

Portfolio Holder Decisions/Leader Decisions

Friday 17 February 2023

Minutes

Attendance

Committee Members

Councillor Isobel Seccombe OBE
Councillor Peter Butlin
Councillor Kam Kaur
Councillor Heather Timms

Other Members

Councillor Bhagwant Pandher

Officers

Amy Bridgewater-Carnell, Senior Democratic Services Officer
Isabelle Moorhouse, Democratic Services Officer
Graham Stanley, Engineer (Contractor)

Public Speakers

Guy Ferguson
Keith Kondakor

1. Country Parks Fees and Charges 2023/24

Resolved

The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Climate & Culture approved for approval be given for the changes to Country Parks fees and charges from 1 April 2023, as set out in the Appendix.

2. Fees and charges report for Waste Management 2023/2024

Resolved

The Portfolio Holder for Environment, Climate & Culture approves for approval be given for the changes to waste fees and charges from 1 April 2023, as set out in the Appendix to this report.

3. Developer -Funded S278 Highway Scheme Approvals

Resolved

That the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property gives approval to the addition of the following s278 fully developer-funded highway improvement schemes to the Capital Programme for 2022/23:

- a) A3400, Stratford Road, Shipston-on-Stour - Ellen Badger Hospital – widening access and relocation of pedestrian island of approximate value £80,000
- b) C7 Tamworth Road, Wood End Land East of Islington Farm - construction of new access, footpath and road of approximate value £80,000

4. ETRO Closure of Station Rd, Kenilworth

Mr Guy Ferguson made the following statement:

“If we look at what the scheme was designed to do, there were two main aims of the scheme, as noted in the report under point 2.3 in the report: ‘to prohibit misuse of the right hand turn of junction at Station Road and Warwick Road’, ‘to allow the creation of a pedestrianized area for local businesses to utilise, creating a small park let’.

So, I've looked at both those points in terms, starting first of all with the misuse of the turning. The report notes that the scheme has reduced the number of near misses and collisions and has no environmental impact. Unfortunately, from my position, the problem with both these points is quite simply, the conclusion being drawn, is impossible to justify. In terms of near misses, it states reduction, but it's unclear whether this means no accidents; and presumably if not, then you draw it's been a failure, but correlation does not imply causation. The report does not mention once, the reduction of the 20mph speed limit, (that was reduced from 30mph along on that stretch of the Warwick Road), that was implemented at the same time. Claiming the road closure has reduced accidents, is for me, to equally claim the 20mph restriction has caused these, is completely unprovable.

With the environmental impacts, if you displace traffic from the main non-residential through road, onto residential roads, wholly unsuitable for the purpose, then you're shifting exhaust fumes to residents from shopping areas. I further add that in terms of residents of Central Kenilworth Association, who make representations on behalf of central Kenworth residents, they wrote to the Council in May 2022, and they received response to nine months later. There has been no risk assessment on the additional safety risk of Station Road being closed in light of pedestrian being knocked over by reversing lorry.

A decision is being made on an assessment, after the decision is being made. It's like operating on a patient before you've diagnosed the condition. It needs a full assessment. There appears to be no assessment of extra traffic, especially HGV's, through Abbey and Car Park, which is wholly undesignated for the traffic. Kenilworth Town Council and Warwickshire County Council have reported no extra problems apparently, but this assumes no complaints means there's no issues. Again, it needs a full assessment. There's been no assessment whether a light controlled junction could be fitted at this point to prevent the right turn being made; again, there's been no assessment in light of so little information.

How can a reasonable decision be made today? I'd further add there's no data on traffic displacement in the report. There's massive displacement to other roads.

People who want to turn out right of Station Road are now being forced onto Waverley and Priory Roads. I live there, you get too many vehicles down there at the same stage. It seems to suggest that driving out of Station Road on to Warwick Road is problematic in terms of health and safety for large HGVs reversing out of Station Road. I run a large retail distribution operation, reversing is a health and safety concern and, from a very simple perspective, reversing blind when there's no requirement for those retailers to put two people on that vehicle or fit reversing cameras means it's substantially more dangerous than pulling forward. There's not enough evidence to draw a conclusion, we need more assessment.”

Councillor Isobel Seccombe stated that she understood Mr Ferguson's view of the level of assessment and the report itself stated that the measures implemented during Covid-19 and post-pandemic will be made a Regulation. She continued that, assessments had been done and objectors and supporters of the scheme had been spoken to. Residents of Kenilworth (RoK) submitted their objections, and these were taken separately, not as one singular objection; there were 11 objections altogether. Support for the scheme was given by the local Warwickshire County Council (WCC) member, local Town Councillor and the scheme was funded by Kenilworth Town Council. WCC would be carrying out this work on Kenilworth's Town Council's behalf as a Council partner.

Councillor Seccombe suggested this be put to Kenilworth Town Council and she planned to approve the recommendation.

Councillor Seccombe thanked Mr Guy Ferguson for attending.

Resolved

That Leader approves the making of an Order, pursuant to section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which is to reproduce and continue in force indefinitely the provisions of 'The Warwickshire County Council (Station Road, Kenilworth) (Prohibition of Vehicles) (Experimental Order) 2021'

5. Proposed Puffin Crossing - Coventry Road, near Rectory Drive, Exhall Bedworth

Councillor Keith Kondakor (Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council) made the following statement:

"First, I need to say we're massively in support of this crossing and it's a really busy area and all the routes tend to come into this point. Rectory Drive is quite a big drive coming into the side and we've got the park on your side really supporting the crossing. But unfortunately, it's not been designed to take account of all the cyclists going down there. Warwickshire County Council has a plan as you see on one of your maps to have a cycle route down from Bedworth to Coventry which mostly goes through backstreets but has to come out on the Coventry Road for about 100 yards, where this crossing is going to be.

I'm pleased officers have had a change of heart and you're going to move the control box to the crossing off the pavement on that side. But it's a very long stretch where cyclists are on the carriageway. You've got the central refuge and then a very narrow pavement on the east side. So, this hadn't been designed to take account of the future cycling route and the island in the middle is a real problem for cyclists; because of the layout, we're really in a long funnel with the traffic behind us, which is incredibly unhelpful.

What we'd like is actually for the refuge to go in the middle and effectively have a space, then for the road to be redesigned when the cycle lane comes in, so you'll have to remap it. So, we do far better if we design it, so we haven't built a central island, which we then have to demolish in a year's time. So, I'm happy with the having this crossing, but can we please have one that's just a signal on either pavement and then we can just move them when we need to for the cycle lane and then it's also safer so that cyclists don't get that HGV behind you for a long while; because there's this island in the middle of very busy route.

