

## COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

11<sup>th</sup> April 2006

### PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Lakha)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Ahmed)

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 Matchet
Councillor Bhyat	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor Mutton
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Nellist
Councillor Charley	Councillor H. Noonan
Councillor Chater	Councillor M. Noonan
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Patton
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Miss Reece
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor Ridge
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Field	Councillor Ruddy
Councillor Foster	Councillor Mrs. Rutter
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Mrs. Griffin	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Mrs. Harper	Councillor Mrs. Stone
Councillor Ms. Hunter	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Williams
Councillor Kelsey	
Councillor Mrs. Lacy	

Apologies: Councillor Harrison  
Councillor Maskell

#### 124. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2006 were signed as a true record.

#### 125. **Members Not Standing in 2006 Municipal Election**

The Lord Mayor referred to Councillors Mrs Maskell and Ruddy who were not standing for re-election to the Council at the forthcoming election.

Councillor Mrs Maskell had represented Wyken Ward since June 2004. She had

been a member of Scrutiny Board 2 and Area Forum (North East).

Councillor Ruddy had represented Henley Ward also since June 2004. He had been a member of Licensing and Regulatory Committee, Scrutiny Board 4 and Area Forum (North East).

Members expressed their thanks to the Councillors for their contribution to the work of the Council and wished them well for the future.

#### 125. **Death of Former Councillor Cynthia Hubbard's Husband**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of Mr Ron Hubbard, husband of former Councillor Cynthia Hubbard.

Members noted that a letter of condolence had been sent on behalf of the City Council to Mrs Hubbard and her family.

#### 126. **Stampede in Karachi**

The Lord Mayor referred to the tragedy and the loss of so many lives from the stampede in the City of Karachi recently and reported that he had already written on behalf of the City Council to His Excellency the High Commissioner for Pakistan, expressing the City Council's condolences.

#### 127. **Petitions**

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

- (a) **No 17 Bus Service** - 254 Signatures presented by Councillor Mulhall.
- (b) **Telephone Kiosk, Norton Hill Drive** - 41 signatures presented by Councillor Duggins.
- (c) **Traffic calming – Browett Road/Max Road** – 105 signatures presented by Councillor Ridley.
- (d) **Additional street lighting – Dunchurch Highway** – 48 signatures presented by Councillor Ridge.
- (e) **Cyan Park Development** – 188 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Basu.
- (f) **Motor bikes racing on the land at Silverstone Drive** – 132 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs. Stone.
- (g) **Peoples Place – Community Welfare, Rights and Money Adviser within the Stoke Aldermoor area** – 198 signatures presented by Councillor Townshend.
- (h) **Off-Street Parking on Match Days at Watery Lane, Farm Close, Albert Crescent, Edward Road, Hallbrook Road and Brookford Road** –

231 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Lucas.

- (i) Car Park Repair Business operating from Holbrook Lane – 39 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Lucas.
- (j) Planning Application 46975/A – 1 Stonefield Close – 9 signatures presented by Councillor Patton.
- (k) Bus Route along Beake Avenue between Radford Road and Links Road – 429 signatures presented by Councillor Miss Hunter.
- (l) Request to close entry between Gillians Walk and Caspian Way – 32 signatures presented by Councillor Kelly.
- (m) Close access adjacent to Windmill Road Cemetary from Windmill Road to Cubbington Road – 145 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Stone.
- (n) Rail Station at Coventry Arena – over 3,000 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Lucas.
- (o) Withdrawal of Bus E in Eastern Green – 505 signatures presented by Councillor O'Neill.
- (p) Dennis Road Bus Service – 166 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Basu.
- (q) Parking at the Corner of Mill Race Lane – 16 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Stone.
- (r) Planning Application 52875/A - Coniston Road – 18 signatures presented by Councillor Ridge.
- (s) Damaged grass verges on the pavements along Lentons Lane, Hawkesbury – 25 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Stone.
- (t) No 34 Bus – Change of Route – 235 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Dixon.
- (u) Traffic Calming on Hinckley Road – 493 signatures presented by Councillor Patton.
- (v) Pedestrian Safety at Tile Hill Lane to Village Hotel – 42 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Lacy.
- (w) Telephone Communication Mast at corner of Tamworth Road and Keresley Green Road – 277 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Lucas.
- (x) School Crossing for St Andrews School – 189 signatures presented by Councillor O'Neill.

- (y) **Telecommunication Mast near Keresley Green – 9 signatures presented by Councillor Gazey.**
- (z) **Concierge at Tile Hill Primary Care Centre – 271 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Lacy.**

128. **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 Recommendations for the City Council**

**Personal**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Minute Number</b>
All members of the Conservative Group	131
Councillor Nellist	131
Councillor Ms Hunter	136
Councillor Mutton	131

**Prejudicial**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Minute Number</b>
Councillor Asif*	136
Councillor Charley*	136
Councillor Chater*	132 and 140
Councillor Mrs Dixon*	136
Councillor Mrs Johnson*	136
Councillor Mrs Lacy*	136
Councillor Ruddy*	136
Councillor Sawdon*	132 and 140
Councillor Townshend*	132 and 140

The following officers declared interests Minute 139 (Ricoh Arena):

Stella Manzie and John McGuigan are Directors of the Arena Company Limited (ACL).

Chris Hinde and Angie Ridgwell are Directors of Coventry North Regeneration Limited (CNR).

\* (The Members indicated left the meeting during consideration of these items)

## 129. Question Time

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

<b>Question Asked By</b>	<b>Question Put To</b>	<b>Subject Matter</b>
Councillor Chater	Councillor Field	'Communities that Care' Consultation
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Arrowsmith	Recent changes to bus service
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor O'Neill	Council tax – collections, arrears, claims for housing benefit
Councillor Skipper	Councillor Ridley	Olympic Games 2012
Councillor Mrs Harper	Councillor H Noonan	Services for people with learning difficulties
Councillor Mutton	Councillor H Noonan	ATT centre – young people with learning difficulties
Councillor Kelly	Councillor O'Neill	Replacement windows at Hearsall School
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Blundell	Hearsall School – petition
Councillor Patton	Councillor Arrowsmith	Millennium Place – breakdown of cost
Councillor Chater	Councillor Arrowsmith	Pedestrian safety at millennium place
Councillor Mutton	Councillor Arrowsmith	Millennium Place - grant
Councillor Patton	Councillor Taylor	Memorial for Councillor Clack
Councillor Mulhall	Councillor Arrowsmith	Wyken Croft School – Pelican Crossing
Councillor Ridge	Councillor Foster	Safety barriers
Councillor Chater	Councillor Foster	Dunsmore Avenue
Councillor Chater	Councillor Blundell	Coventry Evening Telegraph – survey of young people
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Noonan	Brandon Wood – services for autistic users
Councillor Field	Councillor Arrowsmith	Traffic Regulation Order – Yewdale Way
Councillor Field	Councillor Foster	Wyken Green area – liveability fund
Councillor Griffin	Councillor Arrowsmith	Re-opening of Pool Meadow
Councillor Griffin	Councillor O'Neill	Community Support Officers
Councillor Mrs Stone	Councillor Matchet	Rowley Green – motor bikes
Councillor Nellist	Councillor Arrowsmith	Residents parking schemes – priorities
Councillor Mrs Johnson	Councillor Ridley	Investment in parks and play areas

## 130. Amendments to the Constitution

Further to Minute 23/05 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 30th November 2005 (their Minute 12/05 refers). The Constitution Working Group had met to examine the Constitution and, as a result, had recommended that two amendments be made.

Currently, the Annual Meeting of the City Council was held in two parts. Part One dealt with the ceremonial aspects i.e. the election of the Lord Mayor and Deputy Lord Mayor and Part Two dealt with the procedural issues such as the appointment of Council

bodies and the approval of the calendar of business. Currently Part Two was held before Part One. The purpose of separating the meeting had been to avoid potential disagreements during "Mayor Making" which would be embarrassing for the new Lord Mayor and the Council as a whole as the meeting was attended by a large number of guests.

The Constitution Working Group had recommended that the City Council should revert back to holding one Annual Meeting as it used to do, with the following provisos to ensure the smooth running of the meeting and to avoid any potential embarrassment:-

- (i) That, as soon after the election in May as possible, meetings be held between the Leaders of the Controlling and Main Opposition Groups to review the allocations of seats/appointments etc. Appropriate consultation with the other Groups would then take place prior to the Annual Meeting with the aims of ensuring that there were no "surprises" or disagreements on the day.
- (ii) No other business would be considered at the Annual Meeting other than that detailed in paragraph 4.1.1 to 4.1.1.19 of the Constitution (i.e. appointment of Lord Mayor/Deputy Lord Mayor, Leader and Deputy Leader, appointments to Council bodies and outside bodies etc., calendar of meetings). There would be no outstanding business from the previous administration, as these would be considered at the April meeting of the Council. Officers would be instructed to ensure that this happened and to plan accordingly.
- (iii) If the progress in (i) above was followed, then it was anticipated that there should be no disagreements arising on the day. However, if it became clear either before the Annual Meeting or on the day itself that there were areas of contention, then it was proposed that the fallback position would be to adjourn the Annual Meeting following the appointment of the Lord Mayor/Deputy Lord Mayor and reconvene that afternoon.

The Standards Committee had noted that Group Leaders had been consulted on these proposals and no objections had been raised.

Currently the Constitution allowed for the Chief Executive to determine that a consultation paper was of a "technical" nature in which case the paper only had to be considered by Cabinet rather than Scrutiny, Cabinet and full Council, as was the case with consultation papers generally. At a recent meeting, the Cabinet had queried this procedure, questioning the need for such reports to be considered by them.

The Constitution Working Group had considered this issue and had recommended the following wording for inclusion in the Constitution:-

"Where the Chief Executive determines that Consultation papers relate to a "technical" issue which do not require full Council consideration, responses to them will be delegated to the appropriate Director, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member and Shadow Cabinet Member. Where practicable within the timescale of the relevant consultation, details will then be sent to all Councillors informing them of the proposed response to the consultation, asking if they wish to make any comments. The appropriate Director and relevant Cabinet Member and

Shadow Cabinet Member will then consider any such comments received before submitting the response".

