

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

12th December 2006

PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Ahmed)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Batten)

Councillor Adalat	Councillor Mrs. Lancaster
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Lee
Councillor Asif	Councillor Mrs. Lucas
Councillor Bains	Councillor Ms. McKay
Councillor Benefield	Councillor Maton
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Matchet
Councillor Charley	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Chater	Councillor Mutton
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor Nellist
Councillor Clifford	Councillor H. Noonan
Councillor Crookes	Councillor M. Noonan
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Patton
Councillor Field	Councillor Ms. Reece
Councillor Foster	Councillor Ridge
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Mrs. Griffin	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Mrs. Harper	Councillor Skinner
Councillor Harrison	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Ms. Hunter	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Mrs. Waters
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Williams
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Windsor
Councillor Lakha	

58. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 31st October 2006, were signed as a true record, subject Councillor Patton's apologies being recorded.

59. Death of Former Lady Mayoresses

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent deaths of Mrs June Hodson and Mrs Evelyn Maxwell.

Mrs Hodson, wife of the late Councillor Stan Hodson, was Lady Mayoress in 1996-97.

Mrs Maxwell, wife of the late Councillor Charles Maxwell, was Lady Mayoress in 1978.

Both ladies served the City with great dignity and dedication. Members noted that letters of condolence had been sent on behalf of the City Council to Mrs Hodson and Mrs Maxwell's families.

60. **Petitions**

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

- (a) **Objection to the Proposed Demolition of the Steel Houses in Canley** – 217 signatures presented by Councillor Batten
- (b) **Request for Resurfacing of Stoke Row** – 26 signatures presented by Councillor Bains.
- (c) **Objection to the Telephone Mast Outside 217 Sewall Highway** – 576 signatures presented by Councillor Bains.
- (d) **Opposing the Installation of a Red Route System on the Hinckley Road** – 275 signatures presented by Councillor Patton.
- (e) **Objection to the Removal of the Portacabin Polling Station in Leicester Row** – 38 signatures presented by Councillor Skipper.
- (f) **Request for Consultation with the Deaf Community about proposals regarding the Deaf Development Workers Post** – 43 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Lancaster.

Note: The above petition was considered in conjunction with the item entitled 'Consultation on Social Services Efficiencies' (Minute 67 below)

- (g) **Residents Parking Scheme in Larkin Grove** – 56 signatures presented by Councillor Patton.

61. **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 Members decided to take at the meeting indicated, having regard to the National Code of Government Conduct and the City Council's Constitution:-

(a) **Interests in Recommendations for the City Council**

Personal

Member	Minute No.
Councillor Chater	63
Councillor Mrs Harper	66
Councillor Nellist	69
Councillor Sawdon	63
Councillor Taylor	66
Councillor Townsend	63

Prejudicial

Member	Minute No.
Councillor Asif*	66
Councillor Mrs Johnson*	66
Councillor Lee*	66

(a) **Interests in Debates**

Personal

Member	Minute No.
Councillor Mrs Lucas	71

Prejudicial

Member	Minute No.
Councillor Harvard*	72

* The Members indicated left the meeting during consideration of these items.

62. Question Time

The appropriate members answered all the questions set out in the questions booklet, together with supplementary questions put to them at the meeting.

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

Question Asked By	Question Put To	Subject Matter
1. Councillor Field	Councillor Charley	Whitefriars High Rise Review – additional service charges to residents for improvements to security.
2. Councillor Mutton	Councillor Noonan	Cygnets and Orwell Court: Commitment to make alterations/adaptations
3. Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Arrowsmith	The Role of Transport Officer Group and its accountability
4. Councillor Windsor	Councillor H Noonan	Cygnets Court – Installation of stairlift
5. Councillor Lee	Councillor O'Neill	Applications for employment at the City Council since implementation of single status
6. Councillor Chater	Councillor Taylor	Thanking the Volunteers who recently went to Sri Lanka
7. Councillor Townshend	Councillor O'Neill	Number of employees who have left the Council since 1 st June 2006
8. Councillor Skipper	Councillor O'Neill	Appointment of the Head of Human Resources

RESOLVED that in relation to questions 1 and 7 above, a written response be submitted to all members of the Council in accordance with paragraph 4.1.24 of the City Council's Constitution.