I'm really, really pleased that Warwickshire is looking at Bedworth to Coventry cycle route, particularly with all the jobs at the RECO. People are going to cycle to Coventry and Bedworth into the RECO on Baynton Road. The industrial estate is going to be really busy for cyclists, it already is, and we just haven't had the cycle safety audits and the planning for the cyclists to go at the same time as the crossing.

So, I'm happy for the principal of the crossing, but can we please have the design tweaks to make it future proofed? Thank you very much."

Councillor Bhagwant Pandher (Warwickshire County Council and the local member) said that this scheme started a couple of years ago. The cycling route is a separate issue, and a puffin crossing was needed on Rectory Drive for pedestrians, especially children and dog walkers. The local member at Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council was supportive of the crossing.

Councillor Seccombe noted the work done by officers in the report and was not in favour of redesigning the scheme, especially as Councillor Pandher was funding the scheme with money he saved from his delegated budget. Inflation with constructing costs were difficult to manage too. Funding was not available to make changes to this scheme but cycling scheme bids will continue to be made. She added that she was not in favour of delaying a pedestrian crossing and planned to approve the recommendations.

Resolved

That the Leader approves:

The installation of a Puffin Crossing on the B4113 Coventry Road, near Rectory Drive, Exhall, Bedworth in accordance with Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

6. School Term and Holiday dates 2024/25

Resolved

That the Portfolio Holder for Education approves the school term and holiday dates for the 2024/25 academic year as set out in the published report.

7. Reports Containing Confidential or Exempt Information

Resolved

That members of the public be excluded from the meeting for the items mentioned below on the grounds that their presence would involve the disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 7 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972.


8. Letting of Ground Floor of Building 1 at Saltisford

Resolved

The recommendations were approved as set out in the report.

The meeting rose at 12:25

Portfolio Holder Decision – Country Parks Fees and Charges 2023/24

Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Environment, Climate & Culture
Date of decision	17 February 2023
	Signed 

Decision taken

Approval be given for the changes to Country Parks fees and charges from 1 April 2023, as set out in the Appendix.

Reasons for decisions

The County Council's constitution requires approval of fees and charges by the relevant portfolio holder prior to their application.

Income derived from rents, tenancies, catering concessions, shop sales, caravan site profits share, special events and grants etc, account for approximately 25% of the country parks' total income in a normal year; these elements are adjusted through rent reviews and lease arrangements and are not included in this review.

Background information

The Country Parks service has generally increased fees and charges on an ad hoc basis, with increases to some charges one year, then different charges the next and so on. This has meant that more substantial increases have taken place each time a fee has been increased, sometimes to account for a number of years' worth of inflationary increases. Section 43 of the Countryside Act 1968 allows reasonable charges to be made, and we are comfortable that the amended fees and charges remain reasonable in the marketplace.

A more fundamental review of how and when we increase our fees and charges is required and is likely to result in smaller, index-linked increases on an annual basis, to negate the need for larger increases less regularly. However, for this review the proposal is to increase all fees and charges that were not subject to increases last financial year.

It is also worth noting that, prior to the introduction of cashless parking machines in 2020, parking charges were paid in cash, making it difficult to increase in line with inflation, which would result in visitors having to pay odd amounts in change, which is unrealistic and cumbersome.

It is recognised that, especially during the recent pandemic, the amenities provided to our communities by the Country Parks service are of the highest value and it is important to ensure these remain accessible to all. This will support peoples' health, safety, and wellbeing and also the local visitor economy.

As a result of these factors, it is important that access to our parks remains affordable and value for money, and on a par with similar amenities locally, to remain competitive. However, it is also vital that we increase fees and charges sufficiently to reflect rising costs generally and sustain income to help pay for service delivery. This report sets out around a 10% increase to most fees and charges for parking and other activities in Country Parks for all the fees that were not increased in 2022/23.

The Appendix sets out the new fees and charges which take effect from 1 April 2023.

Proposed changes

Fishing Permits at Kingsbury Water Park

Prices have not increased since 2019/20, with course fishing last increased in 2015. We are therefore proposing a 10% increase on all fishing fees, apart from concessionary course permits, which increased in 2022/23. As investment and improvements are being made in the Fishery over the next five years, we anticipate making fee increases more frequently.

Car Parking price rises

In 2022/23 the charges for the smaller sites were increased by **50p** across the sites with flat day rates, as these had not increased for a number of years. Therefore Burton Dassett, Hartshill Hayes and Pooley Country Parks will not be subject to increases for 2023/24, with the exception of an increase to coach parking fees at these sites from £20 to £22. Stratford Greenway also saw price increases in 2022/23, for the first time since they were introduced in 2017, so will be exempt in this round.

Kingsbury Water Park & Ryton Pools

Car parking fees at Kingsbury have not increased since 2016 and at Ryton since 2019. Therefore, it is proposed to increase all parking charges at Kingsbury and Ryton on all tariffs by 10%.

Annual Parking Permits – All Parks/ South Parks & North Parks

All multi-park annual permit prices were increased in 2022/23, so will not be subject to increases in 2023/24.

Other price increases/changes

- Horse-riding Annual Permits – Adult - £30 to £33, Junior - £15 to £16.50 and Family - £55 to £60
- Adult Group sessions (i.e. talk/ presentation to interest group) – this has been £35 for some time. However, as it is similar in nature to a talk/ slideshow, which has

been priced at £55, we have decided to amalgamate these into one category, so the fee for 'Talks/ Walks/ Slideshows', which are accompanied sessions with Countryside or Specialist Rangers, will be £60.50.

- Education Centre Room Hire (for non-school groups): Morning or Afternoon session from £70 to £80. All day from £100 to £120. These figures are comparable to local village hall hire.
- Corporate Away Days - £15 per person (this is a new fee, but has already been successfully introduced this year)
- Event fees are by arrangement, as they vary significantly depending on the type of activity, so no flat fee is put against this

Financial implications

The price increases detailed above should provide for additional income of approximately £58,000 based on current visitor numbers/sales. This is a total increase of approximately 10%, based on average income over the last 5 to 6 years for car parking and permit income at Kingsbury and Ryton, as well as on the fishing income achieved.

In reviewing our fees and charges for 2023-24 we have not applied the same percentage increase to all charges, but instead have considered each charge on its own merits. This is in line with the approach to fees and charges across WCC services where there is a range of planned price increases for 2023-24, as well as some price freezes, depending on the circumstances of each service.