The following amendment to the above paragraph was moved by Councillor Field, seconded by Councillor Benefield and carried giving the following substantive motion:

"Where the Chief Executive determines that a consultation paper relates to a "technical" issue, all Group Leaders on the Council shall be consulted. If any Group Leader disagrees, the Consultation paper will go through the normal process for consultations. If Group Leaders agree the paper is "technical", responses to them will be delegated to the appropriate Director, in consultation with the relevant Cabinet Member, Shadow Cabinet Member and other Group Leaders. Where practicable within the timescale of the relevant consultation, details will then be sent to all Councillors informing them of the proposed response to the consultation, asking if they wish to make any comments. The appropriate Director and relevant Cabinet Member and Shadow Cabinet Member will then consider any such comments received before submitting the response".

**RESOLVED that the City Council make the two amendments to the Constitution as outlined above in relation to the Annual Meeting and technical consultation papers.**

#### **131. Outcome of Consultation for the Establishment of Two Academies in Coventry**

Further to Minute 225/05 of Cabinet, the City Council considered a joint report of the Acting Director of Education and Libraries and the Director of Finance and ICT, which provided feedback on the recent consultation to establish two academies in Coventry and sought approval for the next steps for each of the two proposals.

On 28<sup>th</sup> June 2005, the Cabinet approved a report authorising consultation on the establishment of two Academies in Coventry (Minute 34/05 refers). The first of these proposals was for an Academy to replace Woodway Park School. The sponsor for this Academy was Mr Robert Edmiston of IM Group Ltd and the proposal was for a new seven form of entry school on the Woodway Park site. Following approval of that report, an Expression of Interest was submitted for this Academy, which was subsequently approved by the Secretary of State.

The second proposal was an "in principle" proposal to establish a new Academy as part of the Swanswell Learning Quarter to replace both the existing Sidney Stringer and Barr's Hill Schools. This proposed Academy did not at the time have a sponsor and the consultation was therefore in principle only.

Following the approval of the Expression of Interest for the Woodway Park Academy by the Secretary of State, the consultation process was commenced from 31<sup>st</sup> October 2005 until 6<sup>th</sup> January 2006. During the course of this consultation, a schedule of meetings was arranged with various stakeholders including two public meetings, meetings with staff, unions, governors and parents of all of the schools individually affected, and meetings with the parents and carers of children at primary schools feeding into the schools affected.

For those meetings which were scheduled at Woodway Park School or for the

feeder primary schools of Woodway Park School, and with the Trade Unions, the proposed sponsor for the Woodway Park Academy, Mr Robert Edmiston, attended the meetings, along with Mr Steve Chase who was the Project Manager for the sponsor's other Academy, Grace Academy in Solihull, and Mr David Wootton who was the Principal-Elect of that Academy. In addition, the Sponsor team also met with the Local Learning and Skills Council, the North East Federation Secondary Headteachers and the linked Primary Headteachers. A full schedule of the consultation meetings was provided at Appendix One of the report submitted.

The City Council prepared a formal consultation document on both of its proposals, which was supplemented by an appendix prepared by the Sponsor's team outlining the sponsor's vision for the Woodway Park Academy. These documents were sent home with every pupil of the schools affected as well as every pupil of the main feeder primaries of the three schools concerned and copies were made available at all of the meetings. In all over 9,000 printed copies of the consultation document were distributed and were also available from the City Council's website.

As an additional arm of the consultation process, Scrutiny Board 2, at the request of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, established a Scrutiny Review Group specifically to examine the Government's policy on Academies and the specific proposals for Coventry. A separate report was presented to the Cabinet by that Scrutiny Review Group, which was chaired by Councillor Field. That report supported the proposal to proceed with the Woodway Park Academy. The Review Group did not reach a conclusion on the proposed Swanswell Academy because at this stage an Expression of Interest had still not been finalised. The Scrutiny Review Group was prepared to reconvene itself as and when more work was required from it on the Swanswell Academy proposal.

Many of the people responding to the consultation objected in principle to the establishment of Academies, as did numbers of people attending the various meetings. When the views of parents/carers and members of the community were looked at separately, there was more support for the proposals.

In summary, from the consultation responses received when asked the question "do you agree with the proposal to open the Academy at Woodway Park" 22 respondents replied "yes"; 24 respondents replied "no"; 5 respondents replied "do not know"; and 23 respondents made no reply.

This response indicated that there was a broadly mixed reaction to the consultation proposals from the very small number of responses received. If the responses were analysed by the interest of the respondee, it would appear that a majority of respondees who were parents of children at Woodway Park or at local primary schools were in favour of the proposal. It was stressed however that the number of responses was very low.

Both the current Headteacher at Woodway Park and the Board of Governors had backed the proposal for a new Academy at Woodway Park on the basis that they believed very strongly that a new school building was very much needed, and was essential to improve the quality of education for young people in the area. They would particularly want to see the new Academy continuing to work as part of the family of City secondary schools and within the North East Federation of secondary schools.

The development of a new school on the Woodway Park site would very much support the New Deal for Communities project, which was taking place in the school's



catchment area and was likely to see a significant house building programme in the near future. A new school would help to attract people to the area.

Both the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) and the sponsor were prepared to continue with the project, and were preparing to start a detailed feasibility study.

On that basis it was recommended that the proposal to replace the current Woodway Park School with the new Academy of 7 forms of entry to be located on the existing Woodway Park School site be approved, subject to a number of conditions detailed within the report submitted.

Subject to the approval of this recommendation by the Council, a Statutory Notice would be published for the closure of the current Woodway Park School, subject to the successful outcome of the feasibility study being undertaken by the DfES. That would lead to the finalisation of the funding agreement between the sponsor and the DfES to establish the new school. The Statutory Notice would need to be considered in due course by the City's School Organisation Committee.

The consultation on the proposed Swanswell Academy was more complex because the proposals involved the potential amalgamation of two separate schools, Barr's Hill and Sidney Stringer, and because at the time of the consultation, a sponsor for the proposal had not been finalised. During the course of the consultation process, the City Council had commenced work with a potential sponsor, the Centre for British Teachers (CfBT) and were continuing to work with the CfBT and DfES on a potential Expression of Interest for this Academy.

The consultation meetings in relation to the Swanswell Academy showed more concern from the community and from parents/carers than the Woodway Park Academy. The key issues that were emerging were concern about the amalgamation of the two schools; the perceived "take over" of Barr's Hill by Sidney Stringer, an inevitable feeling given that the proposed new Academy will be built on the Learning Quarter which is adjacent to the current Sidney Stringer site; concerns about the additional travel to school distance for pupils in the Radford area who currently go to Barr's Hill; concern about the route which would need to be taken by children travelling from parts of the Barr's Hill catchment area to the new Swanswell Learning Quarter; concern which some parents and carers from Barr's Hill have about the nature of Hillfields and their perceptions of crime and other antisocial activities taking place there, making it an "unsafe" place for their children to go to school; and concerns from staff about possible job losses as a consequence of amalgamation.

The rate of pupils newly arriving in Coventry from abroad and seeking education had increased very substantially in recent months. Figures produced during the consultation period had demonstrated that on average 30 children a month are now arriving in Coventry and needing to be placed in schools. If this rate of influx continues, it would begin to counteract the demographic trend, which for secondary schools was still very strongly downwards.

More work was undertaken to analyse the possible implications of all known and possible housing developments in the Sidney Stringer and Barr's Hill catchment areas. Although many of these developments were still at an early stage of planning and may not materialise, it was clear that given the scale of development, and given the City's emerging

ambition to stabilise and grow, there was an argument for keeping both the Sidney Stringer and Barr's Hill sites available for secondary education.

Having discussed these factors with the DfES and the potential sponsor, and with the Headteachers and Chairs of Governors of the two schools affected, employees were now working on a revised proposal for a possible Swanswell Academy. This revised proposal was for a single Academy operating on two sites, which would consist of a new secondary school to be built on the Learning Quarter site at 7 forms of entry and the existing Barr's Hill site to be refurbished and kept open at its current five forms of entry. The report submitted identified a number of advantages of this revised proposal.

Discussion with the DfES and with the potential sponsor about this revised proposal were ongoing and the Cabinet were advised that, depending on progress, it may be possible to offer an update at the Council meeting scheduled for 11<sup>th</sup> April 2006.

The current position with regards to sponsorship is that the Centre for British Teachers (CfBT), which was a large charity with a significant track record in the education field, was happy to act as the lead sponsor for the proposal. CfBT wanted the sponsorship to be put together by a consortium and was keen for the City Council and other public sector players, including possibly City College and Coventry University, to be part of that consortium. At this stage the full £2m sponsorship stake had not been created. However, the DfES had indicated that they were prepared to consider an Expression of Interest based on CfBT as the lead sponsor on the basis that the remaining sponsorship could be put into place subsequently. It should be stressed that, as the Lead Sponsor, CfBT would be writing the Educational Vision for the Academy which would be encapsulated in the Expression of Interest. Other sponsors would not be able to change this vision, which would be subsequently built into the funding agreement between the DfES and the sponsor were the proposal to proceed to implementation.

It was proposed that, depending on the outcome of discussions, an Expression of Interest be submitted to the DfES on this revised basis and that authority be delegated to the Chief Executive and the Acting Director of Education and Libraries, in consultation with the Cabinet Member (Children's Services), to finalise this Expression of Interest.

If an Expression of Interest for the Swanswell Academy were to be submitted and approved by Ministers, a further public consultation would be required, leading to a report for approval to proceed being prepared for consideration by the Cabinet and Council. On this revised basis, the Academy proposals if implemented would not reduce the overall capacity of secondary schools in the City.

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Duggins, seconded by Councillor Mutton and lost:

"Delete the existing paragraph 2.4 and replace with:

That a further report be brought to Council on an Expression of Interest for a Swanswell Academy, with Barrs Hill remaining a Local Authority School. Ask that the Academy Review Group be reconvened and examine any further proposal".

