

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY**13th December, 2005****PRESENT**

Lord Mayor (Councillor Lakha)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Ahmed)

Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Kelsey
Councillor Asif	Councillor Mrs. Lacy
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Lee
Councillor Mrs. Basu	Councillor Mrs. Lucas
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 Gazey	Councillor Mrs. Rutter
Councillor Mrs. Griffin	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Mrs. Harper	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Harrison	Councillor Mrs. Stone
Councillor Ms. Hunter	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Williams

Apologies:- Councillor Mrs. Lancaster
Councillor Ms. McKay

91. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 1st November, 2005, were signed as a true record.

92. Petitions

RESOLVED that the following petitions be referred to the appropriate City Council body/external organisation:-

- (a) Wallace Road, Keresley – 78 signatures presented by Councillor Gazey.

- (b) **Grass Verges in Sewall Highway** – 59 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs. Dixon.
- (c) **Gating Entry Between Fir Tree Avenue and Broad Lane** – 34 signatures presented by Councillor Lee.
- (d) **Fir Tree Avenue/Broad Lane Footpath** – 39 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs. Lacy.
- (e) **Gravel Hill, Tile Hill South – Traffic Calming** – 48 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs. Lacy.
- (f) **Proposed Development at 474 Woodway Lane** – 20 signatures presented by Councillor Patton.

93. **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 Government Conduct and to the City Council's Constitution:-

Interests in Minutes and Debate

Personal

Member	Minute Number
Councillor Chater	96 and 102
Councillor Sawdon	96 and 102
Councillor Townshend	96 and 102

94. **Question Time**

The following Members asked oral questions put to them by other Members as set out below, together with supplementary questions on the same matters:-

Question Asked By	Question Asked To	Subject
Councillor Nellist	Councillor O'Neill	Financial impact of single status
Councillor Mutton	Councillor Kelsey	Use of non-contracted agency staff
Councillor Mutton	Councillor Taylor	Potential strike action in relation to Single Status
Councillor Skipper	Councillor Ridley	Herbert Art Gallery and Museum
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Kelsey	City Council employees who are Territorial Army reserves
Councillor Field	Councillor Arrowsmith	Size of buildings on former Barras Heath Wholesale Market

Councillor Nellist	Councillor Blundell	Quality of school dinners
Councillor Chater	Councillors Arrowsmith and Foster	Shopping trolleys in Coventry Canal
Councillor Mrs. Rutter	Councillor Taylor	Responsibility of Council Members attending Area Forums
Councillor Mrs. Griffin	Councillor Foster	Responsibility for shopping trolleys
Councillor Townshend	Councillor O'Neill	Training for members
Councillor Patton	Councillor Taylor	Responsibility of Council Members attending meetings of outside bodies
Councillor Batten	Councillor Taylor	Review of area forums and attendance at meetings
Councillor Gazey	Councillor O'Neill	Public participation at area forums

95. **Delegation of Powers Relating to the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005**

Further to Minute 139/05 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services which sought to authorise officers to execute provisions of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 (CNEA).

On 7th April, 2005, the CNEA received Royal Assent. Whilst some elements of the Act were introduced in June 2005, its main provisions come into force in April 2006.

The Act introduced a range of powers to improve the legislative provisions for dealing with nuisance vehicles, litter and refuse, graffiti, fly-posting, waste management, fly-tipping, noise, dog control and general nuisance.

One of the additional powers included in the CNEA was the ability to issue fixed penalty notices for specific offences such as nuisance vehicles, waste offences and related problems. Information on these additional powers were contained in a parallel report on "The Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 Implementation Programme" also considered at this meeting of the Cabinet (Minute 138/05 refers).

Whilst most of the Act amends existing legislation, it has also created new offences and associated powers as follows:-

- Powers to deal with businesses who repair vehicles on the road or leave vehicles on the road for sale.
- Powers to create dog control areas within the local authority to control issues such as dog fouling or keeping dogs on leads and excluding dogs.
- Allowing local authorities to designate alarm notification areas.