63. The Future of Ambulance Services in Coventry

Further to Minute 31/06 of Scrutiny Board 4 (Community Services and Housing, Neighbourhoods, Equalities and Health), the City Council considered the Board's report on the Future of Ambulance Services in Coventry. The report followed on from the Scrutiny Board's earlier response to the proposals for ambulance service reconfiguration and the creation of a new West Midlands Ambulance Service. The report focussed on the location of a proposed Emergency Operations Centre and a digital base station.

RESOLVED that the City Council note and endorse the report.

64. **Building Schools for the Future: Project Governance Arrangements**

RESOLVED that, in accordance with paragraph 4.1.35.5 of the Constitution, this item be combined with the debate on the same subject (Minute 72 below).

65. **Gambling Act 2005 – Statement of Gambling Policy**

Further to Minute 136/06 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a joint report of the Director of City Services and the Director of Legal and Democratic Services summarising the results of the consultation of the draft Statement of Gambling Policy. In addition, the report sought authority for the delegation of powers in accordance with the draft Statement of Gambling Policy. The report also advised on the need to adopt a Statement of Principles for certain Gambling Permits and to put in place appropriate delegated powers prior to the Council receiving applications from April 2007. The report had also been considered by the Licensing and Regulatory Committee on 21st November 2006 (their Minute 55/06 refers).

The Licensing and Regulatory Committee had considered each of the responses received as part of the consultation process and, following discussions, had agreed all the proposed action, subject to the following:

Ref 1	In order to facilitate the efficient administration of the licensing procedures, the Committee agrees to allow up to 4 gaming machines on licensed premises without the need for applications to be heard by the Committee.
Ref 2	The Committee does not consider that a definition of "vulnerable adult centre" should be included in the policy. This will allow the widest possible consideration of the matters in each and every individual circumstance.
Ref 13	The Committee agreed to the adoption of a Statement of Principles for the consideration of applications for the permits detailed in Appendix D, subject to the following amendment. The addition of a requirement that applicants will be expected to demonstrate that documented systems are in place for the training of staff in the procedures required to meet the licensing objectives in paragraph 1.1 of the policy.
Ref 14	The Committee supports the addition of the proposed wording to clarify the requirements for granting Casino licences.
Ref 15	The Committee agrees to delete the wording in order to clarify the requirements for the licensing of door supervisors by the Security Industry Authority.

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (1) Adopt the Statement of Gambling Policy for the purposes of Section 349 of the Gambling Act 2005, subject to the incorporation of appropriate wording giving effect to the observations (summarised above) of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee.**
- (2) Delegate to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee the power to set fees under Section 212 of the Gambling Act 2005.**
- (3) Delegate to the Head of Public Protection all necessary powers to deal with Small Society Lottery Registrations, to receive Temporary and Occasional Use Notices, to maintain the licensing public register and to enter and inspect premises (as detailed in Appendix C of the report submitted).**
- (4) Delegate to the Head of Public Protection all necessary powers to facilitate the Responsible Authority function as a Licensing Authority and as a Pollution / Environmental Health body.**
- (5) Delegate to the Director of City Development all necessary powers to facilitate the Responsible Authority function as a Local Planning Authority.**
- (6) Delegate to the Licensing and Regulatory Committee the power to authorise legal proceedings in respect of any offences under the Gambling Act 2005 where such authority is not already directly delegated to it by the Act.**

66. City-Wide Business Improvement District

Further to Minute 148/06 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a joint report of the Director of City Development and Director of Finance and ICT outlining CV One and the Coventry and Warwickshire Chamber's proposal for a City-Wide Business Improvement District (BID), following the successful implementation of the City Centre BID. The BID would affect approximately 2,000 businesses on business parks and estates across the City. These businesses would be balloted on whether they agreed to pay a levy on their Non Domestic Business Rate to finance a range of additional business related services.

