

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

22nd February, 2005

PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Gazey)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Lakha)

Councillor Ahmed	Councillor Mrs. Lacy
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Mrs. Lancaster
Councillor Asif	Councillor Lee
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Mrs. Lucas
Councillor Mrs. Basu	Councillor Ms. McKay
Councillor Batten	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Benefield	Councillor Mrs. Maskell
Councillor Bhyat	Councillor Matchet
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mutton
Councillor Charley	Councillor Nellist
Councillor Chater	Councillor H. Noonan
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor M. Noonan
Councillor Clifford	Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Patton
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor Miss Reece
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Ridge
Councillor Field	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Foster	Councillor Ruddy
Councillor Mrs. Griffin	Councillor Mrs. Rutter
Councillor Mrs. Harper	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Ms. Hunter	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Mrs. Stone
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Townshend
	Councillor Williams

Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Harrison.

Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 18th January, 2006, were signed as a true record, subject to Councillor Skipper being added to the list of attendees.

94. **Petitions**

RESOLVED:-

- (1) That the following petitions be referred to the City Council bodies indicated:-
 - (a) Arena Green Travel Plan – 13 signatures, presented by Councillor Mrs. Stone (Planning Committee).
 - (b) Request for Fence at Grange Road – 9 signatures, presented by Councillor Mrs. Bigham (Cabinet Member (City Services)).
 - (c) Grass Verges and Related Parking Issues on Torrington Avenue – 32 signatures, presented by Councillor Mrs. Lacy (Cabinet Member (City Services)).

- (2) That the following petitions be considered as part of this meeting (Minute 99 below refers):-
 - (a) Objection to the Proposal to Incorporate Six Area Co-Ordination Offices into Three Large Offices – 354 signatures, presented by Councillor Patton.
 - (b) Opposing the Proposal to Withdraw Funding from Phase 2 of the Development of the Herbert Museum – 26 signatures, presented by Councillor Mutton.
 - (c) Opposing the Proposal to Withdraw Funding from the Phase 2 Development of the Herbert Museum – 50 signatures, presented by Councillor Lakha.
 - (d) Opposing the Proposal to Withdraw Funding from the Phase 2 Development of the New Herbert Museum – 25 signatures, submitted to the Lord Mayor, Councillor Gazey.

95. **Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared interests in the matters referred to in the minutes indicated. The relevant minutes recording the decisions also record, where appropriate, the actions that the Members decided to take at the meeting indicated, having regard to the National Code of Local Government Conduct and the City Council's Constitution:-

Interests in Matters Left for Determination by the City Council/Recommendations for the City Council

Prejudicial

Member	Minute No.
Councillor Mrs Lacy	100

(NOTE: Councillor Mrs Lacy withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the item indicated in Minute 100 below.)

Interests in Other Minutes

Personal

Member	Body	Minute No.
Councillor Ahmed	Scrutiny Co-Ordination Committee	82
Councillor Clifford	Scrutiny Board (2)	36
Councillor Field	Scrutiny Board (2)	36

96. Statement by the Leader of the Council on the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum

Councillor Taylor addressed the Council to report that he was currently exploring new ways of securing funding for the future redevelopment of the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum. The Council was currently talking to external organisations who may be able to provide some funding to secure the future development and a further report on this would be brought to a Cabinet meeting at the earliest opportunity.

Councillor Nellist responded to the statement and Councillor Mutton reserved his comments for the budget debate (Minute 99 below refers).

97. Asset Management Plan

Further to Minute 132/04 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Development which sought approval of the 2004 Asset Management Plan, prior to its submission to the Government Office of the West Midlands (GOWM). The report had been updated since the Cabinet meeting to include the precepts from the Police and Fire Authorities.

Until 2002, all authorities were required to prepare and submit an annual Asset Management Plan (AMP) to their Government Office. In 2003, only those authorities which had failed to achieve a good score for the AMP were required to submit documents. Coventry was in that position, having achieved a 'satisfactory' score for its 2002 document and duly submitted an AMP in July 2003. The 2003 AMP was also scored as 'satisfactory', although the Cabinet noted that the Council were only one point away from achieving a 'good' score. Government Offices used a strict scoring criteria to assess whether AMPs were poor, satisfactory, or good. Those making the assessment were not surveyors and simply checked the AMP against their scoring criteria. It was therefore vital that the plan clearly identified how each of the criteria had been met.

