

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY
(PART 2)

17th May, 2005

PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Gazey)

Councillor Ahmed	Councillor Mrs. Lacy
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Lakha
Councillor Asif	Councillor Mrs. Lancaster
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Lee
Councillor Mrs. Basu	Councillor Mrs. Lucas
Councillor Batten	Councillor Ms. McKay
Councillor Benefield	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Bhyat	Councillor Mrs. Maskell
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor Matchet
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Charley	Councillor Mutton
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 Harrison	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Ms. Hunter	Councillor Mrs. Stone
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Williams

Apologies: Councillor Nellist

1. Former Councillor Parshotam Joshi

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of former Councillor Parshotam Joshi who had represented the Foleshill Ward for nine years.

Members paid tribute to the work undertaken by Parshotam Joshi and stood in silence as a mark of respect. A letter of condolence had already been sent on behalf of the City Council to his family.

2. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 8th and 22nd February, 2005, were signed as true records.

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st March, 2005, were also signed as a true record subject to an amendment to state that members of the Labour, Liberal Democrat and Socialist Groups left the meeting.

3. Election of the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Council

It was moved by Councillor Cliffe and seconded by Councillor Williams that Councillors Taylor and O'Neill be elected as Leader and Deputy Leader respectively of the City Council for the ensuing year.

RESOLVED that Councillors Taylor and O'Neill be elected as Leader and Deputy Leader respectively of the Council for the 2005/2006 year.

4. 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 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 Recommendations for the City Council

Personal

Member	Minute No.
Councillor Chater	15
Councillor O'Neill	17
Councillor Patton	17

Prejudicial

Member	Minute No.
Councillor Mrs. Lacy	5(a)
Councillor Skipper	12
Councillor Sawdon	15
Councillor Townshend	15

Matters for Determination by the City Council

The Council considered the following documents which were tabled at the meeting:-

- (a) Number of Councillors to be Appointed to the Cabinet.
- (b) The Cabinet Portfolios and Appointment of Cabinet Members.

- (c) The Appointments of Scrutiny Boards, Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, Standards Committee, Planning Committee and Licensing and Regulatory Committee.
- (d) The Size and Terms of Reference (as set out in the Constitution) for those Boards and Committees.
- (e) The Allocation of Seats to Political Groups in Accordance with the Political Balance Rules.
- (f) Nominations of Councillors to serve on each Scrutiny Board and Committee and the appointment of Cabinet Members on Area Forums and Chairs of Area Forums.
- (g) Nominations and appointments to Outside Bodies.
- (h) A Programme of Ordinary Meetings of the Council, Cabinet, Scrutiny Boards and Committees 2005/2006.

RESOLVED that:-

- (1) The appointments detailed in Appendix 1 to these minutes be approved.**
- (2) The appointments to Outside Bodies be approved, subject to the following inclusions:-**
 - (a) Coventry Older Peoples' Day Centre Limited – Councillor Mrs. Lucas.**
 - (b) CV One Limited – Councillors Mrs. Harper and Taylor.**
 - (c) Daimler Green Community Recreation Trust – Councillor Ms. Hunter.**
 - (d) Bonds Hospital Estate Charity Trustees – Councillor Mrs. Johnson.**
 - (e) Coventry and Solihull Valuation Tribunal – Councillors Asif, Lee and Mrs. Johnson.**
- (3) That the programme of ordinary meetings for 2005-06 be approved.**

6. Amendments to Constitution

Further to Minute 32/04 of the standards Committee, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services on proposed amendments to the City Council's Constitution to facilitate a more consistent and efficient operation of the political management arrangements.

The Constitution Working Group considered ways in which to improve the quality of decision making by reducing the length of full council meetings and had made a number

of recommendations as detailed in the report. The Group were unable to reach agreements regarding the length of speeches at Council meetings which were currently ten minutes for the mover of a motion or recommendation and five minutes for other speakers (with certain exceptions), and had sought the Standards Committee's view on this.