The report identified those issues on which the City Council needed to make a decision, described those areas where the BID proposal affects City Council services and reviewed the financial and time scale implications of the BID.

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (1) Endorse the principle of the City Wide BID proposed by CV One and the Coventry and Warwickshire Chamber and welcomes its potential benefits whilst recognising that the costs of these services will be borne by a levy on the business community and that it was for the business community to decide through the BID ballot if these benefits were commensurate with their costs.**

- (2) Would nominate a director to the proposed City Wide BID Company at the meeting of Council on 16th January 2007.**
- (3) Note that the BID proposal had a potential impact on the Council's Emergency Services Unit and that negotiations with the BID proposers had achieved an agreement by which this impact was anticipated to be cost neutral or positive, as detailed in section 4.5 of the report.**
- (4) Note the opportunity that the BID and potential AWM funding presented for the development of the Council's ICT infrastructure strategy, as detailed in section 4.6 of the report, whilst acknowledging that further detailed negotiations between the BID proposers and the City Council would ensure that delivery standards, security and cost effectiveness were maintained.**
- (5) Endorse that, where the BID Company sought to develop investment promotion activities, these should be led by the City Council as detailed in section 4.7 of the report.**

67. Consultation on Social Services Efficiencies

Further to Minute 155/06, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Community Services, which detailed the outcome of a number of consultations which had taken place over the last month, since the announcement of a number of proposals to deliver efficiencies in the social care and housing budgets in order to secure resources for Learning Disability Services for this and next year. The report also addressed the concerns expressed by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee on 22nd November 2006.

On 23rd and 24th October 2006, trade unions, employees and service users who would be affected by the proposals were advised of the recommendations to the Cabinet and invited to make any comments.

The proposals had been discussed with the relevant Partnership Boards including twice at the Learning Disabilities Partnership Board. Whilst some concerns were expressed about specific proposals, most significantly those in relation to learning disability services, there was general recognition that overall the proposals support the strategic direction of working towards greater independence and furthermore that direct effect on front line services had been minimised.

Following the meeting of the Cabinet on 31st October 2006 three call-ins were received, which were considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee on 22nd November 2006. During a very lengthy discussion, during which the Committee also heard the views of service users, and a representative of MENCAP, members identified a number of concerns about the proposals in the report. These could be summarised as follows:

- (a) No assessment had been carried out of the likely impact of these

proposals on service users.

- (b) Clearer, more detailed information was needed about the financial implications for the current financial year and the possibility of including the proposals for consideration during the main PPR process.
- (c) The report should set out more fully the justification for taking away the current disregard payment.
- (d) Clarification was required on the current benefit rules in relation to disregard payments.

The report now submitted addressed all of these issues in detail, specifically in sections 4.2 to 4.4. In relation to those proposals that affected people with learning disabilities, comments had been received in relation to three areas of concern for service users and carers. First there had been some concern from the adults with learning disabilities and their carers about the end of the earning disregard payments, some concerns about the end of the meals services in day centres and to a lesser extent to the move of the Centre for Independent Living Day Care to the Wilfred Spencer Centre.

The proposal to cease the disregard for people with learning disabilities had attracted the most publicity and public comment. The Cabinet Member (Community Services), the Director of Community Services, the Head of Adults (twice) and the Service Head (on a number of occasions) met with staff, service users and carers at Curriers Close. Service users were obviously concerned that the Council proposes to take away their money. Some service users and carers accept that the Council need to get more people into work. Many people accept that only some of the service users at Curriers undertake consistent work related activity, with the rest of the users needing care related activities. Obviously those who undertake the work related tasks feel most aggrieved about losing the money. There were a further 10 e-mails from members of the public (including people who did not reside in Coventry) expressing concern about what they had read or seen in the media and a letter of explanation was sent to them.