The Council was now one of a small number of authorities who have yet to achieve a 'good' score for its AMP and had been asked to submit a revised document to the GOWM by January 2005. Following discussions with GOWM over the criteria which the Council had failed to meet in its 2003 AMP, the documents had been reviewed and updated. The draft document had been sent to GOWM for comment, and further changes were made following the comments received. Based on GOWM's initial response, the document should now receive a 'good' score.

Given the approach by GOWM to the assessment of the AMP, certain changes had been made to the content of the document. In particular, specific references to the Council's processes and properties had been removed, as these were not relevant to the limited purpose for which the document was required, i.e. as a statement of how the Council had or had not met the strict scoring criteria laid down by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and enforced by GOWM. The changes and improvements that the Council was making in its approach to strategic asset management had been highlighted, which gave GOWM confidence that the Council was becoming a 'good' authority in respect of asset management. A scoring matrix was attached to the report and clearly showed where each of the scoring criteria had been evident.

RESOLVED that the Council approve the 2004 Asset Management Plan.

98. Corporate Capital Monitoring Report 2004/05 (September – November)

Further to Minute 171/04 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and ICT which set out the latest position on the Council's Capital Programme for 2004/05 following the most recent budget monitoring exercise to the end of November 2004.

In line with the Prudential Code for Capital Finance in Local Authorities and as part of the 2004/5 Treasury Management Strategy report, the Council adopted a number of Prudential Indicators. These indicators were designed to ensure that borrowing entered into for capital purposes was affordable, sustainable and prudent. The purpose of the indicators was to support decision making and financial management, rather than illustrate comparative performance. Although these indicators were essentially technical treasury management tools, the Prudential Code required that they should be reported on during the year.

RESOLVED that the City Council approve the revised capital finance Prudential Indicators in order to allow for the re-scheduling of long term loans as follows:-

Maturity Structure Limits highlighting the risk arising from the requirement to refinance debt as loans mature:	
< 12 months	0% to 15%
12 months - 24 months	0% to 10%
24 months - 5 years	0% to 20%
5 years - 10 years	0% to 30%
10 years +	40% to 100%

99. General Fund Budget Requirement 2005/06 (Including the Treasury Management Strategy 2005/06) and the Council Tax Report 2005/06

Further to Minute 173/04 and 174/04 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Management Board on the General Fund and Capital Budget Requirements 2005/06 (including the Treasury Management Strategy 2005/06) which informed Members of the Government's final Revenue Support Grant (RSG) allocation for the Council and its implications for the next year's revenue budget. The City Council also considered a report of the Director of Finance and ICT which calculated the Council Tax levels for 2005/2006 that resulted from the Collection Fund revenue estimates for the year. The City Council also considered a supplementary report of the Chief Executive which outlined Trades Unions responses to the Policies, Priorities and Resources process and provided additional information on Neighbourhood Management.

Councillor Mutton moved an amendment, as detailed in Appendix A to these minutes, which was seconded by Councillor Duggins and lost.

Councillor Field moved an amendment as detailed in Appendix B to these minutes, which was seconded by Councillor Benefield and lost.

Councillor Mutton moved the following further amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Duggins and lost:-

"At this stage, to take out of the equation of the Capital Programme, the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum to allow further discussions to take place to secure funding."

Councillor Field moved the following amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Benefield and lost:-

"To delete 10.12 and 10.13 of the report and replace with: to continue discussions with third parties for the funding of phases 2 and 3 of the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum, but in the event that such external funding cannot be agreed, to bring the issue back to Council for a final decision."

(NOTE: In respect of the above amendment, a recorded vote was required in accordance with Paragraph 4.1.72 of the City Council's Constitution on the resolutions. The Members voting for and against the resolution was as follows:-

For	Against	Abstain
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Ahmed	
Councillor Mrs Basu	Councillor Arrowsmith	
Councillor Batten	Councillor Asif	
Councillor Benefield	Councillor Blundell	
Councillor Bhyat	Councillor Charley	
Councillor Mrs Bigham	Councillor Cliffe	
Councillor Chater	Councillor Crookes	
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Mrs. Dixon	
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Foster	
Councillor Field	Councillor Gazey	
Councillor Ms. Hunter	Councillor Mrs. Griffin	
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Mrs. Harper	
Councillor Mrs. Lacy	Councillor Mrs. Johnson	
Councillor Lakha	Councillor Kelsey	
Councillor Mrs. Lancaster	Councillor Lee	
Councillor Mrs. Lucas	Councillor Mrs. Maskell	
Councillor Ms. McKay	Councillor Matchet	
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor H. Noonan	

Councillor Mulhall	Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Mutton	Councillor Ms. Reece
Councillor Nellist	Councillor Ridge
Councillor Patton	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Ruddy	Councillor Mrs. Rutter
Councillor Skipper	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Mrs. Stone	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Townshend	Councillor Williams

Result: 26 for, 26 against and 0 abstentions.