The CNEA significantly extends the use of fixed penalty notices, and it was therefore anticipated that the number of fixed penalty notices issued by officers would increase. The majority of these offences relating to fixed penalty notices were for summary offences only. The local authority therefore had a timescale of six months to relay information to the Magistrates' Court. Incidents may take several months to investigate and seeking authorisation to prosecute from the Licensing and Regulatory Committee further extends the processing time. Cases are then in danger of running out

of time. The delegation of powers to the Heads of Services would overcome this risk and would enable the efficient administration of the enforcement powers.

At present, the Traffic Management and Accident Investigation Team are located in the City Development Directorate. However, following the restructuring the Team would be relocated to the City Services Directorate and would be managed by a newly created post of "Head of Highway Services". Powers would therefore have to be transferred to the Head of Highway Services in order for further authorisations to take place.

It was proposed that the Heads of Services detailed in Appendix A to the report submitted should have delegated powers to instigate legal proceedings so as to ensure that the local authority would meet with their legal deadlines. To that end it was proposed that specific authority be delegated to the Head of Public Protection, the Head of Street Services and the Head of Planning and Transportation (as detailed in Appendix A of the report submitted) and duly authorised officers employed by these directorates and currently empowered to enforce various Environmental Health and Trading Standards legislation, to enforce the relevant sections of the CNEA. In the case of nuisance parking, those powers would be transferred to the Head of Highway Services from the Head of Planning and Transportation when the post was created.

It was also proposed that decision making powers be given to the above Heads of Services to make decisions on whether persons should face legal prosecution for non-payment of fixed penalty fines.

There were a number of functions (for example, issuing fixed penalty notices) that could also be carried out by the Council's partners. Enforcement functions have normally been restricted to Council officers. The report therefore sought consideration of and consent for, officers exploring this option further. Subject to the agreement of the above proposal, a study would be undertaken to establish the feasibility of non-council employees issuing fixed penalty notices. Following the outcome of that feasibility study, a further report would be presented to the Cabinet about authorising non-Council partners.

RESOLVED that the City Council:-

- (1) Delegate authority to the Head of Public Protection, Head of Street Services, in the City Services Directorate and the Head of Planning and Transportation in the City Development Directorate to enforce the provisions of the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005 and any regulations made there under as detailed in Paragraph 4.1 of the report submitted.**
- (2) Delegate decision making powers to the Head of Public Protection, the Head of Street Services and the Head of Planning and Transportation so that they can authorise legal proceedings for officers relating to the non-payment of fixed penalty fines listed in Appendix A of the report submitted.**
- (3) Give authority for the transfer of powers to the Head of Highway Services from the Head of Planning and Transportation when this new post is created in the City Services Directorate.**
- (4) Consider the City Council's position on delegating powers to employees of "non-council" partners (such as the City Centre**

Management Company CVOne and Whitefriars Housing) so that their employees, specifically wardens, could issue fixed penalty notices.

- (5) Approve the appropriate amendment of the City Council's Constitution to give effect to the decisions.**

96. Coventry City Centre Health Services Public Consultation

Further to Minute 48/05 of Scrutiny Board (4) (Health), the City Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services which detailed the Board's proposed response to the public consultation on City Centre Health Services.

On 5th September, 2005, Coventry Teaching Primary Care Trust (CTPCT) published its consultation paper on city centre health services. The paper set out a series of options for services to be included in the proposed health centre to be built on or near the site of the existing Coventry and Warwickshire Hospital.

The Consultation paper presented five options for the range of services to be included in the health centre, as a consultation respondent, the Board could choose which of these options it believed would be the best for health services in the area.

Further to this, the consultation paper listed 18 out patient services that could be included in the health centre. The paper asked respondents to list, in order of preference, the five services that should be a high priority for inclusion. CTPCT had explained that this did not necessarily mean that five out patient services would be included in the health centre, they had stated that, whilst their preferences would be to include as many as possible, other factors may influence the final configuration of the services.