The Constitution Working Group had also considered issues relating to Cabinet Committees, substitutes at Scrutiny meetings, petitions at Planning Committee, travel policy for Members, limitations on criteria for call-in, procedure for call-ins and consideration of applications at Planning and Licensing and Regulatory Committees. Details of the Group's recommendations were set out in the report.

The Standards Committee noted a change which was to be made to the City Council's current practice of making annual appointments to Outside Bodies whereby, in future the list of Outside Bodies would be divided into two, those organisations where the City Council would always make annual appointments and those organisations, mainly charities, where the City Council could appoint representatives for a period of up to four years depending on the requirement of individual bodies.

The report indicated that the Director of Legal and Democratic Services currently had authority to make interim or transitional changes to the Scheme of Delegation as set out in Part 3 of the Constitution to ensure that all delegated powers were assigned to the relevant employees. Any such change had been subject to final confirmation by the City Council and it was proposed that this authority be delegated on a permanent basis without the need for Council approval and that it be extended to ensure that any new legislation of a technical nature was delegated to the appropriate Council body. Amendments to Part 3 of the Constitution did not fall within the remit of the Standards Committee and it was therefore before the City Council to approve this amendment.

RESOLVED:-

- (1) That the City Council approve the amendments to the Constitution as set out in the report.**
- (2) That the length of speeches at Council meetings be reduced from ten minutes to five minutes for the mover of a motion or recommendation and from five minutes to three minutes for other speakers. This would be for a trial period of 12 months and that the effectiveness of this would be reported to the Constitution Working Group to consider whether this should be a permanent amendment to the Constitution.**
- (3) That Part 3 of the current Constitution in relation to the scheme of delegation be amended as set out above.**

7. Revised Procedures for Consideration of Planning Proposals

Further to Minute 33/04 of the Standards Committee, the Council considered a report of the Head of Development Regulations and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services on the introduction on a trial basis of a scheme for the presentation to elected Members of proposals for development prior to a planning application being submitted and also for a revised procedure in respect of the circumstances in which site visits can be undertaken.

The report had been approved by the Cabinet Member (Urban Regeneration and Regional Planning) (Minute 106/04 refers) and the Planning Committee (Minute 240/04 refers).

The Code of Good Practice for dealing with Planning Matters highlighted that members of the Planning Committee were both representatives of the local community and made decisions on planning applications that may effect large sections of the community, may involve large sums of money and impact on the quality of the surrounding environment. It therefore recognised that it was important that such decisions were transparent, impartial and justifiable and hence the code. The code outlined the procedures in respect of pre-application discussions by employees and in respect of site visits.

The modernisation agenda had resulted in considerable changes to the planning system with the introduction of the new act and changes in emphasis. A detailed guide had been published by the Government Association for Elected members to explain the mechanics of the new system and a copy of this was appended to the report.

Arising from this publication and ongoing review of practices, it was considered that there would be benefit in a structured approach to Members' involvement in pre-application discussions. It was therefore recommended that, for a trial period of six months, developers (which could include City Council employees in the role of developers) should be able to request, prior to submission of a formal applications for major or potentially contentious proposals, to make a presentation to all members of the Council in the form of a development forum. That forum would be held in public and would provide an opportunity for Members and the public to ask questions and would enable Members to guide employees in any subsequent pre-application discussions.

The procedure for site visits was also detailed within the report and it was proposed that the Constitution be amended so as to enable a visit to be scheduled for any application where, in discussions with the Chair, it was felt that a visual appreciation was necessary prior to any consideration of the reports and of any petitions and/or comments from public speakers.

RESOLVED:-

- (1) That the City Council approve the amendments to the Constitution to enable a modified procedure for site visits as set out above.**
- (2) That the development forum procedures as set out in a report be included as part of the Constitution.**

8. Response to the Standards Board for England's Review of the Code of Conduct for Members

Further to Minute 34/04 of the Standards Committee, the Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services on a draft response to the Standards Board for England in relation to the review of the Code of Conduct for Elected members which it was currently undertaking.