The most common area of concern from both carers of and service users with learning disabilities was not the amount of money but the fact that being paid demonstrated a value to the person receiving the money even though in some cases the person receiving the money did not appreciate its value. There was no evidence of financial hardship given as a consequence of the loss of money. The more able people often earn less money than those who have care needs, as they are more likely to attend college or join in other activities away from the Centre during the week.

The outcome of the discussions at Curriers had led the Director of Community Services to confirm the position with regard to Curriers Close. Firstly, that there are a small number of people attending Curriers Close who ought to be put forward for a work related programme to enable them to find a permanent job outside Curriers. Secondly, those who can undertake consistent work should be supported to do this through the creation of social enterprises. Where these enterprises are established, service users should be able to take money from this work and the work should be priced in such a way that this can happen, without a subsidy from the Council. Thirdly, Curriers should

be redesigned to provide a dedicated area where those who have care needs can take part in appropriate activities away from the workshop environment. Each service user should have an assessment, which identifies which of these routes will be pursued for each person. The Director of Community Services would have discussions with the Centre Manager on the way in which those people who contribute to the packaging work can take an appropriate proportion of any profit made until the new social enterprises are established. No payment would be made to those who have care needs and are unable to contribute to the work undertaken in a meaningful way. Instead, the centre will focus on developing new programmes to meet their care needs.

The position of the trainees at CROW remains unchanged, as the Director of Community Services had identified that the organisation had sufficient resources from the profits on its work to make a payment at the current level to its 5 trainees. This meant that the Council would withdraw its part subsidy on the payments that are made.

The Director of Community Services continued to be concerned that the Council is not meeting its obligations to ensure that the care needs of a significant number of the people attending Curriers Close are being met. He believed that the payment of an earning disregard was a poor substitute for meeting people's needs properly. If the Director of Community Services wished to implement the Council's Fair Access to Care Policy then those who do not have care needs should be excluded from Curriers and the Centre should be closed. That is not what is being proposed. Instead the Director of Community Services is recommending, and had support for this from users and carers, that Curriers Day Centre be changed from within, first, by separating those who have care needs from those who can work and, secondly, developing proper care-related activities on the site.

Some concern had been expressed regarding proposals to cease the provision of subsidised meals at the mental health resource centre at Lamb Street. Staff specifically expressed concerns although some service users were able to think proactively of alternatives. It was noted that about 130 people attend Lamb Street in a week for a whole range of reasons and activities and on average only 20 meals a day are provided. Two carers rang senior managers to express concerns and were given an explanation and reassurance that people's individual needs would be supported. The Mental Health Fieldwork Manager had met with service users and the Head of Adults had met with staff at Lamb Street.

There were also twenty service users who received disregard payments as part of work based training. This is largely a historical arrangement and numbers had significantly reduced over time as Lamb Street had an increasing focus on rehabilitation by developing real employment and other opportunities to support people experiencing mental ill health to recover and maintain their independence. Should the disregard payments for people with learning disabilities be ceased and the model of social enterprise endorsed, then these arrangements will need to be reviewed. It is proposed that a report be submitted to the Cabinet Member (Community Services) in Spring 2007.

The Trade Unions had a number of meetings both to look at the overall proposals in detail and to discuss the details of each proposal. The Trade Unions had also complained about the time frame for consultation on such a detailed package. The

Director of Community Services had pointed out that he has allowed a longer period and more detailed discussion for consultation than on any previous occasion. The initial comment from the Unions was why had social services got to make cuts to fund their budgets and questioned why the Director had not asked for more resources from the Council. The Director of Community Services explained to them the Council's overall medium term financial plan and the current challenges within the setting of next year's budget. The Trade Unions were also concerned whether any of the proposed changes in Learning Disability Services would impact later through increased costs. They expressed concern at the transfer of significant sums of money from older people's services to learning disability services when they believed there needed to be further investment in older people's services, for example, in extra care housing to ensure that the Council is meeting people's care needs.