In order to form a response, the Board had sought evidence from stakeholders including Coventry Teaching PCT, University Hospitals, Coventry and Warwickshire NHS Trust, Coventry and Warwickshire Ambulance Services NHS Trust, Coventry Care Partnership Limited and the Social Services and City Development Directorates. The consultation paper had also been considered at the Council's six area forums and copies of the minutes of each of the forums had been circulated to the Board.

The Scrutiny Co-Ordinator (Health) corrected an error in the report in that the size of the city centre building had been misquoted and should have stated that it would be approximately 16,000m² (not 40,000m²).

The Board had questioned officers on the report and in response to a question on parking the Board were informed that, following consultation, Mr. Siegart would be meeting with City Development officers to discuss planning, design and transport.

During the discussions the Board agreed that, with key stakeholders not able to offer definite statements on the affordability of the city centre project, the Board could not unconditionally support any of the options put forward in the consultation. The evidence received to date did not allow the Board to determine which option would be in the best interest of health services in Coventry.

The Board's view was that, whilst it supported the creation of a city centre facility, as the basis for improving primary care in the city, the process by which the specification was set should seek to ensure that each service included in the city centre would add maximum value to health care provision and patients.

Scrutiny Board (4) (Health) decided to make the following recommendations to Coventry Teaching PCT in response to their consultation on City Centre health services:-

- (1) That Coventry Teaching Primary Care Trust, in future consultations of this sort, offer greater explanation and context for the techniques it uses to obtain respondents' preferences.
- (2) That CTPCT test its consultation questions prior to their inclusion in future consultation papers.
- (3) That CTPCT consider the use of pre-paid envelopes or a free post address for future consultations.
- (4) That CTPCT create the facility for direct work responses for future consultations.
- (5) That CTPCT report the findings of the financial appraisal of the city centre development to the Health Scrutiny Board.
- (6) That CTPCT use the financial appraisal of the city centre development as the basis for a further exercise with partner organisations to determine the affordability and value for money of the four options in the consultation, and report to the Health Scrutiny Board its findings.
- (7) That CTPCT and Coventry and Warwickshire Ambulance Services report to the Health Scrutiny Board their assessment of the implications of *Commissioning a Patient Led NHS* for the city centre development.
- (8) That CTPCT ensure that the city centre development is considered as part of the Coventry and Warwickshire Acute Services Review, and report to the Health Scrutiny Board as appropriate.
- (9) That CTPCT report to the Health Scrutiny Board on how its proposals for improvements to Coventry's primary care facilities relate to the city centre development.
- (10) That Coventry City Council's City Development Directorate reports to the Health Scrutiny Board its action plan for securing appropriate public transport access for the city centre development, its assessment of adequate drop off points and disabled parking, and its assessment of more general car parking requirements for staff and patients.
- (11) That the Board recommends to CTPCT that its first priority in the city centre development was to deliver appropriate health care facilities to the people of Hillfields.
- (12) That the consultation response be submitted to Council on 13th December, 2005, for information.

RESOLVED that the City Council note the response to the Coventry City Centre Health Service Public consultation submitted by Scrutiny Board (4) (Health).

97. **Waste Strategy Kerbside Recycling Scheme Extension**

Further to Minute 154/05 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services, which sought approval for the extension of the existing paper kerbside recycling rounds city wide, and to extend the existing garden waste kerbside recycling rounds to all practical areas of the city. The report also outlined the Council's recycling/composting performance and progress towards Government targets.

The implementation of the current kerbside recycling service for paper and cardboard collections and garden waste collections were approved by Cabinet on 15th October, 2002, and on 18th February, 2003, respectively.