As part of the modernisation agenda for local government, a new Code of Conduct for Elected Members was introduced by the Government in November 2001. Legislation

required that all authorities adopt the model code by no later than May 2002. Authorities that did not adopt the code had it automatically imposed upon them. The City Council adopted the model code without alteration in May 2002.

The Government had now asked the Standards Board to undertake a review of the effectiveness of the Code of Conduct and explore ways in which it could be improved or clarified. The Government has made it clear that it did not wish to dilute the basic underlying principles of the code but rather wished to discover what lessons may have been learned from the three year operation of the code. The Standards Board had issued a consultation document and a copy of the summary of that document was attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted. The Standards Board proposed 29 questions in the consultation document and sought responses on each of them. The deadline for submission of responses to the consultation was 17th June 2005. The suggested response to the consultation paper was attached as Appendix 2 to the report submitted.

RESOLVED that the City Council approve the draft response to the Standards Board for England.

9. Consultation on New School Funding Arrangements

Further to Minute 207/04 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a joint report of the Director of Education and Libraries and the Director of Finance and ICT which outlined proposals for new arrangements for school funding from 2006/07 and sought approval to submit a consultation response on behalf of the City Council.

A new National Funding System for Education was introduced in 2003/04. This changed the methodology used for allocating resources for education to local authorities within the overall local authority funding framework. The new system also separated education funding into a Schools Block and an LEA Block. In this context, the Schools Block included schools delegated budgets and expenditure by the City Council on outside maintained schools e.g. on services for Special Educational Needs.

The distributional impact of the new funding system along with changes to a significant number of grants and a significant increase in teachers' pension contributions, created turbulence and led to winners and losers at local authority and individual school levels. This led to a perceived "funding crisis" which, in the view of Government was in part, precipitated by local authorities holding back funding that was intended for schools. This in turn, led to continued pressure for greater year on year stability and uncertainty in levels of schools funding although a report by the Audit Commission subsequently refuted the notion that there had been a funding crisis or that local authorities were holding back money for schools.

The proposals in the current consultation were intended nevertheless, to deliver increased stability and builds on the promise of a three year planning horizon for all schools which was intimated in the five year Strategy for Children and Learners published in July 2004. The proposals also reduced the level of control that local authorities had in determining the level of resources to be spent on the schools.

Under the current funding system, the City Council had policy control over the overall level of resources spent on schools, although this had been eroded since 1999 by the Government's policy of passporting. This meant that the City Council was required to maintain an historic level of spending and pass on, in full, any increase in resources allocated for schools through the Local Government system.

Under the proposed new system, funding for schools would no longer form part of the Local Government Finance System but instead be passed on to local authorities as a ring fenced Dedicated Schools Grant (DSG). This would mean that the City Council would no longer have control over the level of schools funding, notwithstanding that this control had been limited by the passporting requirements since 1999. The City Council would, however, be able to add additional resources to the DSG if it chose.

There were several other proposals for changes to the current system for funding schools, the details of which were given in the report. A proposed response to the detailed consultation questions were attached at Appendices 1 and 2 of the report submitted.

RESOLVED that the draft response contained within Appendix 2 of the report submitted be approved.

10. **Coventry's Local Development Scheme**

Further to Minute 206/04 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Director of City Development which provided details on the City's Local Development Scheme and other aspects of the City's local development framework.

On 25th January 2005, Cabinet agreed to the submission of the draft Local Development Scheme (LDS) to the Secretary of State (their Minute 145/04 refers). The LDS was a public statement of the Local Authority's programme for the preparation of the various planning documents which form its Local Development Framework (LDF). The report noted that a local planning authority was required to submit the LDS to the Secretary of State before it can be brought into effect and that the Secretary of State could either agree to it or could direct changes to it. The report also noted that an LDS could be revised when necessary, either through an annual monitoring process, identifying whether the timetable set out has been achieved, or by the need to prepare or revise new documents.