(NOTE: The vote was lost on the casting vote of the Lord Mayor.)

RESOLVED that the City Council:-

- (1) Determine that its budget requirement calculated for the financial year 2005/06 in accordance with the requirements of Section 32 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 shall be £382,289,879 (a Council Tax rise for the City Council of 3.9%).
- (2) Approve the Capital Programme of £123.802m for 2005/06, the future years' commitments arising from this programme of £72.063m (2006/07 to 2009/10) and the provisional schemes for commencement in 2006/07 onwards.
- (3) Approve the revised investment policy detailed at Appendix 7 of the Management Board report.
- (4) Adopt the prudential indicators and limits described in Section 14 and summarised in Appendix 8 of the Management Board report.
- (5) Note that at its meeting on 25th January 2005, the Council's Cabinet approved the following amounts as its Council Tax base for the year 2005/06 in accordance with Regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:
 - (a) 86,030.9 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its Council Tax base for the year;
 - (b)

Allesley	356.2
Keresley	213.5

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.
- (6) Note that the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2005/06 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

- (a) £ 601,186,538 being the aggregate of the amounts that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act, other than any expenditure estimated to be incurred which will be charged to a Business Improvement District (BID) revenue account as set out in section 43(2)(a) of the Local Government Act 2003. *Gross Expenditure including the amount required for the working balance*);
- (b) £ 218,896,659 being the aggregate of the amounts that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act, other than any income estimated to be received which will be credited to a BID revenue account as set out in section 43(2)(b) or (c) of the Local Government Act 2003. (Gross Income including reserves to be used to meet the Gross Expenditure);
- (c) £ 382,289,879 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2.2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2.2(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year;
- (d) £ 284,797,454 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of Formula Grant (the sum of Revenue Support Grant and National Non Domestic Rates) [£283,349,192] and the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with the Act as amended by the 1994 Regulations (Council Tax Surplus)[£734,101] and pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charge) directions under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Community Charge Surplus) [£714,161].
- (e)
$$\text{£ } 1,133.23 = \frac{2.2(c) - 2.2(d)}{2.1(a)} = \frac{382,289,879 - 284,797,454}{86,030.9}$$

being the amount at 2.2(c) above, less the amount at 2.2(d) above, all divided by the amount at 2.1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year. (Average Council Tax at Band D for the City including Parish Precepts).

- (f) £ 5,650 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act. (Parish Precepts);
- (g)
$$\text{£ } 1,133.16 = \frac{2.2(e) - 2.2(f)}{2.1(a)} = \frac{1,133.23 - 5,650}{86,030.9}$$

being the amount at 2.2(e) above, less the result given by dividing the amount at 2.2(f) above by the amounts at 2.1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of the area to which no special item relates. (*Council Tax at Band D for the City excluding Parish Precepts*);

(h)	Coventry Unparished Area	1,133.16
	Allesley	1,142.00
	Keresley	1,144.87

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2.2(g) above, the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 2.1(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, at the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate. (*Council Taxes at Band D for the City and Parish*).

(i)	Valuation Band	Parts to which no special item relates	Parish of Allesley	Parish of Keresley
		£	£	£
	A	755.44	761.33	763.25
	B	881.35	888.23	890.46
	C	1,007.25	1,015.11	1,017.66
	D	1,133.16	1,142.00	1,144.87
	E	1,384.97	1,395.77	1,399.28
	F	1,636.79	1,649.56	1,653.70
	G	1,888.60	1,903.33	1,908.12
	H	2,266.32	2,284.00	2,289.74

being the amounts given by multiplying the amounts at 2.2(h) above by the number which, in the proportion set out in Section 5(1) of the Act, is applicable to dwellings listed in a particular valuation band divided by the number which in that proportion is applicable to dwellings listed in valuation Band D, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 36(1) of the Act, as the amounts to be taken into account for the year in respect of categories of dwelling listed in different valuation bands.