The 2003 Household Waste Recycling Act required local authorities to provide two forms of kerbside recycling to all households by 2010. The accompanying guidelines to the Act were released earlier this year, and advised that the co-mingled collection of paper and cardboard was only considered as one form of kerbside recycling.

The expansion of kerbside recycling was an integral part of the City Council's Developing Waste Strategy. The Cabinet were advised that further work with partners and stakeholders was ongoing to develop a waste strategy for the next 25 to 30 years and a further report would be brought to Cabinet before the end of the current Municipal Year.

Both of the current kerbside recycling services have been well received by residents and demand for the service in other areas of the city has grown dramatically in the last two years. This was evident by requests from members of the public, customer satisfaction surveys, area forums, residents' meetings and petitions to Elected Members.

The implementation of the existing kerbside recycling was funded by a one off grant from the Department of the Environment, Food, and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) for £1.3m. On-going revenue costs of providing the kerbside recycling facilities have been met through a combination of PPR funding, internal recycling budgets, and existing budgets.

As part of the Government's paper "Waste Strategy 2000" a number of national and local recycling/composting targets were set. The Council's recycling/composting performance against these targets was summarised in the report submitted.

Prior to the implementation of the kerbside collection scheme in 2002/03 the city had a recycling/composting rate of less than 8%. The introduction of the scheme enabled the City Council to meet its 2003/04 recycling/composting target of 12% (extended to 13.2% by PSA), the outturn figure being 14.4%.

The estimated performance for the second quarter of 2005/06 shows the Council performing at approximately 0.5% under the national target of 18%. Measures have been put in place to recover this position before the end of the financial year. Schemes included the introduction of a garden waste shredding service, increasing the number of recycling sites in December 2005 and January 2006 and one off textile collections in January 2006.

2005/06 had seen the introduction of a new Best Value Performance Indicator (BVPI) measurement for the percentage of the population served by a collection of two recyclable materials. The impacts on future targets and service provision were detailed in the graphs attached at Appendix 3 of the report submitted.

The Audit Commission had recently published final details on the indicators to be used for assessment of local authority service performance under the environment block. These included performance against the Best Value Performance Indicator for collection of one kerbside recyclable (91a). Each indicator's contribution to the overall score would be made on the basis of its performance against threshold set out by the Audit Commission. For 2005/06, collection from 100% households would achieve the top threshold while collection from less than 80% households would achieve bottom threshold.

As part of the recent domestic waste round review, the employees have also carried out an efficiency review of paper kerbside collections for rounds carrying out the current kerbside collection, each round collects from approximately 2,000 properties and then travels to Birmingham to tip. As part of this year's use of recycling resources the Council has constructed a paper/cardboard bulking facility in the tipping apron of the London Road Waste to Energy Plant. Paper/cardboard would now be bulked up and delivered to the Council's waste paper processor in Birmingham. This would free up resources and allow the Council to increase capacity to service an additional 44,000 properties or 13% at no additional labour cost.

The implementation of the recent Domestic Waste Round Review and the introduction of a paper bulking facility would considerably increase the effective use of resources. This would have a significant impact on the Council's performance when set against the Gershon Agenda and the ongoing levels of resources required to operate the expanded scheme.

The proposed extension to the kerbside recycling scheme would be implemented in three stages, the first being the expansion of paper recycling rounds (excluding high rise and multiple occupancy properties) in February/March 2006; the second being the expansion of paper recycling rounds to multi-occupancy properties by September 2006; and the third being the expansion of the garden waste kerbside recycling service with bins being delivered in January/February 2006 and collections starting in March 2006.