NOTE: In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with Paragraph 4.1.71 of the City Council's Constitution. The Councillors voting for and against the amendment outlined above were as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
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 Mrs Lancaster	Councillor Kelsey	
Councillor Mrs Lucas	Councillor Lee	
Councillor Ms McKay	Councillor Matchet	
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor H Noonan	
Councillor Mulhall	Councillor M Noonan	
Councillor Mutton	Councillor O'Neill	
Councillor Nellist	Councillor Miss Reece	
Councillor Patton	Councillor Ridge	
Councillor Skipper	Councillor Ridley	
Councillor Mrs Stone	Councillor Mrs Rutter	
Councillor Townshend	Councillor Sawdon	
Lord Mayor	Councillor Taylor	
	Councillor Williams	

Result: 25 for  
26 against  
0 abstentions

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Approve the proposal to establish a new Academy to replace the current Woodway Park School to be sponsored by Mr Robert Edmiston of IM Group Ltd.**
- (2) Authorise employees to issue a Statutory Notice for the closure of the current Woodway Park School, subject to the finalisation of a funding agreement for a new Academy.**
- (3) Delegate authority to the Acting Director of Education and Libraries, in consultation with the Cabinet Member (Children's Services), to finalise the details of the Statutory Notice.**
- (4) Note the position in relation to the creation of the proposed Swanswell Academy and delegate authority to the Chief Executive and the Acting Director of Education and Libraries, in consultation with the Cabinet Member (Children's Services), to submit an Expression of Interest for a Swanswell Academy on the basis**

**outlined in paragraphs 4.10 to 4.20 of the report submitted.**

NOTE: In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with Paragraph 4.1.71 of the City Council's Constitution. The Councillors voting for and against the recommendations were as follows:

<b>For</b>	<b>Against</b>	<b>Abstain</b>
Councillor Ahmed	Councillor Auluck	Councillor Bhyat
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Basu	Councillor Kelly
Councillor Asif	Councillor Batten	Councillor Patton
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Benefield	
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 Mrs Lacy	
Councillor Mrs Harper	Councillor Mrs Lancaster	
Councillor Mrs Johnson	Councillor Mrs Lucas	
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Ms McKay	
Councillor Lee	Councillor McNicholas	
Councillor Matchet	Councillor Mulhall	
Councillor H Noonan	Councillor Mutton	
Councillor M Noonan	Councillor Nellist	
Councillor O'Neill	Councillor Skipper	
Councillor Miss Reece	Councillor Mrs Stone	
Councillor Ridge	Councillor Towshend	
Councillor Ridley	Lord Mayor	
Councillor Rutter		
Councillor Sawdon		
Councillor Taylor		
Councillor Williams		

Result: 26 for  
22 against  
3 abstentions

### **132. Proposed Responses to NHS Reconfiguration Consultations**

Further to Minute 65/05 of Scrutiny Board 4 (Health), the City Council considered the Board's response to the NHS consultations on "Configuration of Ambulance Trusts in England", "Consultation on new Strategic Health Authority arrangements in the West Midlands: Ensuring a Patient-led NHS" and "Consultation on new Primary Care Trusts arrangements in West Midlands South (Coventry, Warwickshire, Herefordshire and Worcestershire)". An updated response to the "Configuration of NHS Ambulance Trusts in England" was tabled at the meeting.

The NHS consultations on Strategic Health Authority and Primary Care Trust reconfiguration were a consequence of the Department of Health paper, *Commissioning a Patient-led NHS*, published on 28 July 2005. *Commissioning a patient-led NHS* also set the

timetable for ambulance service reconfiguration. The proposal to reduce the number of ambulance trusts was contained in *Taking Healthcare to the Patient*, a report published in June 2005. All three consultations closed on 22 March 2006.

The consultation on ambulance trust reconfiguration proposed the dissolution of Coventry and Warwickshire Ambulance Service, Hereford and Worcester Ambulance Service, Staffordshire Ambulance Service, and West Midlands Ambulance Service, and their replacement with a new ambulance service for what the consultation refers to as the “west central” region.

The consultation on Strategic Health Authority reconfiguration proposed the dissolution of West Midlands South Strategic Health Authority, Birmingham and the Black Country Strategic Health Authority, and Shropshire and Staffordshire Strategic Health Authority, and their replacement with a single west midlands regional Strategic Health Authority.

The consultation on Primary Care Trust reorganisation made no changes to Coventry Teaching PCT. It proposed the dissolution of North Warwickshire PCT, Rugby PCT and South Warwickshire PCT, and their replacement with a single Warwickshire PCT.

The proposal to reconfigure ambulance services had met with significant opposition. Warwickshire County Council, University Hospitals Coventry and Warwickshire, district councils in Warwickshire and Warwickshire PCTs had all expressed concerns and recommended the retention of Coventry and Warwickshire Ambulance Service. Coventry and Warwickshire Ambulance Service Trust Board had agreed a statement against the proposals (appendix 4 of the report submitted).

Scrutiny Board 4 (Health) had taken evidence on these consultations at the meetings on 18 January and 15 February 2006.

The Board had concerns that the consultation had been undermined by mounting evidence that implementation of the proposals had begun before the consultation had concluded and this had been highlighted in the response to the Strategic Health Authority. The Board had also circulated the response to neighbouring local authority health scrutiny committees, local MPs and the Secretary of State.

**RESOLVED that the City Council endorse the responses of Scrutiny Board 4 (Health) to the consultations entitled "Configuration of Ambulance Trusts in England", "Consultation on new Strategic Health Authority arrangements in the West Midlands: Ensuring a Patient Led NHS" and "Consultation on new Primary Care Trusts arrangements in West Midlands South (Coventry, Warwickshire, Herefordshire and Worcestershire)".**

### 133. **Coventry Community Plan and Local Area Agreement**

Further to Minute 235/05 of Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Chief Executive, which sought approval for an updated Community Plan, incorporating a revised local Area Agreement. The report also provided an update on the progress of the Coventry Partnership.

The aim of the Coventry Partnership was to bring together the local public, private, voluntary and community sectors to facilitate joint working and, in particular, to deliver the Coventry Community Plan. The Plan aimed to improve the quality of life and services

across the City and narrow the gap between priority neighbourhoods and the rest of the City. One of the Council's values was to "Work in partnership and deliver the Community Plan".

The Coventry Partnership Board included members from all sectors in the city, including the community and voluntary sectors. The Council was represented by Councillors Taylor, O'Neill, Arrowsmith, Mutton, Lakha and McNicholas. The Chief Executive of the City Council was secretary of the Partnership.

The Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM) had awarded the Coventry Partnership a "green light" for its progress in 2003/04 and 2004/05 – this was defined as "good progress – requires refinement and systematic implementation". It demonstrated that the City Council and its partners had a shared vision expressed in the Plan, strong accountability and decision-making processes and robust performance management and delivery systems to manage the performance of their joint work.

The Partnership conducted its business through an Operations Group and eight Theme Groups (Environment, Community Safety, Learning and Training, Housing, Transport, Culture, Health and Wellbeing, Jobs and Economy). Progress against its targets was monitored by the "Progress, Impact and Evaluation" group, which was chaired by Professor Robert Dyson from Warwick University, and had a membership drawn from a range of organisations including the City Council.

The Chair of the Partnership was held on a rotating basis by one of its members. The Leader of the Council was chair for the current year.

Coventry was one of 21 pilots for Local Area Agreements (LAAs), designed to be a contract between central and local Government to deliver the priorities of local people. The Government was now rolling these out to other local authorities over a two-year period.

The first round of LAAs included three blocks entitled Children and Young People; Safer and Stronger Communities; and Health and Older People. The Government had since added a fourth block, Economic Development and Enterprise. It was proposed to add this new block to the refreshed Local Area Agreement and base it on the Treasury's model for economic growth. This had four broad outcomes that the Council were seeking to address, which included achieving full employment in the city and increasing the employment rate of disadvantaged groups; building an enterprise society in which small firms thrive and achieve their potential, especially in deprived neighbourhoods; stimulating and supporting a diverse, productive, innovative and knowledge-based economy; and providing people with the skills needed for employment, business success, innovation and economic growth. These four outcomes were underpinned and supported by the final aim, to create the conditions for growth within the city.

Council employees and partners had now revised the Community Plan so that the LAA was integrated within it whilst still retaining the original priorities and outcomes from the previous version of the Community Plan. The draft revised Plan also reflected a more integrated approach with other groups and initiatives within the City such as the Cultural Partnership, the Older Peoples' Partnership and Neighbourhood Management.

The draft Plan, which was attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted, outlined a series of priorities, outcomes and ways in which progress can be measured. Annex 2 to

the document contained the detailed measures that will be used to track performance of the Plan and LAA.

Progress on the delivery of the Community Plan and the LAA would be tracked at city level, neighbourhood level and in terms of the impact of the Council's work on black and minority ethnic communities where the data is available. A third Household Survey had been conducted to assess whether, from the perspective of residents, their quality of life was improving and whether the "quality of life" gap was narrowing between different parts of the City. This information was being collated alongside a range of national measures in order to provide a way of assessing the performance of partner agencies in delivering the Community Plan.

There were currently 75 activities, many funded through Neighbourhood Renewal Fund, being delivered specifically to achieve the Community Plan outcomes and to focus upon the City's priority neighbourhoods and communities of interest, i.e. those people who were least well served by public sector organisations and consequently suffered high levels of deprivation. These include the Stoke Aldermoor One Stop Shop which was opened in December 2005 and the successful Godiva Half Marathon which took place in September 2005. This round of funding ended in March 2006.

A number of these activities were highly innovative. For example, the Family Focus initiative was developing ways in which agencies could work together to develop more integrated packages of help for those families who make most use of public services. The Partners as Employers initiative was designing ways in which public services in the City could recruit more people from hard to reach communities. The Council's transport officers were using the Coventry Partnership to develop an accessibility plan, which would identify those communities that found it hardest to travel to particular services and produce actions to either improve transport links or bring services closer to those communities. The Partnership had also hosted a "Premises Summit" designed to explore the potential for shared use of premises in the City and a "Learning & Training Summit" which aimed to identify common priorities amongst partners in the field of learning and training.

Work was currently underway to allocate the next round of NRF funding which amounted to £5.6m over the period 2006 to 2008. This funding was being allocated using a commissioning approach based upon 6 key issues developed through the Progress Impact and Evaluation group (PIE) of the Partnership and a seminar involving over 20 partner organisations in December 2005. Recommendations on the use of the new NRF allocation were currently being made via the Partnership's sub-groups and involving members from all sectors. A final decision on allocations would be taken by the NRF Sub-Group, which would decide whether the City Council would act as the Accountable Body for the recommended activities. The NRF Sub-Group is chaired by the Deputy Leader of the Council.

The Partnership's Annual Conference was held in November 2005 at the Ricoh Arena and was well received. An innovative learning programme was delivered in the South East of the City designed to improve communication and involvement of residents by front-line staff in the design and delivery of services.

A senior managers' seminar was also held last year designed to help managers develop more effective partnership work in the City. Common Purpose delivered a leadership programme for those likely to become senior managers in the future. Overall, 250 people took part in learning programmes last year.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Approve the Community Plan and Local Area Agreement attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted.**
- (2) Note that the Eight Strategic Theme Groups in the new Plan would now be Environment, Community Safety, Learning and Training, Housing, Transport, Culture, Health and Wellbeing, Jobs and Economy, with underpinning themes of Equalities and Communities and Neighbourhoods**

**134. Older Peoples Strategy**

Further to Minute 236/05 of Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Community Services, which sought approval for the adoption of the Older People's Strategy.