(7) Note that for the year 2005-06 the West Midlands Police Authority and West Midlands Fire Authority have stated that the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwelling shown below:-

Valuation Band	West Midlands Police Authority	West Midlands Fire Authority
	£	£
A	55.79	27.47
B	65.08	32.05
C	74.38	36.63

D	83.68	41.21
E	102.27	50.36
F	120.87	59.52
G	139.47	68.68
H	167.36	82.41

- (8) Having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2.2(i) and 2.3 above, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, set the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2005/06 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:-

Valuation Band	Parts to which no special item relates	Parish of Allesley	Parish of Keresley
	£	£	£
A	838.70	844.59	846.51
B	978.48	985.36	987.59
C	1,118.26	1,126.12	1,128.67
D	1,258.05	1,266.89	1,269.76
E	1,537.60	1,548.40	1,551.91
F	1,817.18	1,829.95	1,834.09
G	2,096.75	2,111.48	2,116.27
H	2,516.09	2,533.77	2,539.51

100. Swanswell Initiative – Learning Quarter Land Acquisition

Further to Minute 175/04 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Directors of City Development, Legal and Democratic Services and Finance and ICT which detailed a one-off opportunity to secure substantial funding from Advantage West Midlands (AWM) to fund the acquisition of a suitable site for a new City College, which was a key component of the proposed new learning quarter within the Swanswell Initiative.

At their meeting on 17th August 2004, the Cabinet approved a report regarding facilitating a suitable site by negotiation between Whitefriars and City College and the proposed land acquisition and funding.

Whitefriars were prepared to dispose of the land at "housing value" (£500,000 per acre); whilst the City College can only pay in "education value" (£250,000 per acre). The dilemma for the Council was that it was being asked to gap fund the difference i.e. about £250,000 per acre in order to guarantee that the project could proceed. A range of options, involving substantial scrutiny of the City College's Development Business Plan had been investigated. At the Cabinet meeting on 17th August 2004 Cabinet charged officers with responding to nine specific issues detailed in the previous private report and the responses were detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.

Nearing the end of the financial year, AWM had identified underspends, and provisionally offered to fund the Council's acquisition of the land concerned. They did not wish to acquire the land themselves due to their accounting procedures, which would effectively penalise them for holding such a legal interest. Consequently the Council would acquire the freehold interest. The Council would subsequently dispose of the majority of the land to the City College via a long lease on detailed terms to be agreed with

City College, but provisionally agreed at £250,000 per acre. The remainder of the site would be retained for the new school and other Council elements of the Learning Quarter.

RESOLVED that the City Council:-

- (1) Approve the Heads of Terms detailed in Section 5 of the report, provisionally agreed with AWM and delegate a decision on entering into the agreement with AWM to the Directors of Legal and Democratic Services, City Development and Finance and ICT as detailed in Section 11, and also referred to in Section 7 of the report submitted.
- (2) Approve the completion of the necessary grant agreement with AWM to secure and draw down such funding.
- (3) Authorise the Director of Legal and Democratic Services to complete all necessary legal documentation with AWM as detailed in Section 11 of the report.
- (4) Subject to (1) and (2) above approve the acquisition of the land concerned from Whitefriars Housing Group as detailed in Section 10 of the report.
- (5) Note that the Director of City Development would report back on the Heads of Terms for the subsequent disposal of the majority of the site to City College, as soon as these had been agreed, and the addition to the capital programme of £3.15m in 2004/05.
- (6) Note the extremely challenging timescale for completing the above, and acknowledge that if this was not achieved by all of the parties involved that this funding will not be available. (All matters, including the land purchase have to be completed by 31st March 2005 and Section 8 of the report detailed the way forward if funding is not used by the deadline.)

101. **Response to Consultation Paper: "Drinking Sensibly – The Government's Proposal"**

Further to Minute 177/04 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Head of Corporate Policy which sought agreement to a response to the consultation paper on "Drinking Sensibly – The Government's Proposals" published in January 2005 on behalf of the Home Office, Department for Culture, Media and Sport and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

A consultation paper on "Drinking Sensibly" was published in January 2005, received on 21st January and brief information was sent via the Members' Bulletin on 28th January 2005, explaining the content of the paper and offering further information if required.