RESOLVED that the City Council:-

- (1) Approve the expansion of the paper kerbside recycling rounds from the current 52% of the city to 100%, as detailed in Section 4 of the report submitted.**
- (2) Approve the expansion of the garden waste kerbside rounds from the current 26% of the city to all practical areas of the city (approximately 85%), as detailed in Section 4 of the report.**
- (3) Approve net budget additional costs of £130,000 in 2005/2006, £1,329,000 in 2006/2007, and £514,000 in 2008/2009 noticing that in 2007/2008, the proposed expansion would return £146,000 to corporate reserves.**
- (4) Approve ongoing net costs of £514,000 per year to be built into the Council's base budget from 2008/2009 if no further Waste Performance Grant was received, as detailed in Paragraph 5.7 of the report.**

- (5) **Note that the expansion of the service would increase the number of recycling rounds from six to 12 and create 18 additional posts within Waste Services.**
- (6) **Note the proposed implementation plan as detailed on the chart attached at Appendix 1 and the areas covered by the expanded recycling service as detailed on the map attached as Appendix 2 to the report.**

98. **Amendments to the Constitution**

Further to Minute 12/05 of the Standards Committee, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services which proposed changes to the City Council's Constitution that had arisen since the Committee considered amendments to the Constitution at their meeting on 14th April, 2005 (Minute 32/04 refers). The Constitution Working Group had met to examine the Constitution and, as a result, had recommended that two amendments be made.

Currently all Council meetings, except for the Annual Meeting and Extraordinary Meetings allow for question time. Councillors are able to submit written questions in advance of the meeting or to ask oral questions at the meeting itself. Question Time had recently been moved to the start of the agenda and was lasting up to an hour and a half. at the Council Tax/Budget Setting Meeting, except in exceptional circumstances, for reasons of urgency, no other items of business are considered. This meeting usually lasts for over six hours, with all Councillors having the opportunity to discuss any issue relating to the proposed budget for the forthcoming year. In light of this, the Constitution Working Group have recommended that there be no question time at the Council Tax/Budget Setting Meeting.

The Constitution requires that approval for Councillors to attend any "conference" (which includes seminars, working parties, fact finding visits and inspections) must be gained from the Cabinet prior to the date of the event. This includes all visits abroad, including those by the Lord Mayor/Deputy Lord Mayor and civic delegations. The Councillor who attends the "conference" must report back on their attendance to a subsequent meeting of the relevant Scrutiny Board within two months of her/his attendance. The Cabinet had asked the Constitution Working Group to consider whether the rules regarding obtaining approval to travel abroad should also apply to the Lord Mayor/Deputy Lord Mayor, bearing in mind the discretion of the Lord Mayor to undertake foreign trips in accordance with the objectives of the Mayoralty.

The Constitution Working Group gave consideration to this issue and, noting the non-political nature and objectives of the Mayoralty, have recommended that only those visits by the Lord Mayor/Deputy Lord Mayor which were outside the European Union should require formal Cabinet approval. Reports back on attendance would still be required for all visits.

RESOLVED that the City Council make the two amendments to the Constitution as outlined above in relation to the deletion of Question Time at the Council Tax/Budget Setting Meeting and only visits by the Lord Mayor/Deputy Lord Mayor that are outside the European Union require formal Cabinet approval.

99. **Revised Medium Term Financial Strategy**

Further to Minute 165/05 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and ICT, which presented a medium term financial strategy for 2005 - 2009 for adoption by the City Council. A copy of the full strategy was attached as an appendix to the report submitted. The Cabinet noted that the report had also been considered by Scrutiny Board (1) at their meeting on 8th December, 2005 (their Minute 61/05 refers).

Coventry City Council had operated medium term financial planning for many years. The Cabinet formally approved the current medium term financial strategy in 2004 (Minute 63/04 refers) and this strategy recommends some minor updating of it.

The Strategy notes that "in applying the resources available, the City Council will determine the most appropriate allocation of resources to reflect the needs of local people and priorities". It also recognises that "the process of management within the authority should be about making the best use of resources available and seeking appropriate opportunities for savings. The Policy Priorities and Resources process may often seek to identify areas of savings as an integral part of the process to allow maximum flexibility of resource switching during periods of policy and financial decision making".