The Strategy had been produced at a time of major structural change in health and social care services in Coventry. The Primary Care Trust was under new leadership, and would take forward the changes announced by Government which would strengthen commissioning, and separate the organisation of commissioning and service provision. The City Council had implemented a process to separate adults from children's social care services, which would be effective from 1st April 2006.

At such a time of change it was essential to keep focus on the service developments that were known to be needed, so they did not become neglected whilst organisational change took place.

The Coventry agencies had produced a number of strategies over recent years, particularly to implement the main measures of the National Service Framework for Older People. However, there was no overarching strategy to show how they all fit together, and what the overall vision and objectives for services were. The Older People's Strategy had been designed to fill that gap.

It had been produced at a time when there had been a number of new policy measures announced by Government. In short these measures sought to broaden the focus of services for older people. This involved moving from a concentration of attention and resources on those in greatest need to a broader approach emphasising the need to help older people to be healthy and active in their communities and enable them to be as independent as possible. Critically, it involved a shift in resources to earlier and targeted intervention.

In Coventry massive strides had been made in recent years in this direction, and the Strategy showed what needed to be done to build upon this solid foundation. In particular this could only be achieved by better co-ordination of community based mainstream services and specialist 'secondary care', integrating health and social care services, and linking them more closely with universal services such as lifelong learning, leisure and cultural services. By doing this, the key policy objectives of the broader approach could be achieved.

The Older People's Strategy supported the modernisation of services for older



people, working on the principle that if services were designed well and were of high quality for older people, they will also meet the needs of the rest of the population.

The report submitted identified policy development in terms of national and local improvements, including priorities identified through the publication of various Government reports, Green and White Papers. The 2005 Star ratings showed that the Coventry Teaching Primary Care Trust and the University Hospitals of Coventry and Warwickshire were seen to be effective in areas relevant to the National Service Framework and other recent national policies.

In particular, the Cabinet noted the performance of the agencies working together to achieve the best performance nationally in combating delayed discharges from acute hospital. In addition, a Section 31 agreement between the Primary Care Trust and the City Council was agreed in 2004 for a joint Community Equipment service, and an agreement for joint Intermediate Care services was currently nearing agreement. These performance results showed that the agencies were well placed to tackle the next main task of the Coventry Older Peoples Partnership – to achieve fully integrated services, and realise the benefits for both consumers and in resource management.

The Older People's Strategy, which was appended to the report submitted, contained an overall summary of the Strategy, the Vision, Values, Key Themes, and Action required to implement the necessary developments.

The basic principles underpinning the Older People's Strategy applied to all areas of the Council's activity, including treating people with dignity and respect; providing services as close to home as possible; that decisions about the long term future were not made at a time of crisis; providing accurate and timely information in an appropriate format to enable people to make informed choices; and training and support to the workforce to deliver high quality services.

Each Directorate would be asked to identify the issues for their work from the Older People's Strategy and to cross-reference the Older People's Strategy with other strategies across the City as they were written or revised, and the Older People's Partnership would continue to influence the work within the Coventry Partnership theme groups.

The Cabinet noted that the Strategy had undergone a consultation and approval process between October and December 2005. The consultation process was wide and built on the inclusive development of the strategy over the past year. It included older people's user groups; the Older People's Partnership and associated networks; Community Services Senior Management Team; Management Board; the Older People's Champions Network; Coventry PCT; and University Coventry and Warwickshire Hospital Trust Board.

The report submitted brought the agreed Older People's Strategy for approval and adoption by the City Council, it being noted that a similar process of approval and adoption will take place in the Primary Care Trust and University Coventry and Warwickshire Hospitals NHS Trust

Achieving success in implementing the Strategy would require the establishment of a programme of change, a major investment of time and resources, and a robust performance management mechanism. The Strategy set out the 8 key steps of action

planning; consulting and involving people; making sure the plan is affordable; making sure the management structure was based on the needs of services; a plan for the workforce; developing the workforce; securing good quality care; and improving information, as being needed to ensure the infrastructure is in place to enable the Strategy to succeed.

Success would also be dependent on the effective implementation of a number of individual strategies for areas of service that make up parts of the overall strategy. Progress would be monitored carefully by the steering group for the Older People's Partnership, which was the main inter-agency performance management group.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Adopt the Older People's Strategy, developed by the Older People's Partnership jointly across health and social care, and note the wider implications of improving the quality of life of older people, which is a whole Council responsibility.**
- (2) Note the key areas of action and joint working within Council Directorates to support the delivery of the Older People's Strategy.**
- (3) Note the implications for the Council in the strategic direction proposed to integrate delivery of services across Coventry PCT and the Council (Social Services) wherever it is beneficial to service users and increases the effectiveness and efficiency of service delivery.**

**135. Children and Young Peoples Plan 2006-2010**

Further to Minute 237/05 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Chief Executive, which provided details on the outcome of consultation and sought approval for the statutory Children and Young People's Plan. The Cabinet had noted that a report on this matter had also been considered by Scrutiny Board (2) at their meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2006 (their Minute 82/05 refers).

The Children and Young People's Plan (CYPP) was an important element of the reforms underpinned by the Children Act 2004. On the basis of a new statutory duty, and building on the best local planning practice, the Government intended that all areas should produce a single, strategic, overarching plan for all local services for children and young people by April 2006.

The CYPP and the process of joint planning would support local authorities and their partners as they worked together to agree clear targets and priorities for all their services to children and young people; identify the actions and activities needed to achieve them; ensure that they are delivered; and that their impact is monitored. The Plan replaced requirements for seven statutory and ten non-statutory plans.

Through this new planning framework, Government was aiming to achieve improvement and integration of universal services; early intervention/prevention; accessible services and a multi-agency approach; shared responsibility for safeguarding; and more responsive and 'listening' services.

The CYPP was part of the improvement cycle for children's services set out in the

Government's document 'Every Child Matters: Change for Children'. The improvement cycle required Children's Services Authorities (the local authority) to carry out an analysis of performance and needs in relation to outcomes; agree to local priorities; produce a Children and Young People's Plan with local partners; commission and deliver children's services; and undertake an Annual Performance Assessment (July 2005) and a three yearly Joint Area Review (March 2006).

The Children and Young People's Plan was required to cover all services for children and young people in the area; local authority services for education, social services and youth; local authority roles regarding safeguarding; corporate parent role for Looked After Children; promotion of well-being; encouragement of higher educational standards; commissioning of services; and promotion of co-operation, collaboration and equality.

In practical terms, the Plan needed to contain a local vision for children and young people; an analysis of needs in relation to the Every Child Matters outcomes; an outline of the improvements to be made to these outcomes; a description of strategic aims and actions; an outline budget statement; the details of arrangements for performance management; the arrangements for partnership working under the duty to co-operate; and details of how this plan links to other strategic plans.

The Government's intention was that its national vision for children and young people was made locally relevant through the identification of local priorities and local needs. The Director of Children's Services and Lead Member would play a key leadership role in bringing together local partners, both statutory and non-statutory, across the full range of local services. They would also play lead roles in driving reform.

The Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership had agreed strategic aims for Coventry's Plan that were consistent with the City's Community Plan.

The City Council had drawn up the Plan with the active involvement of a wide range of partners, including those stipulated under the 'duty to co-operate' set out in Section 10 of the Children Act 2004. The local authority had consulted with the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership which additionally included representation from voluntary and community sector; University Hospital Coventry & Warwickshire; and the Fire Service.

The full plan and a summary sheet had been posted on the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership web site and also sent to Headteachers, Chairs of Governors and Diocesan Authorities.

In addition, the local authority had consulted with trade union representatives via the Children, Learning and Young People's Directorate Management and Trade Union Forum.

The strategic aims and actions within the Plan were based on the findings of an extensive range of consultation exercises. It was now the intention to consult children, young people, parents and carers specifically on how well the Plan reflected the issues that have previously been raised and to identify new areas for inclusion in future revisions of the action plans contained within the CYPP.

Many of the key elements within the Plan have been developed jointly with

members of the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership and agreed during the development of the Plan. As a result, the response to consultation had been fairly limited. All amendments had been incorporated into the final version of the Plan.

Further consultation work would be undertaken during the life of the Plan and as part of the performance review process.

The approved Plan would be professionally produced in two parts, plan and appendices, and a further version would be produced in a format accessible to children and young people.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the Children and Young People's Plan 2006 – 2010.**

### **136. Council Response to Whitefriars Group Restructuring Proposals**

Further to Minute 244/05 of Cabinet, the City Council considered a joint report of the Chief Executive and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services, which sought approval to consent to the proposed restructuring of Whitefriars Housing Group and execute the Deed of Variation and Novation. The Cabinet had noted that the report had also been considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee at their meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2006 (their Minute 231/05 refers).

Whitefriars Housing Group had proposed re-organisation and conversion from their current status of three companies limited by guarantee to one industrial provident society which would have charitable status.

On 9<sup>th</sup> August 2005, the Cabinet had considered a joint report from the Chief Executive and Director of Social Services and Housing, which sought agreement to a provisional response that had been sent to Whitefriars about their group restructuring proposals. Cabinet had endorsed the provisional response and since then detailed work has been carried out in relation to the legal agreements required to give effect to the proposals (their Minute 78/05 refers).

As part of the group structure re-organisation, Whitefriars Housing Group (WHG) had proposed entering into a Deed of Variation and Novation in relation to the initial housing Transfer Agreement (between the City Council and WHG) in order to ensure that all the rights and objectives which currently exist were transferred to the new entity. A draft Deed of Novation and Variation had been drafted by Trowers and Hamlin, the firm of solicitors representing Whitefriars, for agreement by the City Council.

During the consideration of the documents in relation to the proposed re-organisation, it was established that the City Council would stand effectively to lose its right of "veto" under the proposed re-organisation.

The City Council were being advised by external lawyers, Lawrence Graham, and a copy of their advice was attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted and outlined the position and the effect if the proposed re-organisation was to take place.