Where there has been a 10% level increase in our fees and charges the rationale is outlined above and includes where prices have not increased for several years. Some charges have been increased to better reflect the cost of providing the service and to ensure prices remain in line with the marketplace. In all cases the increased charges are pitched to continue to make our country parks accessible and good value for money, and we continually benchmark our prices against our competitors, to ensure we are not under or over charging.

The Medium-Term Financial Strategy budget reduction increases the income target for Country Parks by £45k for 2023/24, so the proposed increase will contribute to reaching this target, but not fully achieve it, due to increased cost pressures facing the service.

See Appendix for detailed information on Fees & Charges for 2023/24

Environmental implications

Whilst the Country Parks service is heavily dependent on income from car parking charges, we are confident that, given the relatively modest and infrequency of fee increases, our regular users will continue to pay to visit their local country park or greenway. Most of our visitors do not need to travel for long distances in their vehicles to be able to get to their nearest/ favourite country park. Therefore, we do not believe that these fee increases will have an impact on length of vehicle journey for most of our users, which in turn will not have a detrimental effect on air pollution.


Report Author	Rachel Baconnet Lead Commissioner – Country Parks & Green Spaces Tel: 01926 412818
Assistant Director	Assistant Director, Communities
Lead Director	Strategic Director for Communities
Lead Member	Portfolio Holder for Environment and Heritage & Culture

Urgent matter?	<i>No</i>
Confidential or exempt?	<i>No</i>
Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?	<i>No</i>

List of background papers
Appendix 1

Members and officers consulted and informed
<p>Portfolio Holder – Councillor Heather Timms</p> <p>Corporate Board – Mark Ryder</p> <p>Legal – Sarah Duxbury</p> <p>Finance – Andrew Felton</p> <p>Equality – n/a</p> <p>Commercialism – John Stansfield</p> <p>Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse</p> <p>Councillors – Local Member(s): Jenns, Mills, Bell, Redford, M Humphreys, Rolfe</p>

Portfolio Holder Decision – Fees and charges report for Waste Management 2023/20244

Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Environment, Climate & Culture
Date of decision	17th February 2023
	Signed 

Recommendation

- 1) Approval be given for the changes to waste fees and charges from 1 April 2023, as set out in the Appendix to this report.

Reasons for decision

1.1 The County Council's constitution requires approval of fees and charges by the relevant portfolio holder prior to their application. The purpose of this report is for the portfolio holder to consider and approve the proposed fees and charges for 2023/24.

1.2 The County Council, as a Waste Disposal Authority, can apply charges to certain waste materials e.g. commercial waste, which is accepted at our waste transfer stations and in smaller quantities at our household waste recycling centres (HWRCs). There is a well-established system of making charges and these charges need to be adjusted for 2023/24. This report sets out the approach to this, gives details on how the charges are calculated, and presents the fees and charges recommended for 2023/24.

1.3 Waste management fees and charges for non-household waste need to be adjusted to ensure they reflect current market conditions and continue to ensure that the County Council's costs for this waste management activity are covered. Appendix A sets out the charges recommended for 2023/24.

Analysis

2.1 Warwickshire County Council as a Waste Disposal Authority has the duty to provide "free to access" HWRCs for the deposit of household waste by householders. Commercial waste and certain types of waste which are not classified as household (for example where a householder has a large quantity of rubble or wants to bring waste in a commercial vehicle such as a van) is chargeable.

2.2 Two of our HWRCs - Princes Drive and Hunters Lane – have weighbridges and can charge by weight. The other HWRCs which do not have weighbridges allow commercial waste to be delivered and paid for on a by-volume basis.

2.3 The Appendix sets out the proposed fees and charges which take effect from 1 April 2023.

Method of calculation

2.4 Calculations are based on a DEFRA model which identifies that staff time is used for each transaction, so the pricing mechanism charges proportionately more for lower weight bands. Charges by weight are banded in ten bands from 0 – 100kg to 900 – 1000kg. At the lower band, an administration multiplier of two is used and at the upper band, an administration multiplier of 1.5 is used, with the administration multiplier evenly escalated with each band in between. Current costs for the treatment or disposal costs of each material have been calculated, as have the costs for haulage of each material to the treatment facility. These costs will increase in the next financial year; some are linked to RPIX (Retail Price Index excluding mortgage interest payments), landfill disposal includes landfill tax rises, some contracts are new rates and are fixed until contract end.

2.5 The gross figures are rounded up to the nearest 50p for use at Princes Drive and Hunters Lane weighbridge sites. For the non-weighbridge sites, the gross figures are used, along with 70% fill levels for each of the five types of vehicle and average densities for the materials. The relevant administration multiplier is applied, and the gross values are rounded up to the nearest £1.

2.6 A number of assumptions have been used in the calculated prices and further changes are anticipated during the year. One example of change is where a contractor goes into administration and contingency plans have to be put in place. In this case there can be uncertainty over the future costs of transporting and processing materials. Another example is the Bubbenhall landfill contract which uses RICS (Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors) indices to calculate an annual increase, which is due to be calculated later in the year but is likely to be higher than RPI (retail price index).

2.7 In recent years, the price of plasterboard disposal has been aligned with that of general waste and we will continue this and also apply this to the vehicle size charges. This alleviates any operational issue of traders incorrectly declaring plasterboard as general waste to access a cheaper price, leading to potential contamination of the general waste. The price difference is so small that we will use the general waste price for plasterboard and will continue to monitor and review.

2.8 For the pay by item prices, £12 per item of large furniture for the non-weighbridge sites will continue. That assumes that the large item i.e. a mattress or bed base would not weigh more than 50kg. On site monitoring supports this assumption.

2.9 The Environment Agency are introducing additional stipulations around items containing Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) so that items such as sofas and other upholstered seating should be incinerated rather than sent to landfill. Therefore, we expect either to restrict this waste from commercial sources or to introduce an appropriate price when the full costs are understood.

2.10 The £12 charge for a load of paper or cardboard works well alongside our recycling permit. This means that small businesses have good access to recycling services. It is very rare that a load of paper or cardboard exceeds 1 tonne but to help operations and to limit additional cost liability the maximum load size will be capped at 1 tonne.

2.11 The minimum charge for disposal of a gas bottle, fire extinguisher or tyre was reduced to £5 in 2021, making the proper disposal of these items even more accessible, and we will continue to do this. Certain gas bottles that cost the authority more than £5 are charged at a higher rate based

on the Council's costs to dispose of the item. Other pay-by-item charges remain the same. Public weigh charges will remain at £10 plus VAT in line with other local weighbridges.