The City Council had received a letter from the Government Office for the West Midlands stating that the Secretary of State did not intend to take action under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 and that the LDS could be brought into effect. The Cabinet noted that Planning Policy Statement 12 stated that, when an LDS takes effect it must be made available at Council offices and published on the Local Authority's website.

The requirements of the new planning legislation had been accompanied by a great deal of government advice about its implementation. However, such advice had been evolving over time and there had been significant changes to advice on the structures of LDFs. Employees were in discussions with the Planning Inspectorate and the Government Office for the West Midlands about how such changes might effect the structure of Coventry's LDF and how the programme was set out in the future versions of the LDS.

Any revisions to the structure of the LDF would retain previous principles of clarity and responsiveness. Revisions were likely to be dealt with through the annual monitoring process and it was recommended that such revisions were approved by the Cabinet Member (Urban Regeneration and Regional Planning). In addition, a start was being made on the initial elements of the LDF: The Statement of Community Involvement and the Core Strategy.

The Core Strategy would set out the main elements of the planning framework for the City, especially the vision for the future of the City and Strategic Policies. Work had commenced on the development of a vision of the initial element, and was being done with the LDF Members Advisory Group.

The Statement of the Community Involvement (SCI) would set out policy for involving the community in the preparation of the planning policy documents and planning applications. Initial informal consultation on the scope of a SCI was being completed. A draft SCI would be published in June to be followed by a statutory six-week period for representations. The statement would then be submitted to the Cabinet Member (Urban Regeneration and Regional Planning) for approval for submission to the Secretary of State. Members would also be involved through the Members Advisory Group at the informal stages of this process.

RESOLVED that the City Council:-

- (1) Approve the Local Development Scheme to come into effect from the date of this meeting.**
- (2) Delegate authority to revise the Local Development Scheme to officers in consultation with the Cabinet Member (Urban Regeneration and Regional Planning).**
- (3) Note the work being undertaken to progress the Statement of the Community Involvement and Core Strategy.**

11. Home Office Consultation: "Together we Can Reduce Re-offending and Increase Public Confidence"

Further to Minute 208/04 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Head of Corporate Policy which sought agreement to a response to the Home Office on the consultation document "Together We Can Reduce Re-offending and Increase Public Confidence".

In March 2005 the Home Office circulated the Consultation Paper which was intended to inform the National Offender Management Service, Communities and Civil Renewal Strategy, which would be launched in September 2005. This strategy highlighted the value of involving local people in offender management.

It was proposed that during 2005/2006 there would be a national assessment of community engagement activities and consideration of the funding implications of new work agreements would then be reached regarding new plans and potential measures for this work for 2006/2007.

The consultation proposed five key areas for further support and development by NOMS and views were sought on the challenges to be faced in the implementing of the community strategy. The five key areas were:-

- (i) Public protection – Reassuring the public that high risk offenders were managed safely.**

- (ii) Unpaid and Reparative Work – Offering the public a sense of justice through visible and practical demonstrations of offenders repairing harm.
- (iii) Volunteers, Mentors and Governance – Providing emotional and practical support to reduce re-offending and involve local people in the scrutiny of NOMS' work.
- (iv) Victims and Restorative Justice – Encouraging direct or indirect communication between victim and offender providing an opportunity for the victim to seek information, explanation and maybe reparation.
- (v) Transition to Ex Offender – Giving support to offenders to reintegrate into communities as law abiding citizens.

There were many complex and sensitive issues associated with the management and rehabilitation of offenders. The opportunity to contribute towards a coherent strategy that addresses the issues in an inclusive way through promotion of greater community involvement, would improve public confidence and support in the delivery of the Local Community Safety Strategy.

The proposed response to the consultation document was attached as an appendix to the report submitted.

RESOLVED that the City Council approve the draft response contained in Appendix 1 of the report submitted.