Under the present arrangements, the City Council had a weighted bloc vote which could be exercised by its nominated representative. In effect this means that the City Council had a "veto" on such issues as changes to the Whitefriars constitution. The report

submitted indicated that, in the rules for the new company, Whitefriars Housing Group Limited, voting would be restricted to Board Members, of whom there were proposed to be 18 of which the City Council will have 6, and Board Members would have to attend in person or appoint a proxy if their vote is to count. The effect of their change is that the City Council would lose its "bloc" vote as well as the weighting arrangement which required a Council appointed representative to be present for a meeting to be quorate. The Council's representatives would, therefore, need to ensure that they attend the relevant meetings. Whitefriars had been asked on several occasions to change their proposals so that they reflected current voting arrangements but they had declined to do so.

The Chief Executive had reported at the meeting of Cabinet that a letter had been received from Whitefriars Housing Group, which indicated that they had instructed their lawyers to insert revisions to the rules of the amalgamated charitable entity to reflect the weighted voting system as currently applies. The deed of variation would also be amended to take out the provisions relating to Council consent to rule changes as these were only relevant if a weighted voting system was not to be followed. Therefore, at the point of amalgamation, the Council would have the same right of "veto" as at present.

**RESOLVED that the City Council endorse the Cabinet's decision to:**

- (1) Accept the voting arrangements proposed by Whitefriars subject to the proposed Deed of Variation and Change to Rules being revised to reflect the weighted voting system as it currently applies, which will provide a continuation of the Council's existing rights of veto.**
- (2) Approve the City Council entering into a Deed of Novation and Variation between the City Council with Whitefriars Housing Group to give effect to the re-organisational proposals.**

#### **137. Further Amendments to the Constitution**

Further to Minute 35/05 of the Standards Committee, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services which proposed further changes to the City Council's Constitution that had arisen since the Committee considered amendments to the Constitution at their meeting on 8th February, 2006 (their Minute 23/05 refers). The Constitution Working Group had met to examine the Constitution and as a result, had recommended that further amendments be made.

In relation to Planning Committee, the opportunity had been taken to review procedures and practices and as a result, a list of proposed amendments were detailed in an appendix to the report. A number of these amendments sought to ensure fairness and good practice at Planning Committee.

The Constitution was currently silent in relation to adjourning meetings if, for example, they were or became inquorate. It was proposed to include a paragraph in the Constitution clarifying that when a meeting is adjourned and reconvened, there must be at least five working days notice of the date of that reconvened meeting.

The Standards Committee, at their last meeting, had recommended that the City Council increase the number of Independent Members of this Committee from five to seven (including a Parish Councillor), due to the anticipated increased workload in relation to the local handling of complaints of misconduct by Councillors, the change in the rules of

the Committee and succession planning in relation to the existing members of the Committee (there Minute 24/05 refers). The Constitution Working Group had considered this issue and had recommended that the number of Councillors on the Committee should also be increased from two to three, to include a representative of the Main Opposition Group. This would give a total membership of ten.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approves:**

- (1) The amendment to the City Council's Constitution in relation to Planning Committee as detailed in the appendix to the report.**
- (2) The amendment to the City Council's Constitution in relation to clarifying the procedure for adjourning/reconvening meetings.**
- (3) The increase in the number of Councillors on the Standards Committee from two to three, to include a representative of the Main Opposition Group.**

**138. Progress Report on Neighbourhood Management and Proposals for the Creation of 18 Ward Forums**

Further to Minute 250/05 of Cabinet, the City Council considered a joint report of the Chief Executive and the Head of Neighbourhood Management setting out progress in the development of the Neighbourhood Management Service, and putting forward proposals for the creation of eighteen Ward Forums to replace the six Area Forums as a strategic framework for the Council and its partners to work together through the Neighbourhood Management Service to address the delivery of improved services in Coventry's neighbourhoods.

The Neighbourhood Management Service came into being on the 1st October 2005, following the decision of the Cabinet on the 6th September, 2005, to re-structure the former Area Co-ordination Service into three Neighbourhood Management areas to be co-terminous with Police Operational Command Units. The proposals were closely linked to moves to integrate the different wardens services into a single wardens service across the City. Neighbourhood Management was officially launched at a series of events aimed at communities in each of the three areas, elected members and a City-wide partners' event in November 2005.

All area staff teams were now in place. Work was planned to make the accommodation of some teams more accessible for residents and, in some cases, new premises were being sought. The move of the South main office to Stoke Aldermoor had been completed in conjunction with the opening of the One Stop Shop at Barley Lea House. Other premises options were being investigated, particularly opportunities to co-locate with other agencies.

Additional Neighbourhood Wardens had been recruited and new teams had been put in place to patrol the areas previously identified as hot spot areas. Work was currently underway to transfer the Hillfields wardens, the City Centre Street Crime wardens and the New Deal for Communities wardens to the corporate Neighbourhood Warden service within Neighbourhood Management. From the 1st April, 2006, all 75 Neighbourhood Wardens in the City were being managed as one service.

More structured approaches to the planning and recording of Neighbourhood Management activity with local communities were being put in place. This would give more complete information for councillors and partners about what activity is taking place in each area enabling Neighbourhood Management to work with local councillors to prioritise activities.

Work was still taking place on the future of neighbourhood plans and how best to work with local communities on them and to integrate them into the planning processes of the Council and other partners.

With the immediate Neighbourhood Management staff team structures in place, preliminary work had started to develop the strategic framework within which Neighbourhood Management would work with other Council departments and in partnership with other public agencies. It had previously been agreed that Neighbourhood Management was intended to achieve the following immediate outcomes:

- More joined-up services which offer improved services, a better customer experience and better use of resources
- Better Value for Money in Council and partner service delivery
- Achievement of agencies' service targets and objectives
- Better involvement and engagement of communities

The above outcomes encompass:

- Developing joint delivery of ambitions for the area
- Building a shared understanding of local needs between local residents, councillors and partners
- Continuing to try and close the gap between more and less prosperous communities
- Achieving long-lasting and sustainable change

Work had started and would continue to be developed to ensure that Neighbourhood Management was responsive to local issues. The proposed Ward Forums would provide one of the mechanisms to achieve these aims.

In order to achieve the above outcomes, the Council needed to work in partnership with other public service agencies, voluntary organisations and communities. There was already a strong foundation for working in this way through the Coventry Partnership and its delivery of the Coventry Community Plan and the Local Area Agreement (LAA). The 2005 – 2010 Community Plan had an underpinning theme of Neighbourhoods, which included priorities intended to improve the quality of life for people in Coventry and narrowing the gap in inequalities for disadvantaged neighbourhoods. The development of the Neighbourhood Management structure was, therefore, intended to be strongly linked to local councillors and to make strategic links between the Coventry Partnership and related partnerships such as the Community Safety Partnership and the Children and Young People's Strategic Partnership and area-based working. It was also intended to reflect a strategic approach at the three area levels, underpinned by work at a neighbourhood and ward level. This was being supported by moves towards neighbourhood policing.

The report submitted referred to the introduction of Area Management Groups (AMG), which, it is proposed, would consist of senior officers from a number of Council services and other public agencies, working as a local partnership. AMGs would meet

quarterly to share each agency's key targets and objectives and identify where these could be aligned to achieve better services, improve provision around identified gaps in local services and identify opportunities for service collaboration to create efficiencies. This would be a strategic meeting and should be chaired by one of the senior employees of partner organisations to enable employees of all the organisations involved to be held to account. Elected members for the wards in the area would have a standing invitation to attend AMG meetings and would be circulated with agendas and minutes. It was recognised that not all members would be able to attend these meetings regularly and therefore arrangements would be put in place to report back to members on the issues raised and discussed at the meetings. Draft Terms of Reference for Area Management Groups were appended to the report submitted.

Work was currently underway to develop an Area Management Group (AMG) for each area, (these were referred to as Area Teams in the Cabinet report approved in September 2005). It was proposed that beneath each AMG would be a sub-group known as the Safer, Stronger Area Group. This group had been initiated by the Coventry Community Safety Strategy and fitted between the fortnightly Active Intelligence Mapping (AIM) meetings and the neighbourhood-based Safer Estates or Safer Neighbourhood meetings. A further appendix to the report submitted showed this in diagram form. Discussions were also taking place with the Primary Care Trust and the Health Development Unit to create a similar sub-group to address the health inequalities/Choosing Health agenda in each of the Neighbourhood Management areas. These two themed sub-groups of the AMG create an area-based network of officers to address operational as well as detailed strategic issues in delivering on two of the LAA blocks. Further consideration would be given to the creation of similar sub-groups to address the children and young people and the economy and enterprise themes of the LAA.

All of this was underpinned at a neighbourhood level by safer estates or safer neighbourhood groups, health action groups or a replacement for them, ward forums and the many resident and community-led networks and forums. These structures were critical for ensuring community engagement and influence in the design and delivery of public services in neighbourhoods.

As regards the creation of Ward Forums, the report indicated that there had been discussions for some time within the Council about Area Forums. A review was undertaken in 2002. Area Forums in some areas had come to be seen as effective. In other areas, there had been tensions between the size of the area and the public wanting a more neighbourhood focus. There had also been ambiguity about the roles of Area Forums, with some tensions between, on the one hand, trying to encourage uninhibited local involvement and debate and, on the other, making the Area Forums part of the Council's constitution and framework. Council members and officers alike reflected the concerns from Area Forums about over-domination of Forums by Council-led presentations, even though it is acknowledged that this has been motivated by entirely good intentions to consult.

During December 2005 and January 2006, Area Managers sought the views of ward councillors on what local consultation meetings they would like. Forty-eight out of fifty-four councillors were either interviewed or completed a questionnaire giving their feedback on what might work in their ward. A few councillors felt that Area Forums were beginning to work and wanted to retain them but most councillors were supportive of the concept of Ward Forums. The main criticisms of Area Forums was that they cover too wide



an area to address issues of concern to residents in their neighbourhood, that too few residents take up the opportunity to attend Area Forum meetings, and that this may be linked to the concerns that, very often, the meetings were overwhelmed by Council department presentations with too little opportunity for community engagement.

At the meeting of the Members Advisory Panel on Neighbourhood Management held on the 8th February, 2006, members were able to discuss the idea of moving to Ward Forums. The Advisory Panel members all supported the potential introduction of Ward Forums but acknowledged that there would be resource implications for supporting and servicing them. It was also accepted that there could not be a "one size fits all" approach to Ward Forums. Whilst for many wards, meetings being held quarterly was considered appropriate, some wards were felt only to need a forum twice a year and, in a small number of cases, there may be an argument for meetings to be held more frequently than quarterly. It should be noted, however, that the support arrangements for an increased number of forums would need careful consideration as it would be damaging if the Council made commitments to local people which could not be supported.

