendix A is put forward for public consultation, is agreed.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Butler)

104. **10, 12 & 14 Chapel Street, Warwick**

The Executive considered a report from Asset Management outlining a proposal concerning 10, 12 & 14 Chapel Street, Warwick.

The Executive on 9 January 2013 approved the sale of Warwick District Council's 10 - 14 Chapel Street, to the Warwick Kings High School ('WKHS'), subject to an overage payment to be made to Warwick District Council by WKHS, if the property was to be sold off by WKHS within a 20 year period from the date that WDC disposed of it to the WKHS.

WKHS placed this property along with all of its neighbouring buildings around the Chapel Street area for sale on the market in 2017 and WKHS now wished to dispose of all their premises, including 10 - 14 Chapel Street, in the near future.

WKHS were aware of the overage requirement and duly approached Warwick District Council for this overage sum, required by Warwick District Council, to be agreed. Following discussions between Warwick District Council and WKHS, an appropriate overage sum had been agreed, subject to Executive approval.

The proposal would provide this Council with an appropriate capital receipt and would enable the site to be developed, in partnership with the other WKHS buildings, in an appropriate refurbishment of the buildings, subject to future Planning Consents, in accordance with the agreed development brief.

As an alternative option, the Executive could decide to refuse to agree to the proposition but this would result in the property lying empty and would defer the receipt of a capital receipt without any surety of obtaining a larger or the same sum. For this reason, this option was not recommended.

A confidential addendum was circulated at the meeting advising of the financial agreement.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report.

The Executive, therefore,

Resolved that the offer of a capital receipt from an overage agreement concerning the former Warwick District Council property known as 10 - 14 Chapel Street, Warwick, hatched on Plan 1 to the report, be approved.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Phillips)

105. **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 item 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
108, 110	1	Information relating to an Individual
108, 110	2	Information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual
106, 107, 109, 111, 112	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 this will be included in the confidential minutes of this meeting.

106. **Europa Way Progress Update and Next Steps – Private & Confidential**

The Executive considered a private and confidential report from the Chief Executive accompanying the public report entitled *Europa Way Progress Update and Next Steps* (Item 3 on the agenda, Minute 96).

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report.

The recommendations in the report were approved.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Phillips)
Forward Plan reference 962

107. **Compulsory Purchase Order**

The Executive considered a private and confidential report from the Deputy Chief Executive (AJ) asking Members to agree that the Council should make a Compulsory Purchase Order.

The recommendations in the report were approved.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Rhead)

Forward Plan reference 977

108. Assets Team Redesign – Update Report

The Executive considered a private and confidential report from the Deputy Chief Executive (BH) seeking approval to fund redundancy and severance payments for those staff who had not been accommodated within the new structure.

The recommendations in the report were approved.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Phillips)

Forward Plan reference 975

109. Victoria Park Café

The Executive considered a private and confidential report from Cultural Services seeking approval to purchase the lease of the Victoria Park cafe.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee supported the recommendations in the report.

The recommendations in the report were approved.

(The Portfolio Holders for this item were Councillors Butler and Coker)

110. Update on Action Plan following Review of Closure of Accounts

The Executive considered a monthly update report from the Chief Executive which set out the progress on the action plan that was agreed in the report on the Review of the Closure of 2017/18 Accounts in October 2018.

The Finance & Audit Scrutiny Committee noted and supported the report.

During scrutiny of the End of Year Accounts and the Audit findings at the start of the Finance & Audit meeting, the Committee decided that they wished to see regular in-year reports on progress against all outstanding Audit recommendations from senior Officers. After debate, the Chief Executive agreed to extend the scope, as requested.

The report was noted.

(The Portfolio Holder for this item was Councillor Whiting)

111. 10, 12 & 14 Chapel Street, Warwick – Appendix

The Executive noted the confidential appendix to public agenda Item 11, Minute 104 .

112. **Minutes**

The confidential minutes of 31 October 2018 were approved and signed by the Chairman as a correct record.

(The meeting ended at 7.10pm)