12. Herbert Art Gallery and Museum Development

The Council considered a joint report of the Director of Finance and ICT and the Director of City Development detailing the progress of the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum Redevelopment Scheme. The report sought retrospective approval for expenditure incurred in respect of Phase 1 of the development, and sought to secure approval for the continued funding of the scheme.

The Development of the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum formed part of a wider programme of investment in city centre culture and leisure facilities that include the Coventry Transport Museum and the Belgrade Theatre. These developments followed on from the investment in the SkyDome and Phoenix Project to create a step change in the image and profile of the city centre and the city as a whole. Plans for the Herbert Art Gallery would make the Museum more accessible to a wider range of visitors. The Herbert's membership of the West Midlands Museums' Hub and the investment of Central Government money in the hub for education, social services inclusion and cultural diversity programmes complement the proposed capital development. The plans would attract more people into the city and provide a stronger base for the Herbert's work in schools and local communities.

The redevelopment of the Herbert is being phased. Phase 1 was currently near completion and provided 1,300 square metres of new and refurbished space. The benefits included:-

- Bringing back into use the lecture theatre.

- Relocating of audio video and creative IT facilities from the former Depot Studios in Bond Street (demolished to make way for the Belgrade Development).
- The provision of training, education, meetings, exhibitions and event spaces.
- The establishment of an arts information centre.

The next stage of the redevelopment was to create a landmark building facing Coventry Cathedral and the University Square. It comprised a 'Phase 2' and a 'Phase 3' of the development. This phasing has been determined largely to enable the scheme to take maximum advantage of external grant opportunities. These phases were interdependent and the whole scheme was scheduled for completion in 2006/2007. Details of Phases 2 and 3 were outlined in the report.

The Council noted a typographical error relating to paragraph 4.1 of the report in so far that the amount of expenditure on the Herbert phase 1 redevelopment should be £3007k and not £3047k as detailed.

Since 2003 the Council's Capital Programme has been under significant pressure from a number of sources beyond the Council's control. This meant that the Council had to review its priorities and when the Capital Programme for 2005/2006 was set, the final approved programme excluded Phases 2 and 3 of the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum.

Shortly after the finalisation of the Capital Programme, officers reviewed the position and identified that in relation to ERDF and HLF grant payments made in respect of Phase 1 were technically dependant upon completion of Phases 2 and 3 to deliver the agreed outcomes. Talks with the funding bodies identified that they would have to follow grant conditions and the Council would have to repay the grants made if the rest of the project did not proceed, despite this money having already been spent and phase 1 of the development being to some degree self-contained. Also, the Council would still be potentially committed to incur further costs in creating archive space bringing back into use other spaces within the HAGM and updating exhibitions. Whilst important, this did not however alter the position that the overall committed Capital Programme had other major priorities within it e.g. investment in the roads network, school rebuilding etc.

Therefore, in order to try and ensure that the scheme could proceed, the Council sought to obtain funds from other external sources in addition to those funds already allocated by the Heritage Lottery Fund and the Government Office (ERDF). The Alan Edward Higgs Trust Charity approached the Council with an offer to help fund the scheme. Following discussions with Council officers, the offer that had been made was for a £3m loan over three years to be repaid at £1m per annum. It was also expected that the time limited support towards the revenue costs of the loan would be made by the Alan Edward Higgs Charity and other local charities who wished to remain anonymous.

The report detailed the proposals agreed by the Trustees of the Alan Edward Higgs Charity Board at their meeting on Friday 13th May 2005.

This confirmed the other as follows:-

- A £3m loan payable to the HAGM Trust.

- Three annual repayments of £1m commencing 12 months after draw down of the loan.
- Interest chargeable at 6% per annum.
- Coventry City Council to agree the loan.
- A nominee of the Trustees of the Alan Edward Higgs Charity Trust to be on the HAGM Trust Board for the period of the loan.