There were also high levels of support for making Forums less bureaucratic, which could be achieved by removing the requirement to hold Forums from the Council's constitution and the associated need to service the meetings as a Council committee. A multi-agency approach to Ward Forums was seen as potentially more attractive for communities who may have issues they want to discuss which relate to a number of public services including the Police, Whitefriars or the Primary Care Trust and not just the City Council.

Advisory Panel members were keen to see Ward Forums have a more action-focused approach. They felt that it was not necessary to have so many officers present at the meetings but key directorates, such as City Services, would need to be represented. In other cases, people may be requested to attend depending upon issues raised on the agenda. More importantly, clear recording of issues raised and prompt follow-up activity, with feedback to residents raising issues, was seen as what was needed, rather than waiting until the next meeting.

Work was currently being undertaken to map all groups and meetings in each ward, including residents groups, community forums and networks, local interest groups and specific groups such as safer estates groups. Once this information was collated, ward councillors would be able to make an informed recommendation about how frequently Ward Forums would be needed in their ward, alongside other places that community members are able to share their ideas, aspirations and concerns. There had not yet been discussion with the existing Area Forums about proposals for Ward Forums. Clearly, some members of the public have given great commitment to Area Forums and would want to understand the implication of Ward Forum proposals. Proposals should also be tested out on existing groups in local areas.

It was proposed that Area Forums should be replaced by Ward Forums. The chair of the Ward Forum would be appointed by the Council, as is the case for Area Forums. There would be some standard approaches to ward forums, such as each ward forum having a similar style of agenda and format for creating action notes, but there would be local variations, such as frequency of meetings. It was hoped that Ward Forums, while being structured, would have a "more friendly" style in terms of format and arrangements and should have fewer Council-led presentations. It was proposed that, at the beginning of the municipal year, members for each ward would agree the cycle of

meetings in their ward for the forthcoming year. Consideration would be given to this alongside other ward or neighbourhood based meetings. It was proposed that members of the public who were currently regular attendees of Area Forum meetings should be involved in the process of discussing how best to move to ward forums.

Each Ward Forum would be allocated a senior council officer to provide support to the chair and to be responsible for ensuring that actions are followed up after the meeting. Each Ward Forum would be allocated a council officer responsible for taking action notes. It was expected that officers from across the council will take on these roles, not just those from either Neighbourhood Management or Committee Services.

There would be publicity and promotional activity for each ward forum to ensure wider community involvement in the meetings. An annual budget of £25,000 would be required to support the ward forums not only for promotional activity but also to support mailings to residents and partners and to pay for room hire and refreshments. A one-off budget of £10,000 (to be funded from the Policy Contingency Fund) would be needed in the first year to launch ward forums and to ensure a good profile is established for the new approach.

As regards monitoring, progress on developing the next stages in the Neighbourhood Management framework would, as now, be reported in regular meetings between the Head of Neighbourhood Management and the Cabinet Member (Finance and Equalities). The Members Advisory Panel also provided an overview and monitoring function when requested by the Cabinet Member.

It was intended to hold the first Area Management Group meetings during May 2006, the cycle of meetings then to be agreed by the Council and partners to best meet the requirements of their own planning and meeting cycles.

Ward Forums were to begin by June/July 2006. However, further Area Forum dates have been identified and put in the diary as a contingency until all Ward Forum arrangements are satisfactorily in place.

The Cabinet also considered a progress report indicating the outcome of the consideration of this matter by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee and the Standards Committee at their meetings on the 29th March, 2006.

The Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee had supported the recommendations contained in the report submitted and had also made the following additional recommendations – which the Cabinet approved:

- (a) That the Cabinet request officers to produce a further report on how the views expressed by ward forums, and how neighbourhood plans, might be fed into the Council's political management arrangements and corporate processes (including how links with the Management Board might be maintained and how officers attending ward forums might be empowered to take decisions on behalf of their Directors).
- (b) That the Cabinet note that the Cabinet Member (Finance and Equalities) gave an undertaking to the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee that a progress report on the operation of the ward forums would be submitted to them in November/December 2006.

The Cabinet also noted that the Standards Committee had agreed to recommend that the City Council make the appropriate changes to the Constitution.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:-**

- (1) Note the progress made to date in developing Neighbourhood Management.**
- (2) Endorse the draft Terms of Reference for Area Management Groups.**
- (3) Endorse the proposal to create 18 Ward Forums and cease the existing Area Forums from July 2006.**
- (4) Agree to the additional spend of £35,000, which will be funded from the policy contingency fund in the first year.**
- (5) Request the employees to produce a further report on how the views expressed by ward forums, and how neighbourhood plans, might be fed into the Council's political management arrangements and corporate processes (including how links with the Management Board might be maintained and how officers attending ward forums might be empowered to take decisions on behalf of their Directors).**

**139. Ricoh Arena – (1) Operation of the Ricoh Arena, (2) Ricoh Arena Funding, and (3) Hotel Developments**

Further to Minute 254/05 of Cabinet, the City Council considered a joint report of the Director of Finance and ICT and the Director of City Development up-dating the Council, as a fifty per cent shareholder in Arena Coventry Limited (ACL), on the operation of the Ricoh Arena and seeking approval (a) to change the structure of the leases and company structures for the Ricoh Arena development to maximise the tax efficiency of the development and (b) for the acquisition of the land necessary to facilitate the hotel developments on the Ricoh Arena site.

The report indicated that, notwithstanding the difficulties of the delayed and phased opening of the Ricoh Arena, there had been a successful start to its operation by ACL. There were now conferences held on a daily basis and the entire exhibition hall had been used recently for both a fashion and a motor trade show. Since opening in August, there had been over 400 events held including Advantage West Midlands' Regional Conference, and major marketing events by Ricoh and Yorkshire Bank. Within the last few weeks, the Ricoh Arena had won a top international award for its conference, exhibition, banqueting and hotel facilities – just six months after opening. The Ricoh Arena was named best UK venue at the International CONFEX Exhibition held at Earls Court in London. CONFEX is the International Conference/Exhibition for all businesses and industries involved with the conference trade across the world. In addition, two major concerts would take place during the summer.

Football match attendance continued to be significantly higher than at Highfield Road. The residents parking scheme was working well and a significant number of people were travelling by bus. The closure of Judds Lane had also increased the effective dispersal of supporters by bus travel on match days.

The pitch-side hotel rooms were fully operational and are reaching their occupation targets. The Bistro was also up and running within the main atrium. The Health and Fitness centre, to be operated by the Coventry Sports Trust, was on programme to be operational in March. The fit-out of the community office space has commenced, with the programme of works scheduled to conclude on the 16th June 2006.

The City Council had submitted a bid for a regional casino, which would offer opportunities for greater investment on the Ricoh Arena site and in the surrounding areas. In the meantime, Laing O'Rourke had commenced works, under a separate contract, on the fit-out of the casino space. This would provide services throughout the area under the current casino license. The fit-out of the casino was due to be completed by 15th December 2006.

In addition, the job creation at the (old) gasworks site was likely to exceed the Council's original estimate by 25%. There were 2,700 jobs already, or being, created on the site and a further 1,000 jobs would follow if the Council was successful in achieving the regional casino licence. In itself, the regional casino licence was likely to generate a further £50m of investment in the immediate area, which would create more jobs in the future.

As regards Ricoh Arena funding, ACL signed their lease with Coventry North Regeneration Limited (CNR), the Council's 100%-owned company, on the 26th January 2006. ACL had been paying the agreed rent of £1.9m per annum to CNR since the 1st February 2006 (due on the 14th February) using the £1m cash-flow assistance provided by CNR. The cashflow assistance was approved by the Council on the 17th January 2006, and the formal agreement between CNR and ACL was signed on the 24th February 2006. Interest charges arising under this agreement would be backdated to the draw-down date of the 14th February 2006.

CNR had been making repayments on their £21m loan from the Council since August 2005. The rental stream from ACL would now cover these costs, meaning that the Council was no longer incurring any costs in relation to this loan.

ACL had accepted the offer of a £21m loan from the Yorkshire Bank, and it was now available for drawdown until the 1st June 2006. However, in order to draw down the loan, the Bank required the lease re-structure to be completed.

With regard to lease and company structures, the Council, CNR and ACL had been working with their respective advisors to ensure that the most tax-efficient position was achieved in accordance with the implementation decisions approved in the October 2003 Council report. At that time, employees made it clear to Members that company and lease structures would need to be addressed to ensure the optimum tax position was achieved.

Employees were now able to be clear on the best structures to optimise the tax advantages to the Council and these are set out below.

CNR was entitled to receive tax allowances based on its costs incurred in the construction of the Ricoh Arena. However, CNR was unable to use these allowances (as it has insufficient taxable income) and it was always the intention to transfer these allowances to ACL, which, as a trading company, can off-set them against tax due on its profits.

As 50% shareholder in ACL, the Council would benefit from the use of these allowances as ACL will pay less tax, and therefore:

- *had an improved cashflow position;*
- *had more funds available to support its commercial interests including the early repayment of borrowings; and*
- *in the medium term, would be likely to make funds available for distribution to its shareholders (the Council and the Higgs Trust) at an earlier time than would otherwise be the case.*

In order to transfer these allowances, the Council has been advised that it is necessary to assign the head lease from CNR to a new company (ACL 2006). Employees have sought to protect the interests of the Council in these arrangements and the new structures would not disadvantage the Council at all.

- *The Council, through its 50% ownership of ACL, will be a 50% owner of ACL 2006; and*
- *The assignment of the lease will preserve the Council's entitlement to the 'super rent' once ACL's profits reach £3.75m per annum.*

The only restriction for the Council from the assignment would be in fifty years' time, when CNR would lose the interest in the ACL lease for a period of 3 days. It had been confirmed by the Council's advisors that this loss had no value.

A diagram of the company/lease structures was appended to the report submitted.

The changes to the lease and company structures were identified in 2003, when the new funding arrangements were put in place following the unacceptable conditions (a Council guarantee) placed on the original bank loan being sought by ACL from Banco Espirito Santo. At that time, it was not possible to change the structures due to the volume of legal paperwork this would entail; nor was there any perceived urgency to do so as, due to Disadvantaged Area Relief, stamp duty was not payable on lease changes. In 2005, the Chancellor of the Exchequer unexpectedly changed the stamp duty rules in respect of Disadvantaged Area Relief. This meant that ACL would now be required to pay stamp duty of approximately £1m on the lease payment of £21m. However, this cost was more than outweighed by the advantages of the tax allowances. The tax allowances were always reflected within ACL's business plan in line with the Council's original plans. The extra stamp duty cost had now been included in ACL's latest Business Plan.