The Council already places considerable emphasis on improving value for money and identifying efficiency savings throughout the organisation and is on track to deliver the £8m savings required by the Government during 2004/05 and 2005/06.

The Strategy was intended to improve the financial planning process, to enable the Council to achieve the best fit of resources to policies and to maximise the transparencies of the Council's financial plans. The completion of and adherence to the strategy would continue to meet the requirements of the Council's modernising agenda.

RESOLVED that having noted the comments of Scrutiny Board (1) the City Council approve the medium term financial strategy appended to the report submitted, as the basis for the City Council's medium term financial planning process.

100. **Response to the DEFRA Draft Guidance on the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005**

Further to Minute 173/05 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services, which outlined a proposed response to a consultation paper and a partial regulatory impact assessment produced by the Department of the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) entitled "Draft Guidance on the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005".

On 7th April 2005, the Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act received Royal Assent. The main provision of the Act comes into force during April 2006. However, some specific areas of the Act came into force on 7th June, 2005.

The Act was specifically introduced to address problems affecting the quality of the local environment, which formed part of a continuum of anti-social behaviour, vandalism, disorder and levels of crime. The measures have been developed over the last two years following the Urban Summit and consultation exercises such as "Living Places – Powers, Rights and Responsibilities" and the "Clean Neighbourhoods Consultation".

In order to assist local authorities with their new powers, the Government intends to issue guidance and, in order to ensure the most suitable guidance is given, the Government has produced draft guidance and requested local authorities to submit comments by 2nd January, 2006.

A copy of the proposed response was attached as Appendix A to the report submitted, along with a partial risk assessment. The Cabinet Member (City Services) reported at the meeting that it was hoped to amend the response detailed in question 34, page 9, of the appendix to read "the authority finds that the proposed ranges of fixed penalty amounts set out in the Environmental Offences (Fixed Penalty) (Miscellaneous Provisions) Regulations 2006, are too prescriptive and allow little room for local manoeuvre. This was particularly the case for fly-posting which was largely perpetrated by commercial operations and yet the proposed range of fines, £50 to £80 does not appear to be a suitable deterrent. We should also like to see a greater proposed range of fixed penalty fines for graffiti".

The Council's response so far to the legislation included the production of an implementation plan, which had been approved by the Cabinet at their meeting on 1st November, 2005 (Minute 138/05 refers).

RESOLVED that the City Council approve the final response to the consultation, detailed at Appendix A of the report submitted, and the amended response to Question 34, for submission to DEFRA.

101. **The Institute for Community Cohesion**

Further to Minute 31/05 of the Cabinet Member (Finance and Equalities), the City Council considered a report of the Chief Executive regarding the invitation, from the National Institute of Community Cohesion, to Coventry City Council to become a founder partner.

The report indicated that the term "Community Cohesion" was developed following the disturbances in the North of England four years ago and since then the concept had been developed rapidly by Central Government. As a result, local authorities were expected to play a leading role in developing cohesive communities.

Coventry has a history of relatively good race and community relations and had been fortunate in not experiencing the disturbances that had been seen in the North of England or more recently in Birmingham. The City Council was not complacent and continued to work with local organisations and local communities to promote and develop good race and community relations. The City Council's commitment to this work was demonstrated by the corporate objective to "*Actively promote equalities so that people from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities*" and the Council's vision "*value diversity, social justice and community cohesion*".

The Coventry Partnership and Coventry City Council were currently working together with local organisations and communities on the development of a framework and promote community cohesion in Coventry and the City Council was also developing and consulting on its own community cohesion strategy, which would be adopted in the new year.

A National Institute of Community Cohesion, led by Ted Cattle, was being established to provide a new approach to race and diversity and in particular would focus on building positive harmonious relations. It was aiming to establish itself as the leading national and international proponent of the principles and practice of community cohesion.