2.12 The cost of the commercial recycling permit increased from £40 to £50 in 2021. This was the first price rise since inception 5 years ago and will be kept at £50 for this coming year.

2.13 Last year a per bag charge was introduced for hardcore, bricks, rubble and soil. We will retain the £3 per bag charge for additional sacks of hardcore, bricks, rubble and soil material (up to 25kg per bag).

2.14 The orange sack scheme for businesses that generate small amounts of residual waste will remain at £4 per sack and are usually sold in 20 bag rolls for £80.

2.15 The Waste Management Service aims to offer the broadest possible range of recycling opportunities to the public, and also where appropriate, to the non-household and commercial sector. In order to continue to act commercially, we will seek to develop new trade services and will seek approvals to launch these at the appropriate time and using decisions under the Council's scheme of delegation.

Benchmarking

2.16 To ensure that prices are competitive with the marketplace, the proposed charges have been compared to the charges of other local authorities. Bearing in mind the varying cost of waste treatment and haulage depending on availability and proximity, the proposed charges are broadly in line with our peers.

Financial implications

3.1 Prices are calculated based on a DEFRA model. The price is calculated using the disposal / reprocessing and haulage costs to the Council and the model adds the additional costs of site running costs, administration, and on-costs using an administration multiplier. Income gained supports the operation of waste sites and the delivery of services. The facility to recycle and dispose of a wide range of waste types are of benefit to the local economy. The public have a facility to dispose of non-household waste and local businesses can easily access competitively priced recycling and disposal services that ensure their compliance with waste legislation and the reduction of fly-tipping.

3.2 Table 1 shows the level of income from providing the opportunity for local small businesses to be able to deposit waste at our network of HWRCs. The income generated in 2020/21 was significantly lower due to lockdowns, but appear to have started to recover in 2021-22. The economic downturn and higher cost-of-living may have an impact on 2022/23 and 2023-24 figures. Our budgeted total income figure for 2022/23 is £234,100.

Table 1: HWRC Trade Waste Sales, Fees & Charges Income

	Income 2019/20	Income 2020/21	Income 2021/22	Income YTD @31/12/2 2	Projected Income 2022/23	Budgeted Income 2022/23
HWRCs	£9,460	£2,697	£7,970	£7,579	£10,100	£9,100

Transfer Stations	£261,461	£207,866	£294,268	£170,323	£227,100	£225,000
Totals	£270,921	£210,563	£302,238	£177,902	£237,200	£234,100

3.3 The chargeable rates proposed in this paper will ensure that income keeps up with the rising costs of delivering services. Income from members of the public from item charges or charging by vehicle size is small and changes have been kept to a minimum to avoid confusion and discourage fly tipping. Most of the income received is at the waste transfer stations and the changes to rates at these locations is given in detail in Appendix A. Changes have been made to better reflect the Council's true costs, to remain competitive in the marketplace and to encourage responsible waste management including cheaper recycling options. During 2023/24 an in-depth review of our trade waste offer is planned, and we hope to find opportunities to increase income further.

Environmental implications

The Council's commercial waste service offers the facility for local people and businesses to recycle and dispose of their non-household waste in compliance with their waste duty of care and other environmental legislation. The Council offers local business the opportunity to recycle a wide range of materials that may not be accessible to them through standard collection services. Providing local services that allow for the correct disposal of waste and the increased recycling of valuable materials, benefits the environment by reducing pollution, reducing the use of raw materials, and reducing carbon emissions.

Report Author	Laura Vesty Lead Commissioner - Waste Operations Tel: 01926 418071
Assistant Director	David Ayton-Hill Assistant Director, Communities
Strategic Director	Mark Ryder Strategic Director for Communities
Portfolio Holder	Councillor Heather Timms Portfolio Holder for Environment, Climate & Culture

Urgent matter?	No
Confidential or exempt?	No
Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?	No

List of background papers

Appendix A – Detailed Fees and Charges for 2023-24

Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Heather Timms

Corporate Board - All

Communities DLT

Legal – Nichola Vine

Finance – Andrew Felton

Equality – Jenny Kemp

Commercialism – John Stansfield, Commercial Lead

Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse

Local Member(s): N/A

This page is intentionally left blank

Portfolio Holder Decision Developer -Funded S278 Highway Scheme Approvals

Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property
Date of decision	17 February 2023
	Signed 

1. Decision taken

- 1.1 That the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property gives approval to the addition of the following s278 fully developer-funded highway improvement schemes to the Capital Programme for 2022/23:
- a) A3400, Stratford Road, Shipston-on-Stour - Ellen Badger Hospital – widening access and relocation of pedestrian island of approximate value £80,000
 - b) C7 Tamworth Road, Wood End Land East of Islington Farm - construction of new access, footpath and road of approximate value £80,000

2. Reasons for decisions

- 2.1 On 14th May 2021 Council reconfirmed the delegated power to the Leader, or body nominated by them, to approve the addition to the capital programme of projects costing less than £2.0 million, which are fully funded from external grants, developer contributions or from revenue. The Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property is that nominated body.
- 2.2 Under the Constitution, the power is delegated onwards to the Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property.

3. Background information

A3400, Stratford Road, Shipston-on-Stour - Ellen Badger Hospital

- 3.1A planning application was submitted to Stratford-Upon-Avon District Council by South Warwickshire NHS Foundation in respect of Ellen Badger Hospital Stratford Road, Shipston-on-Stour. Planning consent was granted with conditions on 17 March 2022 (ref: 21/00004/FUL) for the erection of a replacement Hospital, Well Being Centre, Medical Centre and associated infrastructure. The conditions require works to be carried out in the public highway and the Council will enter into

an agreement under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in order to facilitate these works. The s278 works required are the widening of the access and the relocation of pedestrian refuge island.

C7 Tamworth Road, Wood End Land East of Islington Farm

- 3.2 A planning application was submitted to North Warwickshire Borough Council by Cameron Homes in respect of Land East of Islington Farm, Tamworth Road, Wood End. Planning consent was granted with conditions on 5th February 2021 (ref: PAP/2020/0420.) for the development of 34 residential no dwellings, associated works, and access. The conditions require works to be carried out in the public highway and the Council will enter into an agreement under section 278 of the Highways Act 1980 in order to facilitate these works. The s278 works required are the construction of a new access to the highway.