This was a complex arrangement and there remained a risk that the tax allowances may not be able to be used as planned. The Council and ACL, together with their respective advisors, had sought to minimise this risk but it could not be eliminated completely.

As regards hotel developments, the report indicated that these arrangements were set out in a report to the Cabinet in June 2005. In order to progress these developments, it was now recommended that the Council buy out ACL's interest in the land and negotiate the development arrangements directly as it was in a position to grant a longer lease which would maximise the premium payable. This would enable the Council to proceed with the

development of the sites without the need to make any further agreements or payments to ACL. The amount payable to ACL for the surrender of their 50-year leasehold interest in these sites had been determined by external professional advisors, engaged by the Council, at £1.25m.

Two option agreements had already been completed with a developer for the proposed hotel developments, which would provide the Council with a gross receipt of £1.77m, giving a net gain of £0.52m, after allowing for the £1.25m payment to ACL. However, should the developer not exercise his options on the sites, the Council would not immediately receive any income to offset the purchase cost. The option for 'site A' (gross receipt - £1.165m) was expected to be exercised in early 2007 and for 'site B' (gross receipt - £605k) in late 2007. In the event that the proposed developments did not go ahead, the attractiveness of the sites, due to the regeneration of the area, meant that it would be likely that an alternative operator would come forward to develop the sites.

The lease changes required to remove the hotel land would be completed at the same time as those required for the transfer of the tax allowances.

The report indicated that the recommended proposals offer best value to the Council in respect of the management of its investment in ACL and its contribution to the regeneration of the area.

In terms of finance, the transfer of tax allowances will benefit the Council through improved profitability of ACL by increasing:

- the value of its 50% shareholding in the Company;
- the probability of receiving dividend income from its shareholding in the Company; and
- the probability of profits exceeding the 'super rent' level of £3.75m.

In addition, the successful operation of the Ricoh Arena should increase the value of the Council's property assets in the surrounding area.

The buy-out of ACL's interest in the hotel development would cost the Council £1.25m. This cost would be recouped through the exercise of the option by the developer at £1.77m generating a net surplus to the Council of £0.52m.

There were a number of risks arising to the Council from its 50% shareholding in the ACL. The Directors of ACL were responsible for risk management within the Company and need to balance the risks of activities against the predicted returns from these activities. These risks had been minimised through the use of appropriate professionals to establish the relevant company and lease structures.

The Council would acquire the land for the hotel developments before the options were exercised, meaning that there was a risk that the proposed developments did not proceed. However, the developer was keen to proceed with the developments and the attractiveness of the sites meant that the eventual risk of loss to the Council from acquisition was low.

The operation of ACL would continue to be monitored to ensure that the holding of

50% of the shares in the Company continued to be in the best interests of the Council.

The lease changes necessary would be put in place as soon as possible to enable ACL to obtain the tax allowances and the Council, via CNR, to receive the £21m lease premium from ACL.

The Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee had considered the report at their meeting on the 22nd March 2006, and supported the recommendations contained in it.

It was reported at the meeting of the Cabinet that the employees had been working with the Council's external tax advisors on the complex issue of how best to maximise the tax position. To ensure that the Council could deliver on the principles accepted by Members, it was suggested that the following recommendation be added in place of one contained in the original report in order to reinforce the capacity to make any detailed technical/legal changes that are necessary within the overall principles agreed in the report to ensure that any technical issues can be dealt with that might come up from the advisors in a way that allows the Council to obtain the £21m from ACL as soon as possible:

"To delegate authority to the Director of Finance and ICT and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services to make other appropriate changes as necessary to the corporate and lease structures required to maximise the tax efficiency of the Arena development in line with the implementation decisions approved by the Council on the 16th October, 2003, it being noted that Councillors will be advised of any changes made and the Cabinet Advisory Panel informed."

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Note the successful start to the operation of the Ricoh Arena and the positive impact that this will have on the Council's investment in ACL.**
- (2) Delegate authority to the Director of Finance and ICT and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services to make other appropriate changes as necessary to the corporate and lease structures required to maximise the tax efficiency of the Arena development in line with the implementation decisions approved by the Council on the 16th October, 2003, it being noted that Councillors will be advised of any changes made and the Cabinet Advisory Panel informed**
- (3) Authorise the surrender of the hotel land back to the City Council at a value of £1.25m payable to ACL for the loss of the car parking and land at the Arena, in accordance with the principle agreed by Cabinet at its meeting in June 2005. This transaction will be structured to achieve the most advantageous tax position.**

**140. Future Joint Working Between the City Council and Local Health Services, including Response to Consultation on a Mental Health Trust**

Further to Minute 256/05 of Cabinet, the City Council considered a joint report of the Chief Executive and the Director of Community Services seeking approval for the direction of partnerships between Health Services in the City and the Local Authority, including options to establish (a) a joint post as Director of Public Health across the Primary

Care Trust and the City Council, (b) a joint post as Service Head of Mental Health Services between the new proposed Mental Health Trust and the City Council and (c) a Project Management Team to consider the possible options open to the City Council and the Primary Care Trust in Coventry for future arrangements for joint working in the City.

The report also contained, in Appendix A, a response to the consultation on a proposal to establish a Mental Health Trust across Coventry and Warwickshire.

The report indicated that City residents who come into contact with both health and social care services often commented that they would like to see the services more joined up and more connected to each other. The most common comment was that people would like to only have to tell "their story" once and that this information could trigger the required interventions and services.

Professionals working within the health and social care settings could see the total inter-dependence that each professional had on the other. This was so that the services that determine who needs medical or therapeutic interventions and how people might recover from those interventions were closely connected to community-based delivery of social care.

On the 30th January 2006, the Government published a White Paper "Our Health, Our Care, Our Say: A New Direction for Community Services". The paper made further requirements for social care (in both adults and children's settings) and health services to work more closely together and its policy for health services is for the Primary Care Services to more clearly distinguish between the way in which they plan and commission services to meet people's health needs and the range of provision for which they may have responsibility.

In Coventry, the City Council and the Primary Care Trust (PCT) had, over the last five years, sought stronger ways in which they could work in partnership with each other. This had mostly been achieved through the establishment of Partnership Boards, which brought together all key stakeholders around key client groups (Older People, Children, Mental Health, Learning Disability and Adults with Physical Disability). They had also established joint services in Community Mental Health and the Joint Equipment Store as well as co-located services, for example, the community team for adults with Learning Disabilities.

The Cabinet had already accepted the principle of establishing a Children's Trust. Work now needed to be undertaken between the Council and the PCT on how these arrangements would be carried out, the mechanisms and protocols for managing risk (particularly financial risks) and the detailed workings of such a Trust.

In addition, there was now an opportunity to consider if the relationships between the two organisations serving adults in the City also needed to be brought closer together to more clearly jointly commission and plan for services to meet the health and social care needs of local people and to find better ways together of delivering those same services in partnership with both the private and voluntary sector.

There was a view that, in bringing services together, it may be possible to use resources better (to avoid duplication of effort on both organisations), to have a stronger set of skills in both commissioning and procurement (bringing expertise from both organisations) and to better use the skills and people within the existing and future



workforces where partners are often competing with each other for the same people.

The Primary Care Trust was also being required to put a stronger emphasis on its primary role as a commissioner of services. To this end, it needed to create a clearer split between its role as a commissioner and where it is the direct provider of a service. It was clear that the former function must be carried out with the local authority. It was possible that the Council should also look to bring together its assessment and provider functions that serve the local communities.

The report accordingly proposed the establishment of a Joint Project Management Team across the PCT/City Council. This would be overseen by a Senior Manager working for one of the organisations but would report to the Chief Executives (or Director of Children Learning and Young People or the Director of Community Services in the Council) in both organisations. A post of Project Manager would be established for a one-year contract to undertake the work required, which included:

- *Recommend the scope of joint primary health and community commissioning and its interface with acute sector commissioning.*
- *Recommend the financing arrangements that will be necessary to implement any proposals including the budgets that may need to be pooled.*
- *Recommend the protocols and risk management approach to delivering joint services or joint commissioning.*
- *Recommend the governance and management arrangements that will need to be in place to support the delivery of joint services or joint commissioning.*
- *Recommend the nature of any staff employment matters arising out of any proposed changes and make agreements with the relevant trade unions.*
- *Recommend any sites at which staff may be co-located in order to carry out these tasks.*
- *Make provision for consultation with key stakeholders on the outcome of any proposals that both the PCT and the City Council support.*
- *Make provision for consultation and discussion with staff in both organisations as to how the services might better work together.*
- *Work with the legal teams in both organisations to ensure compliance with Section 10 of the Children Act or Section 31 of the National Health Act in any pooled arrangements.*
- *Recommend lead agency responsibilities or new governance arrangements (Children's/Care Trusts) as appropriate to hold responsibility for these functions.*
- *Recommend the arrangements for the capture of performance, finance and activity data that need to support the governance and the regulatory bodies to which the PCT and the City Council are accountable.*

As regards the post of Joint Director of Public Health, the report indicated that the Director of Public Health (Dr Keith Williams) had indicated that he would be resigning from his appointment with the Primary Care Trust at the end of March 2007. Dr Williams had made a significant contribution to public health in Coventry and had started the process of increasing life expectancy for all citizens in the City. There was much in common between the Primary Care Trust's ambition to improve health outcomes in the City and those similar aspirations shared by the City Council. Both key partners were committed to working with the "Health of Coventry" Theme-Group of the Coventry Partnership. The City Council had allocated some resources within City Services to enable the Council to play an active part in health promotion. These services included the Health Development Unit (involving health promotion, local health development, health nutrition and hygiene officers) and the Secondary Smoking Officer. The Council supported about twenty people undertaking this activity, which it either funded itself or through various grant agreements. However, before any arrangements about the post could be finalised, there were key operational arrangements which need to be worked on in terms of the agreed focus of the joint director and how he/she would work within the management boards of the two organisations and in relation to staff.

As regards the Service Head (Mental Health Services), the response appended to the report submitted explained the development of joint mental health services in the City. The Director of Community Services had been working with the Chief Executives of the Coventry Primary Care Trust to gain common agreement on the shape and organisation of any proposed Mental Health Trust. The Director had been concerned that a new Mental Health Trust would focus its energies and efforts on developing excellent acute services (which were needed) but that this may be at the expense of the equally-important community-based services. Over recent years, the Coventry PCT, as the provider of Mental Health Services, had made many improvements, which needed to be sustained. In taking these developments forward, the Director of Community Services was aware that the importance of getting the right housing support and employment opportunities for people recovering from mental ill-health was as important as their health and social care. Therefore, there must be strong links created between any new Trust and the City Council.