RESOLVED:-

(1) That, in respect of the Phase 1 development, the City Council:-

- (i) Retrospectively authorises expenditure of £257,000 to the contractor to meet the costs incurred and payments in respect of Phase 1 of the development consequential upon the decision in adjudication (as outlined in the private appendix to the report).**
- (ii) Delegates authority to the Director of City Development, the Director of Finance and ICT and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services to approve additional payments to the contractor and to the respective consultants as required to meet the Council's contractual obligations and the decision in any future adjudication up to the limit of the worst case scenario (as outlined in the private appendix to the report).**
- (iii) To delegate that Cabinet receive a report back on the final outcome of the negotiations referred to in (ii) above.**

(2) That, in respect of phases 2 and 3 development, the City Council:-

- (i) Makes an addition of £12,902k to its approved Capital programme to fund the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum Phases 2 and 3, in the Phase 1 overspend known to date to be funded as follows:-**

Grants (HLF, ERDF, DCMS)	Outstanding £
Grants (HLF, ERDF, DCMS)	6,698
City Council	3,204
HAGM Trust (via Alan Edward Higgs Charity)	3,000
	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>
Total	12,902
	<hr style="width: 100%;"/>

- (ii) Agree to reconstruct a dormant existing trust as the new Herbert Art Gallery and Museum Trust so that it can receive the £3m loan from the Alan Edward Higgs Charity and to**

support the Trust in securing re-financing of the loan should this be necessary.

- (iii) Agrees to act as a guarantor to the £3m loan to be made by the Alan Edward Higgs Charity to the Herbert Art Gallery and Museum Trust.
- (iv) Delegates authority to the Director of City Development, the Director of Finance and ICT and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services to proceed with the negotiations with Coventry University to secure the land required for the development to proceed.
- (v) Approves the appointment of ISG as the main contractor for the scheme and the extension of the appointment of Events Communications to cover the Phase 3 exhibition, and these appointments will be subject to:-
 - Acquisition of land from Coventry University.
 - Confirmation of the funding from the Alan Edward Higgs Charity and the other local charity.
 - Costs being within the approved budget.
- (vi) Accept the risks:-
 - That the land may not be acquired from Coventry University.
 - That the Alan Edward Higgs Charity or the other local charitable trust Boards do not approve the proposals for the £3m loan as set out in the report.
 - That the HAGM Trust fails to secure the financing of the £3m loan or to fund the ongoing servicing costs.
 - That the conditions set by the external funders (ERDF/HLF) are not met and the City Council either does not receive funding or has to repay funding already received.
 - That the cost of the scheme exceeds the allocated budget.

Business Postponed from 19th April 2005

13. Petitions

RESOLVED that the following petitions be referred to the City Council bodies indicated:-

- (1) **Request to Whitefriars to Erect Security Fencing – 24 signatures presented by Councillor Mutton (Whitefriars Housing Group).**
- (2) **Opposing the Cessation of Funding to the Irish Community in Coventry – 1,284 signatures presented by Councillor Mutton (Cabinet Member (Finance and Equalities)).**

14. **Main Debate – Major Redevelopment**

Councillor Batten moved the following motion for the Main Debate, which was seconded by Councillor Patton.

"The City Council welcomes the major redevelopments that have taken place and continue to take place contributing to the regeneration of Coventry – enhancing the reputation of Coventry, and increasing the prospects for further investment in the City."

RESOLVED that the substantive motion as set out above be adopted.

15. **Health scrutiny: Review of Health and Social Care, City Centre – Update**

Further to Minute 49/04 of Scrutiny Board (4) (Health), the Council considered the Board's Review of Health and Social Care Services, City Centre.

The report set out the terms of reference for the review, explained the issues addressed, summarised the evidence received and set out findings and recommendations.

The summary of the report indicated that the Health Scrutiny Board had looked before at the future for the health services in the city centre and concluded that:-

- Outpatient services should be retained in the city centre.
- Social Services should be collated with the Health Services.
- Access and transport issues would be important.
- Further consultation including reports to the Health Scrutiny Board was necessary.