4. Financial implications

- 4.1 As the new highway assets which are being created through these schemes will come on to the Council's balance sheet once completed, the costs incurred by the Council need to be treated as capital expenditure.
- 4.2 Section 278 schemes are fully funded by developer contributions which are ring-fenced for the schemes described in the sections above. There are no alternative uses for the contributions and the addition of these schemes will not affect the overall level of available capital resources.
- 4.3 The respective Developers have already committed to funding the technical review work by accepting the Council's fee estimates. The Council's fees for technical review are always collected in advance of the s278 agreement being signed.
- 4.4 Procurement and subsequent award of construction contracts will only take place subject to the applicable Section 278 agreements being signed, which will provide 100% of the funding. The Section 278 agreements will also require both Developers to provide a bond or cash security at least 150% of the costs of the works. The commencement of the works is dependent on the completion of the technical review, procurement and contractor mobilisation processes. Any slippage or increase in costs due to changes in the scope of the works will be reported in the normal quarterly monitoring process.

5. Environmental implications

- 5.1 The environmental impacts of developer-funded highway schemes are considered through the planning approval process.
- 5.2 The contractors on the Council's Framework Contract for the Provision of Engineering and Construction Works (WCC 6012) have all demonstrated that they hold a certificate of compliance with BS EN ISO 140001 (or equivalent) or have otherwise satisfactorily demonstrated their policies and arrangements for the management of construction-related environmental issues.

Report Author	Kudzai Chengeta kudzaichengeta@warwickshire.gov.uk,
Assistant Director	Scott Tompkins - Assistant Director Environmental Services
Strategic Director	Mark Ryder - Strategic Director for Communities
Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Finance and Property

Urgent matter?	No
Confidential or exempt?	No
Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?	No

List of background papers

N/A

Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Peter Butlin

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Caroline Gutteridge

Finance – Andrew Felton

Equality –n/a

Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse

Councillors – Warwick, Singh Birdi, Board, Philipps and W Roberts


Local Member(s):

A3400, Stratford Road, Shipston-on-Stour - Ellen Badger Hospital - Cllr Jo Baker (Shipston)

C7 Tamworth Road, Wood End Land East of Islington Farm - Cllr Marian Humphreys (Polesworth)

This page is intentionally left blank

Portfolio Holder Decision Prohibition of Vehicles Order – Station Road, Kenilworth

Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning
Date of decision	17 February 2023
	<p>Signed</p>  <p>PP</p>

1. Decision taken

- Recommendation:
- 1.1 That the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning approves the making of an Order, pursuant to section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which is to reproduce and continue in force indefinitely the provisions of 'The Warwickshire County Council (Station Road, Kenilworth) (Prohibition of Vehicles) (Experimental Order) 2021'.

2. Reasons for decisions

- 2.1 On 11 November 2021, Warwickshire County Council made an Experimental Traffic Regulation Order, pursuant to sections 9 and 10 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which was to:-
- 2.1.1 prohibit all vehicles from proceeding along a section of Station Road, Kenilworth, from its junction with Warwick Road, north-eastwards for a distance of 16 metres; and
- 2.1.2 prohibit vehicles (with the exception of pedal cycles) from proceeding along a further section of Station Road, Kenilworth which extends from a point 16 metres north- eastwards of Warwick Road, north-eastwards for a 82 metres.
- 2.2 The Experimental Order commenced on 29 November 2021 and will expire on 28 May 2023.
- 2.3 The experimental scheme prohibited the misuse of the right turn ban at the junction of Station Road and Warwick Road, which was widely ignored by motorists. Additionally, the closure created a pedestrianised area for local businesses to utilise this space, creating a small pedestrian parklet.

- 2.4 The experimental scheme, has successfully reduced the number of near misses and collisions at this junction due to it being closed, and does not cause an adverse environmental impact on traffic around the area. WCC is satisfied that the experiment was successful as it has mitigated the misuse of right turns onto Warwick Road, for which WCC frequently received reports of near misses and vehicles ignoring the prohibited right turn. In the experimental closure period, WCC monitored the traffic flow under normal, post COVID-19 conditions, and monitored the affect the closure had on this traffic. Naturally, as a road has been closed, traffic has been displaced to surrounding roads, including Abbey End, so whilst traffic using this road has increased, WCC have not reported any significant impacts on this road. If the permanent closure of the road is approved, a full safety assessment will take place on surrounding roads and any engineering measures installed as appropriate.

3. Background information

- Reasons for the proposed scheme at this location***
- 3.1 Station Road was initially closed temporarily in the summer of 2020, following initiatives from Central Government to encourage the public to return to High Streets following the first lockdown period, and to help local businesses, whilst following directives to maintain social distancing. Following the success of the COVID closures, at both mitigating the right turn issues at Warwick Road, and allowing for more space within this area, Kenilworth Town Council (“KTC”) were keen to explore the possibility of potentially keeping the closure, on an experimental basis, with a long-term vision of creating a pedestrianised area for extra seating and amenities for local businesses.
- 3.2 The initial temporary closure in 2020 throughout periods of lockdowns and covid isolations was not a true representation of traffic and pedestrian flow, so it was important to trial the closure in ‘normal’ traffic conditions and monitor the effects of the closure taking these factors into consideration. Warwickshire County Council (“WCC”) and KTC agreed that the closure appeared to deter and prevent motorists illegally turning right at the end of Station Road, onto Warwick Road. The growing number of motorists ignoring this right turn ban was posing as a high collision risk, which the temporary closure of Station Road helped to prevent.
- 3.3 The experimental scheme currently in place involves 16 metres of Station Road closed to motorists, to create a pedestrianised area. Prior to the full closure, chicanes created from large wooden planters have been installed to divert and slow traffic but maintain access for refuse vehicles and delivery vehicles who may deliver to the local businesses located within this section of the closure. If the 16 metre section which is closed to all vehicles is made indefinite, KTC have indicated a desire to pave this section of road to delineate the pedestrian only areas versus the areas of partial closure. This would be subject to separate discussions between KTC and WCC as to the cost and authorisation of any such paving works within the public highway. Any potential paving works that may be undertaken in the future is subject to funding being provided by KTC.