Under the Mental Health Act 1983, the responsibility for the Approved Social Work Services (those social workers who had the power to assess people to consider their compulsory admission to hospital) rested with the local authority and with the previous post of Director of Social Services. The Director of Community Services now holds these responsibilities. The Coventry Primary Care Trust, within the joint service agreement, managed the current service. There was a Fieldwork Manager, who reported to the Head of Adults' Services but was located within the joint service structure, who had oversight of this service. The Director of Community Services was proposing that, through the creation of a joint service head post – Director of Mental Health (Coventry) reporting to him, he was able to carry out his statutory duty.

Under the new arrangements, if a Mental Health Trust (Coventry and Warwickshire) was created, the commissioning of the services delivered by that Trust would be undertaken by the Coventry Primary Care Trust in collaboration with the City Council. This was the clearest way in which the City Council would be able to influence the way in which the new Trust was organised to deliver services to the people of Coventry. If, in addition, there was a direct reporting line for the local service head, this would add to the way in which the City Council would be able to influence and affect local services.

One determination (contained in the response appended to the report) that the Director of Community Services would ask the Council to affirm was that community-based services for adults with learning disabilities should not be included within the proposed Mental Health Trust. It was unclear at present as to the position that Warwickshire Council would take on this matter although they were aware of the views of employees in Coventry. The Council's position was supported by the Local Primary Care Trust.

The report highlighted serious risks, indicating that, while the Management Board of the City Council overall supported the direction of building stronger partnerships with the local health community, there were, however, serious concerns regarding the financial risks within the current total health economy for Coventry and Warwickshire. There was evidence that a combination of growing cost pressures from new contracts, increasing drug prices, the mechanisms in operation for payment by results, the costs of the new hospital, the viability of the smaller local hospitals and the pressure to deliver high performance on government targets could put enormous financial strain on the Primary Care Trust's budgets, which might make it difficult for them to commit resources to working in partnership with the local authority. The Coventry Primary Care Trust had been very open with the City Council about these pressures and how they might be managed but there were risks that the pressures on their budgets could put pressures on the City Council's budgets which might make joint agreements on funding hard to secure. The Director of Community Services would be very mindful of these issues in any future proposals that were brought forward to the City Council.

In summary, the report indicated that the Chief Executive would need to explore with the Primary Care Trust the details of any such arrangements of a Joint Appointment of a Director of Public Health. These would include the nature of any reporting and governance arrangements, the nature of any pooled budgets and the services that were currently managed by the City Council and by the Primary Care Trust that would need to sit within any new arrangement. Any proposals would be subject to normal consultation with the Coventry Partnership (as key stakeholders), as well as with staff and their trade union representatives. The purpose of the report, accordingly, was to seek approval for the Chief Executive to enter into these discussions and to delegate authority to the Chief Executive to establish a joint post if that is the outcome of discussions and consultation.

With regard to Neighbourhood Management, the report indicated that one of the key objectives for any joint services between the Council and the PCT was to ensure that the organisation of services supports the new neighbourhood structure that the Community Partnership and the City Council are working to develop. The organisation of the delivery of social care and primary care will be driven by a number of factors but, most significantly, will be linking GP practices and other Primary Health settings where locality-based commissioning may be developing with a neighbourhood structure that most key partners will have adopted.

In terms of Best Value, both the City Council and the PCT would be looking to make efficiency gains out of combining current management and operational responsibilities. It was expected that some efficiencies would be achieved through the joint management of activities that are currently separately managed.

As regards Children and Young People, the aim of the project would be to work on the issues which impact on joint working between the Council and the PCT. Current joint working operates within three main areas – Social Care (Adults); Children's Services and

Public Health. The scope of the project would focus on the first two areas whilst discussions would take place between Senior Managers on the Public Health Directorate. Within that, the way in which the City Council and the PCT served the children and young people in the City will be critical to the success of the Project.

In terms of the Coventry Community Plan, which arose from the Coventry Partnership and formed part of the critical framework within which joint work and joint commissioning would take place, a principal focus of developing joint working arrangements would be how any new arrangements would contribute to the key goals and targets set within the Local Area Agreement and the Community Plan.

Any proposed changes to the post of Director of Public Health needed to be developed with the Health of Coventry Theme-Group of the Partnership. The City Council and the PCT were in a strong place to take any proposal forward as they are already jointly committed to the Reducing Health Inequalities objective in the Plan.

The costs of the Project Management would be met between the City Council and the Primary Care Trust, either through seconding existing staff to the project or employing someone on a one-year fixed contract to undertake the Project Management Tasks required. The estimated costs to the City Council would be in the region of £35,000. This figure could rise up to £70,000 if the only way of obtaining someone for this length of project is from a specialist agency. This would have to be met from the Social Care Services Budgets for 2006/07.

There would need to be agreement between the City Council and the PCT on any financial contribution that the City Council may be asked to find if the Director of Public Health were to be a joint appointment. This was likely to be up to a maximum of £50,000, including any on-costs. It was expected that this would need to be met from within existing resources and this would be examined in detail in the report back referred to the recommendations below.

There would also need to be agreement between the City Council and the new Mental Health Trust on any financial contribution that the City Council may be asked to find if the Director of Mental Health were to be a joint appointment. This, too, was likely to be up to a maximum of £50,000, including costs, with the expectation of this being met within existing resources. Again, details will be examined and reported back.

In terms of Human Resources, the current practice between the City Council and the Coventry PCT was that, for joint appointments, one of the organisations employed the person on their terms and conditions and then seconds staff accordingly into the appropriate service area. There are a number of people on either PCT or City Council contracts occupying joint posts. This practice would continue until further progress had been made on protocols for joint working. It would be expected that both the Director of Public Health and the Director (Service Head) for Mental Health would be employees of the health services but seconded as appropriate to work within the local authority.

The human resource implications of any wider changes to the working arrangements of staff would be significant. It would be important that both the PCT and the City Council came to agreement on new ways in which the current interests of staff could be protected whilst offering them new opportunities of working which would enhance their status and their job satisfactions. A Joint Trade Union Forum between the PCT and the Council trade unions had already been established and that Forum would have an

important part to play in agreeing a way forward.

The City Council and the PCT now had a number of experiences where joint appointments had been made to posts within either organisation.

There would also be significant legal implications in creating any joint services, particularly in creating pooled budgets. These issues would need to be resolved between the PCT and the City Council before any new arrangements were in place. This may stretch the existing resources that Legal and Democratic Services had to support such activity.

In terms of property, there were likely to be both some efficiency savings but also some complex negotiations on the shared use of properties (if services are to be co-located) across the City between the City Council and the PCT.

In addition, one of the critical aspects of the project management tasks would be to agree the protocols for managing risks across the two organisations. The management of financial risks would be particularly significant in this respect. If this could not be resolved, it was unlikely that shared services could be developed.

As regards monitoring, the Director of Community Services would report back to Cabinet on any further proposals arising from the work proposed.

The decision to develop joint posts for Public Health and Mental Health was likely to be resolved by the autumn of this year. Any further proposals were likely to come later in the year. There were pressures in the health community to make a divide between commissioning and provision of services by April 2007.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Approve the establishment of joint post with the Coventry Primary Care Trust of a Director of Public Health and to give authority to the Chief Executive to work on the creation of such a post and report back on the implications.**
- (2) Approve the establishment of a joint post between the City Council and the new proposed single Specialist Mental Health, Learning Disability and Substance Misuse NHS Trust for Coventry and Warwickshire and to give authority to the Director of Community Services to work on the creation of such a post of Service Head (called Director in the PCT) of Mental Health Services for Coventry as part of the proposed Mental Health Trust.**
- (3) Approve Appendix A to the report submitted as the Council's response to the consultation on the creation of a single Specialist Mental Health, Learning Disability and Substance Misuse NHS Trust for Coventry and Warwickshire, (it being noted that, at their meeting on the 15th March 2006, Scrutiny Board 4 (Health) considered and supported the response but were keen to emphasise the importance of Older People with Mental Health being appropriately supported in the community, that the Appendix has been amended accordingly and that the Coventry and Warwickshire Project Board (which oversees the work in setting up this**

Trust) had received some feedback regarding the title of the proposed new Trust, a proposal having been made that it is called "The Coventry and Warwickshire Specialist Partnership Trust" and elected members having been asked if they wish to comment, as appropriate).

- (4) Delegate authority to the Director of Community Services and the Interim Director of Children, Learning and Young People to establish a Project Management Team with the Coventry Primary Care Trust to establish options for future joint working across the two organisations in the City, to develop option appraisal to recommend ways in which the commissioning and delivery of health and social care could be better co-ordinated or jointly delivered within the City.
- (5) Require the Director of Community Services to report back to the Cabinet within nine months on the options available and to recommend the way forward in the City.

141. **Debate – Facilities and Services for People with Learning Difficulties**

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

"This Council commits itself to ensuring that people with learning difficulties continue to enjoy the same quality of facilities and services that they have in the past from the City Council and no-one is left behind by change. At the same time seek a review to be undertaken when external funding of services for vulnerable people runs out so that an evaluation is made about how such services can continue to be made available."

The following amendment was moved by Councillor H Noonan, seconded by Councillor Rutter and carried giving rise the following substantive motion:

"This Council commits itself to ensure that people with Learning difficulties are offered a wider range of opportunities, alongside good quality care, and any changes will involve both service users and carer's, in a way that did not happen in the past. At the same time the council affirms its policy that when external funding of services for vulnerable people are provided, an exit strategy, and a clear evaluation is done, and that the provision of further investment would meet the councils policy objectives."

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

142. **Debate – Lobbying Government Over Rises in Energy Costs**

Councillor Mrs Stone moved the following amended version of the original motion, which was seconded by Councillor Field and carried:

"This Council supports the campaign by the British Pensioners Trade Union and the Coventry Older Peoples Forum, who are lobbying the Government over the recent massive rises in energy costs.

This Council believes that urgent action is needed and agrees that a delegation from Coventry including a representative from the Older Peoples Forum and the British Pensioners Trade Union, should be sent to meet with the relevant Minister to discuss the issue of fuel poverty and what action could be taken to alleviate the effect of these price rises.

This Council is particularly concerned about the impact on the City's elderly and vulnerable citizens who have no idea how they are going to be able to afford to pay their massive increases in fuel costs."

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

(NOTE: The meeting closed at 8.55 p.m.)