The recommendations of the report were as follows:-

- (1) The Health Scrutiny Board recommends that Coventry Teaching PCT publish, as soon as practicable, a list of services that will be affected by the delay to city centre LIFT, and also publish an action plan setting out how it will deal with the disruption caused, including proposals for informing patients of changes and ensuring appropriate disabled access and parking.
- (2) Coventry City Council Health Scrutiny Board recommends that Coventry Teaching PCT, as part of agreeing the outline business case for city centre LIFT, publish information demonstrating that stakeholders had adequate opportunity to contribute to the process by which the outline business case was agreed.

- (3) Coventry City Council Health Scrutiny Board recommends that Coventry Teaching PCT launch, at the earliest opportunity following agreement of the outline business case for city centre LIFT, a formal statutory consultation relating to its proposals for the city centre, in accordance with Section 4 of SI 2002 No. 3048 and associated guidance. The Health Scrutiny Board recommends that the consultation paper accompanying the Consultation should include:-
- A list of all the services considered for inclusion in City Centre LIFT, with explanations of why they have been included or were rejected
 - Financial information relating to the proposals
 - Full timetable for delivery of city centre LIFT
 - A summary of the public consultation already undertaken relating to the city centre, how this influenced the development of the outline business case and what further public consultation is proposed
- (4) The Health Scrutiny Board recommends that (a) the Strategic Partnering Board should publish its agendas and consider whether its meetings should be held in public and (b) that the Strategic Partnering Board should consider whether its membership should be extended to include University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust

Scrutiny Board (4) had requested a response from Coventry Teaching Primary Care Trust by 12.00 noon on 27th April 2005.

RESOLVED that the City Council notes the report of the Scrutiny Board.

16. Appointment of Public Analyst and Agricultural Analyst

Further to Minute 194/04 of the Cabinet, the City Council noted a joint report of the Director of City Services and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services which sought approval for the appointment of Public Analysts (Food) and an Agricultural Analyst and Deputies (Fertilisation and Animal Feeding Stuffs).

Public Analysts and Agricultural Analysts provided a wide range of scientific services to local authorities concerning their Trading Standards and Environmental Health enforcement roles, particularly in relation to food standards and safety, fertilisers and animal feeding stuffs. Routine, complaints and home authority foods, fertiliser and animal feeding stuffs samples are submitted as part of a comprehensive sampling programme to ascertain composition or requirements, nutritional values, compliance with labelling, identification of additives and to establish the presence, source and identification of any contaminants. On 20th September 1985 the then Policy Advisory Committee had agreed that all analytical work for consumer services would be sent, for three years, to Garrets Green (their Minute 95/85 refers). This continued after the three years and Mr. R.W. Davies fulfilled the role of Public Analyst and Agriculture Analyst. Mr. Davies was employed by Birmingham City Council at Birmingham City Laboratory at Garrets Green, Birmingham. Following a review, Birmingham City Council decided to cease the provision of Public Analyst and Agricultural Analyst Services from 31st March 2005.

Therefore, there was an urgent need to appoint a Public Analyst and Agricultural Analyst to act as analysts for the purpose of the Food Safety Act 1990 and the Agriculture Act 1970 within the authority's area. The appointment will be to fulfil their functions under the above legislation but not as an employee of Coventry City Council.