- 3.4 The intention for the experimental scheme to be made indefinite was consulted on in accordance with the relevant statutory regulations. This includes publishing a notice in the Leamington Spa Courier on 18 November 2021, public notices being erected on site, scheme information being made available on WCC's website, and copies of the scheme documents being made available at Shire Hall. There was a period of six months commencing on 29 November 2021 and expiring on 29 May 2022 during which objections to the scheme being made indefinite could be submitted pursuant to the relevant statutory regulations.
- 3.5 A statement of reasons for proposing the experimental scheme is appended to this report in Appendix 1. A copy of the public notice is included in Appendix 2, the Experimental Order is included in Appendix 3, and the Consultation Plan for the scheme is included in Appendix 4.
- 3.6 Three letters of support were received to making the scheme indefinite, a full copy of these can be found in Appendix 6. Nine objections have been received to making the scheme indefinite from local residents. The full copy of objections can be found in Appendix 5 of this report. A basic synopsis and breakdown of common concerns of the objections are as follows:
- Concerns on diversion route for deliveries for Waitrose
 - Concerns on extra stress on Abbey End Car Park
 - Concerns of near miss collisions due to HGV deliveries on Station Rd
 - Concerns that there is no economic benefit to the closure
- 3.7 Officer response to the above matters is as follows.
- 3.7.1 The routes for Waitrose have been unaffected by the closure of Station Rd. Deliveries are still permitted to all businesses within and around the closure, including Waitrose. Access to the residential apartment above the hairdressers is also still permitted. Officers were made aware of an issue with vehicle access when the chicanes were erected, and the issue was resolved on site at the time of the issue which was raised by the resident.
- 3.7.2 No extra traffic problems or adverse effects have been observed by, or reported to, WCC in respect of Abbey End Car Park.
- 3.7.3 Near miss collisions have not been observed by, or recorded by, WCC but are taken seriously. Pedestrians, as always, should take extra care of unloading vehicles, particularly those reversing. Whilst some objections argue that vehicles are left to reverse out of the closure, instead of being able to navigate left out onto Warwick Road, this was equally as tight of a manoeuvre and would result in large vehicles, such as refuse vehicles and HGVs, to over-hang the footway, resulting in pedestrians having to take extra care and precaution within this area regardless.
- 3.7.4 The economic benefit is that the extra space provided by the closure can be utilised by local businesses and charities in order to create a safe pedestrianised space for extra seating or stalls.

4. Financial implications

- 4.1 The scheme has been fully funded by Kenilworth Town Council budget, who have partially used the 'Welcome Back' initiative budget from Central Government to fund the scheme up until this point. Any future works will solely be funded by Kenilworth Town Council and subject to separate discussions.

5. Environmental implications

- 5.1 The proposed indefinite scheme will prohibit the misuse of the right turn ban at the junction of Station Road and Warwick Road, resulting in fewer potential near misses and collisions. The pedestrianisation of this area will allow for local amenities to utilise this space with possible extra seating for the surrounding establishments, along with enhancing the public realms of the Town Centre.
- 5.2 Additionally, by creating a pedestrianised area, it can reduce fuel consumption – therefore increasing air quality and encouraging the use of active travel.

Report Author	Marcus Alford-Longley, Dana Loxley marcusalford-longley@warwickshire.gov.uk, danaloxley@warwickshire.gov.uk,
Assistant Director	David Ayton-Hill davidayton-hill@warwickshire.gov.uk
Strategic Director	Mark Ryder markryder@warwickshire.gov.uk
Portfolio Holder	Wallace Redford wallaceredford@warwickshire.gov.uk

Urgent matter?	<i>No</i>
Confidential or exempt?	<i>No</i>
Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?	<i>No</i>

List of background papers

Appendix 1 Statement of Reasons
Appendix 2 Public Notice
Appendix 3 Experimental Traffic Regulation Order
Appendix 4 Consultation Plan Sheet 1 of 1
Appendix 5 Copy of Objections
Appendix 6 Copy of Letters of Support

Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Wallace Redford

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Serena Cammish & Caroline Gutteridge

Finance – Virginia Rennie

Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse


Councillors – Clarke, Chilvers, Fradgley and D’Arcy

Local Member(s): Rik Spencer

This page is intentionally left blank

Portfolio Holder Decision

Proposed Puffin Crossing - Coventry Road, near Rectory Drive, Exhall Bedworth

Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning
Date of decision	17th February 2023
	Signed  PP

1. Decision taken

That the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning approves:

- 1.1 The installation of a Puffin Crossing on the B4113 Coventry Road, near Rectory Drive, Exhall, Bedworth in accordance with Section 23 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

2. Reasons for decisions

- 2.1 Where objections have been received (and not withdrawn) to advertised traffic orders it is necessary for the Portfolio Holder, in consultation with the local member(s), to decide whether to proceed with the order.
- 2.2 Four objections have been received as detailed at paragraph 3.6 below.

3. Background information

- 3.1 The primary purpose of the proposed Puffin Crossing is to improve the safety for School children crossing the Coventry Road to access All Saints Junior School and The Cannon's C of E School, local amenities, and Baynton Road Industrial Estate.
- 3.2 The site of the proposed Puffin Crossing is located on Black Bank /B4113 Coventry Road just North of Rectory Drive which is residential in nature with housing situated on both sides of the road, and the Old Black Bank PH. It is subject to a 30mph Speed Limit.
- 3.3 The results of the pedestrian survey for a formalised crossing on

the Coventry Road just North of Rectory Drive by the Old Black Bank PH ,Bedworth was evaluated, and the survey results indicated that a pedestrian and vehicle² value of 105% was recorded for the highest hour crossing at this point, this is well above the 90% required to justify a Puffin Crossing.

See Appendix A Proposed Plan of Puffin Crossing.

- 3.4 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, Section 23, requires that before establishing, altering, or removing a pedestrian crossing facility, the local traffic authority shall consult with the Chief Officer of Police and give public notice of the proposal. A public notice was erected on site in the vicinity of the proposed crossing, information was sent to statutory consultees (including the Chief Officer of Police) and to the residents in the immediate vicinity of the site and who are directly affected. The public notice was also published in the Nuneaton News on .1st December 2021.
- 3.5 During the consultation period between 2nd December 2021 and 31st December 2021 there were four objections received relating to the proposed crossing.
- 3.6 Details of the 4 Objections and the officers responses are detailed below

Objection 1)

I wish to object as the plans appear to show a narrowing of the carriageway at the point of the crossing, which is going to make cycling even more unpleasant than it already is in this area-coming from Bedworth there are lots of parked cars and cyclists are going uphill.

The LTP3, which as far as I am aware, is still the relevant document should be leading to all schemes being better for sustainable transport in particular pedestrians and cyclists, not worse.

The Cycle Forum has been assured that the cycle route from Bedworth to Coventry is virtually ready to go and yet this application does not seem to take any action of that. I worked close to this location for 7 years and so I am very familiar with the road layout here. I am all in favour of a crossing for pedestrians, but it must not be at the detriment to cyclists.

Please can you confirm that this will be looked at in relation to the proposed cycle route along this section and ensure that the schemes are fully integrated to ensure cyclist safety as well as pedestrian safety before any approval is granted.