The consultation followed the publication in November 2004 of the Government's national alcohol harm reduction strategy. The report outlined the Government's concerns about the levels of alcohol-fuelled violence currently being reported across the country and set out a proposed response. It did not rule out other options. The paper detailed recent measures introduced and new proposals to combat a range of issues including under age sales, irresponsible promotions, alcohol related disorder and changing the culture of "binge drinking". Responses to the consultation paper had to be returned to the Home Office by

28th February 2005. The proposed response had been developed in consultation with the Coventry Community Safety Partnership, the Crime and Disorder Reduction Strategy Programme Delivery Group and the Children and Young People Strategic Partnership.

The consultation paper reviewed recent legislation and other measures and made clear that responsibility for tackling alcohol misuse cannot rest with the Government alone but required partnership working at both national and local levels between the Government, the drinks industry, health and police services, individuals and communities.

The Cabinet, after due consideration of the options and proposals contained in the report and matters referred to at the meeting agreed to approve the proposed response to the consultation and referred the report to Scrutiny Board (2) on 17th February 2005 for their consideration.

RESOLVED that the City Council endorse the views of the Cabinet and Scrutiny Board (2).

102. Appointment to Outside Bodies – Coventry Airport Consultative Committee

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services making an amendment to the appointment made to the Coventry Airport Consultative Committee at the City Council's annual meeting (Minute 42(2) refers).

At its meeting on 24th June, 2004, the City Council nominated Councillors Mrs. Dixon and Lakha to represent the City Council on the Coventry Airport Consultative Committee. This appointment overlapped with a reorganisation of the Consultative Committee by West Midlands International Airport. The reorganisation was undertaken for several reasons, the old Committee had not met for some time; the ownership of the West Midlands International Airport had recently changed; and there was a need to respond to recent legislative changes. The reorganisation meant that the City Council was now only allocated one seat, rather than two seats as had previously been the case.

RESOLVED that Councillor Mrs. Dixon be the City Council's nominated representative on the Coventry Airport Consultative Committee.

103. West Midlands Fire and Civil Defence Authority – Public Consultation: Response to Notice of Motion

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services seeking the Council's formal response following the West Midlands Fire and Civil Defence Authority's (WMFCDA) response to the Council's Notice of Motion which was adopted at the meeting on 14th December, 2004 (Minute 77/04 refers)).

Following a period of public consultation, the WMFCDA published its first Integrated Risk Management Plan (IRMP) "Your Safety Priority" in April 2004. This was produced as a requirement of the Government's White Paper "Your Fire and Rescue Service" which set out the modernisation and requirements for UK fire brigades. This had subsequently been updated into a national framework document which directed all fire authorities to issue and maintain an IRMP, and publish and consult on an action plan on an annual basis.

On 10th November, 2004 the WMFCDA published a public consultation detailing changes to the fire and rescue service over the next year. On 12th January, 2005 the

WMFCDA's response to the motion was received and was attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

The consultation period closed on 1st February 2005. The outcomes resulting from the consultation would be published in April 2005 and would set out any approved changes resulting from the consultation period. Any changes to service provision would then take place between April 2005 and March 2006.

Councillor Asif moved the following recommendations, which were seconded by Councillor Foster:

- (1) Council notes these reassurances by Senior Fire Officers and notes that overall the Integrated Risk Management Proposals are safe.
- (2) Council notes the considerable public disquiet concerning these proposals and that residents do not appear to have been sufficiently reassured. Council does not believe that the relative geographical isolation of Coventry has been adequately accounted for in the proposals.
- (3) Council accordingly request its three representatives on the West Midlands Fire & Civil Defence Authority to oppose the proposals in their current form insofar as they affect Coventry.

Councillor Nellist moved an amendment, seconded by Councillor Ms. McKay and adopted as follows:-

"In the first sentence of the recommendation 2.2 delete "and note"."

RESOLVED that the City Council:-

- (1) Note the West Midlands Fire and Civil Defence Authority's response to the Council's notice of motion adopted at the meeting on 14th December 2004.
- (2) Note the reassurances by senior fire officers that overall the integrated risk management proposals are safe.
- (3) Note the considerable public disquiet concerning these proposals and that residents do not appear to have been sufficiently reassured. Council does not believe that the relative geographical isolation of Coventry has been adequately accounted for in the proposals.
- (4) That the Council's three representatives on the West Midlands Fire and Civil Defence Authority oppose the proposals in their current form insofar as they effect Coventry.

104. **Adjournment of Meeting**

RESOLVED that the meeting be adjourned and that the outstanding item of business, namely question time, be deferred to the next meeting of Council on 19th April, 2005.

(NOTE: The meeting closed at 2.00 a.m.)