In relation to learning disabilities, the Trade Unions wanted assurance that the commissioning of new services, the development of employment opportunities and underlying financial planning were robust. They had received extensive information regarding this and had a meeting arranged with key staff on 29th November 2006 to go through this in detail. Similarly, assurance was required that an impact assessment on the transfer of the day service for people with learning disabilities with particular reference to health and safety issues at the Centre for Integrated Living to the Wilfred Spencer Centre had been completed.

Some concerns were expressed about the cessation of meals and the loss of the cooks' posts and the potential for that task to fall onto support assistants. It was confirmed that support staff in day services have the responsibility to support people at mealtimes and already undertake this task in those day services where subsidised meals are not provided.

Clarification was required regarding the changes proposed in older people's day care and intermediate care; specifically on what basis the decision to reduce intermediate care day care was made and why the savings in the "Efficiencies Report" had been identified to pre-empt the consultation on the day care. Why the dementia day care report had been produced ahead of the full day care review was also questioned. The Director's response is that the savings target had been set for the review because managers could see that the target would be met through a combination of the savings from the closure of the Magpie Centre and the combining of day care on a single site but the details of this were still subject to consultation to which the Unions are still able to contribute. Trade Unions were offered opportunities for further discussion.

There were also concerns expressed about a reduction of an Intermediate Care social work post though this had to be seen in the context of the overall relationships between Intermediate Care and the Assessment and Care Management Teams. It has now been agreed with the relevant Trade Union that any proposed reduction will be considered in relation to the overall social work establishment within Older People's Services.

There was general opposition from the Trade Unions to the 5% vacancy margin. They see this as putting pressure on their members and would rather see it expressed in terms of post deletions. The managers reiterated that regulated services

are excluded from this target and that managers would have responsibility to manage efficiencies in light of their own services, etc. It was agreed to monitor the situation and for the Trade Unions to report any areas where they considered the impact of this was adversely affecting a service.

Finally, it was affirmed that the Security of Employment arrangements would be in place for anybody affected by the job losses; including ring fencing arrangements, and that alternative work opportunities would be sought for everyone.

The Director of Community Services and the Cabinet Member (Community Services) have considered the comments made by representations. The first issue that they would want to be clear on is that they support the development of social enterprises in the City, which enable people with disabilities who may find mainstream employment difficult to get paid work. It is believed that the profits from their enterprise should be shared with the people who undertake the work. This should not require a subsidy from the council taxpayer. The media coverage from one such enterprise gave the false impression that the Council was refusing to make a payment. The accounts of this organisation have been seen and it is clear that they are making sufficient profit to make their current payments to their workforce without having to resort to public funds. The Council will develop its policy and activities accordingly.

An equality impact assessment of the policy on disregard payments had been undertaken. It was considered that the current policy of making payments to everyone who attended Curriers Enterprise is inequitable. There was no logical reason for making disregard payments to service users who have care needs and who have limited ability to contribute to the training and work programmes, otherwise payments should be made to everyone who attends day care in the City (a policy that was ended in the late 1990s).

For service users who contributed to the work activities there may be a stronger argument to make a payment if this was a temporary measure on a pathway to work. However, this had not been the case and people have remained in a workshop environment and not moved on into work. At Curriers, the income received from contracts for putting parts in boxes did not even cover the disregard payments made to service users. Curriers could never be a sustainable business because although market rates for the work undertaken at Curriers are charged, the length of time required by people with limited skills, together with the running costs of Curriers do not make it viable. However, it had provided a training platform to develop individuals' skills.

Curriers first opened in 1984 and payments of £1 per day were made and a monthly bus pass provided to people with learning disabilities who attended. At that time the criteria for attending Curriers was that people had to travel independently, hence the provision of a bus pass.

Other industrial workshops for people with learning disabilities at Stonebridge and Kingfield Road had been operating since the 1970s. A review was held in 1990 regarding closing all of the workshops. Family carers were opposed to the closures and although Stonebridge and Kingfield were closed in 1993/94, the workshop at Curriers Close was retained and re-launched in 1994 as Curriers Enterprises. People's

needs were re-assessed following the implementation of the 1990 NHS and Community Care Act, and the criteria for provision of a service at Curriers changed and social care transport began to be provided. Subsequently, less people have moved into work and the work-based training function had become increasingly blurred with addressing people's care and support needs.