Engineers Response:

In the design of this Puffin Crossing, officers have worked within the Policies referred to in the LTP3 Local Transport Plan for 2011-2026,Policy SSTS2 Improving Walking Routes to School -The County will continue to review pedestrian routes to School and implement infrastructure improvements where large number of pupils will benefit.

SSTS3 Improving Cycling Routes to School- The County Council will expand and promote the availability of safe cycling routes to school.SSTS4 The County Council will work with Schools to promote walking and cycling to schools.

The proposed Puffin Crossing has been designed so that it can easily be upgraded to a Toucan Crossing when an East/West Cycling route has been decided on, or if any future changes to the road network are considered. Our Cycling officer has reviewed the Design and confirmed that an Infrastructure scheme is planned for the B4113,connecting Nuneaton to Coventry, with a section of the scheme through Bedworth, where quieter residential roads and green spaces which have not been included in any design for improvements.

The Cycling Officer in his review commented that this scheme provides a safe crossing point and is supported by the local member. The scheme would have to be revisited when officers know what is happening with the wider development proposals that may impact this scheme

3.7 Objection 2)

This crossing ignores all the planning for cycle routes in the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan and the proposed Bedworth to Coventry Cycle route. The narrowing of the carriageway could be a safety risk for cyclists. Please treat this as an official objection.

Engineers Response:

As with all Puffin Crossing proposals the Councils Cycling Officer is contacted, in this instance he made us aware of future planning for the cycle route in the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan and the proposed Bedworth to Coventry Cycle Route (Appendix B). The Cycling Officer confirmed that there is an infrastructure scheme planned for the B4113 connecting Nuneaton to Coventry, which includes a section of the scheme through Bedworth. In this area they would be using quieter residential roads and green spaces.

The proposed New Puffin Crossing is within this area, and has been designed so that it can easily be upgraded to a Toucan Crossing if a future cycling scheme for the Easy West Corridor was put forward, so that it then linked into the main Nuneaton to Coventry, through Bedworth Scheme.

The scheme has been designed to incorporate a pedestrian refuge with running lanes less than 3.2metres.The local County Councillor has taken the initiative in improving this crossing facility within his small Delegated Budget so that a crossing facility on the main Coventry Road is in place for any future East West Cycling link, with minimal changes required to upgrade to a Toucan in the future. The Design of the Puffin Crossing has been reviewed by the Cycling Officer and the final design avoids carriageway widths of 3.2m and 3.9m to deter close pass overtaking therefore eliminating safety risks for cyclists.

3.8 Objection 3)

With regards to the proposed puffin crossing on Coventry Road near Rectory Drive Exhall, I wish to submit the following as an objection in response to the public consultation.

I am supportive of measures to improve pedestrian safety and as such welcome the general concept of providing a controlled crossing space on Coventry Road. However, any road improvements must also be made in consideration of cycling. Local Transport Note (LTN)1/20 states that it “should be applied to all changes associated with highway improvements” (LTN1/20, paragraph 1.3.1).

The location currently features a pedestrian refuge which presents as a “pinch point” for cyclists travelling in either direction. Such locations are hazardous where they put riders-especially less confident riders who may not “take the lane”- at risk of close passes by drivers. The proposal does not improve this situation. Indeed, it appears to make it worse where the new central island appears to be wider and longer than the existing island. There is also a risk of driver’s stopping next to or riders waiting at a red light leaving little room when both move off on a green signal. This is potentially dangerous.

I understand Coventry is earmarked to be part of the major cycle scheme to connect Nuneaton to Bedworth to Exhall. Any changes to the road network must be designed with this scheme in mind, else this change may be short lived requiring replacement to accommodate forthcoming cycle infrastructure-an inefficient use of resources.

The road width at this location appears to be approximately 14.3 metres widening to about 15.3m (north to south) with verge space also available. This would appear sufficient for providing 2 x 3m general traffic lanes, 1 x 2.5m turning lane, 1 x 2.5-3m bidirectional cycle lane, and 2 x 1.5m footpaths. I look forward to your comments in reply and hope that these designs will be revised before commencement of the works.

Engineers Response:

In considering the Design of this Puffin Crossing on the B4113 Coventry Road we have consulted all the design guidelines for the installation of a Puffin Crossing including the recent Local Transport Note (LTN 1/20). The existing pedestrian refuge has been relocated and enlarged to accommodate vulnerable pedestrians, parents with pushchairs, Motorised Wheelchairs and Cyclists, whilst still maintain a 3.2 metre running lane on each side. This makes sure that there isn’t a crunch zone for cyclists when travelling in the lanes either side of the crossing.

The Design of the Puffin Crossing has been reviewed by the Cycling Officer and the final design avoids carriageway widths of 3.2m and 3.9m to deter close pass overtaking therefore eliminating safety risks for cyclists.

The proposed Puffin Crossing has also been designed so that it is easily upgraded when an East/West Cycling route has been decided on, or if any future changes to the road network are considered.

3.9 Objection 4)

I'm objecting to the current plans as they stand for a Puffin crossing in Exhall. I fully support the addition of a crossing here, but I believe it should be built with cycle infrastructure in mind. The plans therefore should include ASLs and cycle lanes in the immediate vicinity to help make future cycle infrastructure easier to integrate. If there is insufficient space for cycle lanes, then the turning lane should be removed.

The additional cycle infrastructure would be expected (based on existing studies) to have a beneficial side-effect of improving safety for all other road users

Engineers Response:

The concerns raised regarding the building of this Puffin Crossing to include for a future cycle infrastructure has been considered. Provision has been made so that the crossing can easily be upgraded to a Toucan Crossing when the demand and infrastructure around it have been introduced. We have not received any confirmation of an existing cycling infrastructure in place or proposed, however this may be some way off at this point in time. Engineers have worked within a budget to design and implement a safe crossing point on the B4113 Coventry Road to improve Road Safety for all road users with current design practices

4. Financial implications

4.1 The scheme will be fully funded from the Member's delegated budget funding for 2021/2022 & 2022/2023

5. Environmental & Equalities implications

5.1 The environmental impacts of delegated Budget highway schemes are considered as part of the process.

5.2 The contractors on the Council's Framework Contract for the Provision of Engineering and Construction Works (WCC 6012) have all demonstrated that they hold a certificate of compliance with BS EN ISO 140001 (or equivalent) or have otherwise satisfactorily demonstrated their policies and arrangements for the management of construction-related environmental issues.