RESOLVED that the City Council give approval to the appointment of Worcestershire Scientific Services, Staffordshire County Council and Leicestershire County Council as Public Analysts and Agricultural Deputy/Deputy Agricultural Analysts, with immediate effect, and in particular to the appointment of the following personnel:-

- (1) Robert Alan Stevens, M. Chem, A. Chem, F.R.S.C., F.I.S.S.T., Worcestershire Scientific Services, as Public Analyst and Agricultural Analyst.**
- (2) Carol Rosemary Stevens, M. Chem, A. Chem C. Chem, F.R.S.C., B.S.C., Worcestershire Scientific Services, as Public Analyst.**
- (3) Robert W. Davies, M. Chem, A. Chem, Worcestershire Scientific Services as Public Analyst.**
- (4) Dr. Frank Hollywood PHD, B.Sc, M. Chem, A. Chem, M.R.S.C., Staffordshire County Council, as Public Analyst and Deputy Agricultural Analyst.**
- (5) John Waller, M. Chem, A. Chem, MiSc, MRSc, C. Chem Leicestershire County Council, as Public Analyst and Deputy Agricultural Analyst.**
- (6) Dr. Geoffrey Hayward M. Chem, A. Chem, B.Sc, MSC, PHD, Leicestershire County Council, as Public Analyst and Deputy Agricultural Analyst.**

17. New Deal for Communities (NDC) – Wood End, Henley Green and Manor Farm – Masterplanning

Further to Minute 195/04 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Management Board which detailed the current position in respect of the masterplanning for New Deal for Communities (NDC) which identified key issues and the next steps planned to invite proposals from a short list of developers and outlined the support requested of the City Council as the plan moved to the next stage.

The report detailed the range of issues and implications for partners and the Cabinet recognised that all of them required much more detailed work over an extended period before they can be finalised. They included financial, design, technical, commercial, development and partnership structures. Any proposals would need to be subject to further public consultation and require planning permission as with any other development.

No final formal commitments are requested at this stage, and can only be considered at a later stage when the response to the ISOP are clear, and the partners have considered which proposals they prefer and what to pursue.

The report further detailed an indicative timetable that could be anticipated, based on the ISOP being issued in April. There was a long lead-in time for such a major complex project and partners, particularly NDC were working up a package of early actions on the ground, which would make early improvements, prepare for the bigger programme of work and ensure NDC resources were used prudently.

RESOLVED that the City Council:-

- (1) Approve the issuing of an invitation to submit outlined proposals (ISOP) from short listed developers, and that the Council be named as a partner and supporter in this invitation.**
- (2) Agree and approve that the Council undertakes the roles and responsibilities underpinning the Masterplan set out in Sections 8 to 12 of the report submitted.**
- (3) Make the Council's support conditional on the NDC Board and Whitefriars Housing Group similarly agreeing and approving their roles and responsibilities.**
- (4) Support the NDC in developing their proposals to implement an early programme of NDC funded works.**
- (5) Authorise expenditure of £100,000 as outlined in Paragraph 8.10 of the report submitted, to move the proposals ahead.**
- (6) Agree to establish a Member Advisory Group as referred to in paragraph 12.4 of the report submitted.**
- (7) Request that further reports and details are brought back before any formal commitments are made.**

18. Question Time

The following Members answered oral questions put to them by other Members as set out below:-

Question Asked By	Question Put To	Subject Matter
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Field	Scrutinising Cabinet Member Plans
Councillor Mutton	Councillor Taylor	Single Status – Industrial Action
Councillor Mrs. Lucas	Councillor Foster	Resurfacing of Kersley Road
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Taylor	Diverting Resources
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Foster	Government Grants
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Arrowsmith	Pool Meadow

Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Arrowsmith	Planting of Trees in Monmouth Boulevard
Councillor Townshend	Councillor Foster	Repayment Costs of Highway Maintenance Programme
Councillor Townshend	Councillor Foster	Attack on Driver of Council Vehicle in Tile Hill
Councillor Mutton	Councillor Taylor	Cost of Visit to Belfast
Councillor Chater	Councillor Matchet	Smoking reduction in Coventry
Councillor Chater	Councillor Foster	Condition of Stretton Avenue
Councillor Mutton	Councillor Foster	Outturn Figure for Resurfacing of Gibbet Hill
Councillor Townshend	Councillor O'Neill	Financial Costs for Major Capital Programme

(NOTE: The meeting closed at 8.35 p.m.)