The payment was stopped at Brandon Wood on 30th September 2005, when the activities at the farm were deemed to be training related. Curriers Enterprises is supposed to provide training for work in a work-based environment, though a small number of people have moved from Curriers to ordinary employment, the centre had developed more into a sheltered workshop where some people do some packaging work when it is available and others spend the day there with limited opportunities for meaningful activity.

A number of people with learning disabilities had told the Council that their aspiration was to work. Some people tell the Council that their carers would not let them work and then add that they are working at Curriers. Work-based training that never ends is not real work. All of this contributes to the institutional dependency that had been created. The Council's emphasis had to be on integrating people into their local communities and enabling people to find employment. Some people with learning disabilities can, and want, to do real jobs, and the Council needs to ensure that it supports people to find and remain in work. It must ensure that its supported employment service is linked into the real jobs sector, and to this end the Council is transferring this service to become part of the City Council's employment services within City Development.

As part of the development of Council policy to modernise the service at Curriers Enterprises it will ensure that there is clarity between people who are able to be prepared for work; people who may need to be supported in social enterprises and people who need services to meet their assessed care needs.

The proposals for closing the gap in learning disabilities services of £2,248,000 for 2007/2008 resulted from efficiencies from within the total net budget of housing and social care services. Future budgetary pressures within learning disabilities have been reported as part of the PPR process for 2008/2009 and beyond. The proposals were aimed at achieving efficiencies in 2007/2008 but where there are vacancies or unused funds, these have already been included in budgetary forecasts for 2006/2007.

An earnings disregard payment enabled a person to earn a certain amount each week, without it having an effect on their benefit. The current maximum disregard payment for disabled people was £20 per week and has been so for at least the past 7 years. For someone to receive a payment of this type, there were conditions that apply, namely that it falls under the requirements of the national minimum wage and the person can only work below 16 hours per week. People at Curriers were not being paid an earning disregard payment, but effectively an allowance for attendance of £3 per day that comes under miscellaneous income in terms of the benefits agency and was ignored in respect of claiming benefits. People with learning disabilities would typically be entitled to severe disablement allowance/incapacity benefit, income support and disability premium, disability living allowance – mobility and care. For example, a person 45 years of age living with their parents would receive benefits totalling £152.05

per week.

In respect of bringing together the day services from the Centre for Integrated Living and the Wilfred Spencer Centre on the Wilfred Spencer Centre site, an initial assessment was made to establish that this was feasible. Since that time, the Council had undertaken further work and were satisfied that, with some minor alterations (to include toileting, hoist, shower, changing facilities and improving access to cooking facilities), the total number of people from both sites could be accommodated. Managers of both services were aware of the range of needs of people with learning disabilities who currently attend these services and both staff groups were working together to ensure a smooth transition. This would be done in a planned and careful way because people with learning disabilities needed time to adapt to a new setting. Individual reviews will be undertaken to ensure people's needs were met appropriately.

The Cabinet, at its meeting on 12th December 2006 had agreed to:

- (1) Affirm that, having considered a variety of views over the past weeks on the proposals contained within the report, these comments had not led to alternative proposals being brought forward nor had they sufficiently challenged the basis on which the original proposals were brought forward.
- (2) Affirm the recommendations of the report of October 31st 2006 (attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted) to agree to the savings contained in that report and to ask employees to now move towards the implementation of these proposals.
- (3) Affirm its principled support to Social Enterprise and in particular for schemes that encourage or support the employment of people with disabilities; encourage these organisations to ensure that their profits are used to pay as reasonable a wage as is viable to the people working on the schemes; give a commitment to help to support any new organisations that want to develop in the City; and support the development of social enterprises from its own base in Curriers Close.