The Institute would have the following aims:-

- To become a national and international centre of expertise.
- To provide a partnership of academic, statutory and non-governmental bodies, which combine the experience and expertise of four universities with practitioners from local and national agencies.
- To collate and disseminate best practice and provide a network for all agencies interested in community cohesion so that developments could be shared and constantly updated.
- To evaluate cohesion programmes and conduct action research to be able to say, with authority, "what works".
- To build capacity at all levels and to provide development opportunities, ranging from the training of community leaders to post graduate based programmes.
- To build clearer connections between the community cohesion, citizenship and several renewal agendas.
- To consider different models of multi-cultural and development of and understanding of communities' acceptance of diversity.

Activities would include the enhancement of training and development programmes commissioned by the IdeA and peer review programmes initially for local government with a view to developing similar programmes for Central Government, key agencies and the voluntary and community sector.

Coventry University, the University of Warwick, Leicester University and De Montfort University are the four universities at the heart of the partnership. Other partners were likely to include the key government departments such as the Home Office and the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister, as well as agencies such as the NHS and the Commission for Racial Equality. Private sector sponsors and charitable bodies were also being approached. In addition, Leicester City Council was also being invited to be a founder partner.

The Administrative Centre of the Institute would be based at Coventry University and the Research Hub at the University of Warwick, with a number of other functions based in Leicester.

In addition to the national value of the work of the Institute itself, it would be an asset to both Coventry and Leicester as their Councils and communities would be involved in developing new ways of promoting community cohesion and would benefit from being associated with the Institute.

For Coventry, in particular, the Institute of Community Cohesion would add to the reputation of the City of Peace and reconciliation and complement the centres of expertise already associated with the city such as the Centre for Study and Forgiveness and Reconciliation at Coventry University, the Centre for Research in Ethnic Relations at the University of Warwick and the International Centre for Reconciliation at Coventry Cathedral.

Following initial discussions with the Chief Executive and the Cabinet Member, a formal invitation to Coventry City Council to become a founder member of the Institute of Community Cohesion was received on 17th November, 2005. As a founder partner, the City Council would be involved in shaping the development of the Institute and, once it was constituted, would have a representative from the Institute's Board.

It was proposed that the City Council accepts the invitation from the Institute of Community Cohesion and becomes a founder partner. The City Council should allocate £20,000 of funds for its subscription to the Institute and appoint a representative to the Board once it was established. It was recommended that the representative would be the Cabinet Member (Finance and Equalities).

RESOLVED that the City Council:-

- (1) Becomes a founder partner of the Institute of Community Cohesion.**
- (2) Allocate up to £20,000 from policy contingency funds as the Council's annual subscription payment to the Institute of Community Cohesion in this financial year and instruct officers to identify future year's funding for annual subscription payments through the annual budget setting process.**
- (3) That the Cabinet Member (Finance and Equalities) be appointed as the City Council's representative on the Board of the Institute of Community Cohesion when it is constituted.**

102. Debate – Ambulance Service

Councillor Clifford moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs. Lucas:-

"This Council has real concerns about the quality of the Ambulance Service that is being proposed for the West Midlands Region. Coventry citizens are served well by the current Coventry and Warwickshire Service which is already delivering most of what is being proposed in "Taking Health Care to the Patient, Transforming NHS Ambulance Services". The Council needs to be assured that what is being proposed is safe and at least as good as what we have now. The Council is not confident that this is the case."

In moving the motion, Councillor Clifford moved an amendment, which was seconded by Councillor Mrs. Lucas, that the motion be amended by the deletion of the final sentence.

RESOLVED that the following amended motion be adopted:-

"This Council has real concerns about the quality of the Ambulance Service that is being proposed for the West Midlands Region. Coventry citizens are served well by the current Coventry and Warwickshire Service which is already delivering most of what is being proposed in "Taking Health Care to the Patient, Transforming NHS Ambulance Services". The Council needs to be sure that what is being proposed is safe and at least as good as what we have now."

(NOTE: The meeting closed at 7.55 p.m.)