5.3 The equality needs of Vulnerable Road users, including Disability users, Parents with Children and Buggies has been considered in the design of this crossing. A Road Safety audit has been carried out in accordance with Warwickshire County Council's safety audit procedure Type B (RSA/B), a Road Safety Audit largely following those recommended in document GG119 'Road Safety Audit' of The Highways England's Design Manual for Roads and Bridges.

Report Author

Graham Stanley

	grahamstanley@warwickshire.gov.uk,
Assistant Director	Scott Tompkins scotttompkins@warwickshire.gov.uk
Strategic Director	Strategic Director for Communities markryder@warwickshire.gov.uk
Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning Cllr Wallace Redford cllredford@warwickshire.gov.uk

Urgent matter?	<i>No</i>
Confidential or exempt?	<i>No</i>
Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?	<i>No</i>

List of background papers

Letters of objection redacted, Appendix A Proposed Puffin Crossing – Coventry Road, near Rectory Road, Exhall, Appendix B Plan Cycle Links Bedworth to Coventry, Email Objections Redacted, Email Objections

Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Wallace Redford

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Caroline Gutteridge

Finance – Andrew Felton

Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse/Helen Barnsley

Councillors –

Local Member(s): Councillor Bhagwant Pandher

Portfolio Holder Decision School Term and Holiday dates 2024/25

Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Education
Date of decision	17 February 2023
	Signed 

1. Decision taken

That the Portfolio Holder for Education approves the school term and holiday dates for the 2024/25 academic year as set out in the published report.

2. Reasons for decisions

The Local Authority (LA) is currently responsible for setting school term and holiday dates for all Community and Voluntary Controlled Schools. Academies, Foundation and Aided Schools are responsible for setting their own term dates. There is collaboration between the LA and Academies, Foundation and Aided schools which have been invited to comment on the proposed term dates and have generally followed the Local Authority's pattern of terms and holiday dates.

The approval of school term and holiday dates is delegated to the Portfolio Holder for Education under the WCC Constitution.

3. Background information

A number of guiding principles has traditionally been used to set the pattern of terms and holidays and effort is made to adhere to as many of the following as possible:

1. 195 days from which five teacher training days are taken
2. Two of the five teacher training days are defined by the local authority, one of these days is at the start of the autumn and spring terms, the other three to be set by schools
3. Complete weeks when setting holiday dates wherever possible
4. A three-weekend break at Christmas and Easter
5. A summer break as close to six weeks as possible
6. A pattern which is as consistent as possible with neighbouring authorities.

A non-statutory consultation exercise ran between the 31st October and 9th December 2022; this engagement was carried out with all state-funded schools and academies and their governing bodies.

The term dates of neighbouring authorities can influence the preferences of some schools, mainly those close to authority borders. Where neighbouring authorities had published their term dates for 2024/25, these were included in the consultation information.

The proposed dates for the 2024/25 academic year comprised the calendar as proposed by the West Midlands Regional School Term Date Group as an option for all regional local authorities:

Term 1 (Autumn)	Half Term 1	02/09/24-25/10/24
	Holiday	28/10/24-01/11/24
	Half Term 2	04/11/24-20/12/24
	Christmas Holiday	23/12/24-03/01/25
Term 2 (Spring)	Half Term 1	06/01/25-14/02/25
	Holiday	17/02/25-21/02/25
	Half Term 2	24/02/25-11/04/25
	Easter Holiday	14/04/25-25/04/25
Term 3 (Summer)	Half Term 1	28/04/25-23/05/25
	Holiday	26/05/22-30/05/25
	Half Term 2	02/06/25-21/07/25
	Summer Holiday	22/07/25-tbd (early Sept 2025)

Consultees were made aware that these dates have already been adopted by Staffordshire, Gloucestershire, Worcestershire and Birmingham authorities. The two Teacher Training days set by the LA were proposed as the first days of each of the first two terms, 2nd September 2024 and 6th January 2025. A universal Secondary School Induction Day was also proposed for 9th July 2025.

In total, 63 responses were received to this informal consultation. 49 (78%) agreed and 14 (22 %) did not agree with the proposed term dates.

Specific comments received from respondents who did not agree with the proposed dates can be summarised as:

Theme of comment	No. comments
“Having Monday 21st July as a school day will be an issue with poor attendance being the result. To mitigate this you might ask schools to consider having an INSET day, but this is an ineffective use of a staff training day. “	10
“The length of the terms and half terms are very uneven, with one half term being 8 weeks and another being 4 weeks. I understand that this is determined by how Christmas and Easter fall in the calendar“	6

All feedback has been carefully considered.

Having the last day of the academic year as a Monday is unfortunately likely to result in poor pupil attendance (unless the school choose to allocate it as a Teacher Training Day). However, to adhere to providing full weeks wherever possible throughout the rest of the year, while providing the required minimum 195 school days, for this year requires a choice between starting the pupil's school year on a Wednesday (4/9/24) or having the final day of the year on a Monday. It is anticipated that many schools will decide to allocate Monday 21/7/25 as a school-determined Teacher Training Day to avoid low attendance.

The length of the Autumn and Spring terms is largely dictated by when the Christmas and Easter school holidays are set, which is defined by when the bank holidays fall each year. To meet guiding principle 4, of a three-weekend break at Christmas and Easter, as well as providing no fewer than 195 school days in a year, these holidays have to include the bank holidays. Therefore in certain years, terms of unequal lengths will be, unfortunately, unavoidable.

The majority of respondents who expressed a preference agreed with the proposed Secondary School Induction Day Date. However, those that did not agree with the Secondary School Induction Day Date all requested that it be one week earlier, on 2nd July. After consideration, it is proposed to change the induction date in line with this feedback.

A calendar of these dates is provided in the Background papers.

It is recommended to adopt the school term dates as shown above and in the calendar provided as a Background Paper.

The Secondary Induction Day will be set as Wednesday 2nd July 2025.

4. Financial implications

None

5. Environmental implications

None

Report Author	Rosalind Currie rosalindcurrie@warwickshire.gov.uk,
Assistant Director	Chris Baird
Strategic Director	Strategic Director for People
Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Education
Urgent matter?	No
Confidential or exempt?	No

Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?

No

List of background papers

Calendar recommended for approval.

Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Kam Kaur

Corporate Board – Nigel Minns

Legal – Sarah Cowen

Finance – John Hopper

Equality – Joanna Kemp

Democratic Services – Andy Carswell

Councillors –

Local Member(s): N/A

By virtue of paragraph(s) 3 of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
of the Local Government Act 1972.

Document is Restricted

This page is intentionally left blank