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Nellist, seconded by Councillor Ms McKay and lost:

To add to paragraph number (2) above "with the exception that the disregard allowance currently paid to any service user not to be withdrawn until such time as a full assessment of those service users' needs have been undertaken".

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:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillor Bains Councillor Batten	Councillor Adalat Councillor Arrowsmith	

Councillor Benefield	Councillor Asif
Councillor Mrs Bigham	Councillor Blundell
Councillor Chater	Councillor Charley
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Cliffe
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Crookes
Councillor Field	Councillor Mrs Dixon
Councillor Harrison	Councillor Foster
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Gazey
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Mrs Griffin
Councillor Lakha	Councillor Mrs Harper
Councillor Mrs Lancaster	Councillor Ms Hunter
Councillor Mrs Lucas	Councillor Mrs Johnson
Councillor Ms McKay	Councillor Kelsey
Councillor Maton	Councillor Lee
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Matchet
Councillor Mulhall	Councillor H Noonan
Councillor Mutton	Councillor M Noonan
Councillor Nellist	Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Patton	Councillor Miss Reece
Councillor Skipper	Councillor Ridge
Councillor Townshend	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Windsor	Councillor Sawdon
	Councillor Skinner
	Councillor Taylor
	Councillor Mrs Waters
	Councillor Williams
	Lord Mayor

Result: 24 for
 29 against
 0 abstention

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Nellist, seconded by Councillor Ms McKay and lost:

"Paragraph number (1) above, line 2, after "not" insert "yet". Line 3, after "they" insert "yet". Line 4 after "forward" add "but not withstanding that, in order to consider the post deletions in light of the wider PPR process, delay the implementation until April 2007", so that the paragraph reads:

- 2.1 Affirm that, having considered a variety of views over the past weeks on the proposals contained within the report, these comments had not yet led to alternative proposals being brought forward nor had they yet sufficiently challenged the basis on which the original proposals were brought forward but not withstanding that, in order to consider the post deletions in light of the wider PPR process, delay the implementation until April 2007.

During the debate on the above amendment, Councillor Taylor proposed a motion to proceed to a vote and, in accordance with paragraph 4.1.71 of the City

Council's Constitution, a recorded vote was required. The Councillors voting for and against the motion to proceed to a vote were as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillor Adalat	Councillor Bains	
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Batten	
Councillor Asif	Councillor Benefield	
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mrs Bigham	
Councillor Charley	Councillor Chater	
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor Clifford	
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Duggins	
Councillor Mrs Dixon	Councillor Field	
Councillor Foster	Councillor Harrison	
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Harvard	
Councillor Mrs Griffin	Councillor Kelly	
Councillor Mrs Harper	Councillor Lakha	
Councillor Ms Hunter	Councillor Mrs Lancaster	
Councillor Mrs Johnson	Councillor Mrs Lucas	
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Ms McKay	
Councillor Lee	Councillor Maton	
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 Townshend	
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Windsor	
Councillor Skinner		
Councillor Taylor		
Councillor Mrs Waters		
Councillor Williams		
Lord Mayor		

Result: 29 for
 24 against
 0 abstention

The motion being carried, the Council then proceeded to a vote on the amendment.

The vote on the amendment was taken and lost

Councillor Matchet then proposed that the "matter now be put" and in accordance with paragraph 4.1.71 of the City Council's Constitution, a recorded vote was required. The Councillors voting for and against the motion that the matter now be put were as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillor Adalat	Councillor Bains	
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Batten	
Councillor Asif	Councillor Benefield	
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mrs Bigham	
Councillor Charley	Councillor Chater	
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor Clifford	
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Duggins	
Councillor Mrs Dixon	Councillor Field	
Councillor Foster	Councillor Harrison	
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Harvard	
Councillor Mrs Griffin	Councillor Kelly	
Councillor Mrs Harper	Councillor Lakha	
Councillor Ms Hunter	Councillor Mrs Lancaster	
Councillor Mrs Johnson	Councillor Mrs Lucas	
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Ms McKay	
Councillor Lee	Councillor Maton	
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 Townshend	
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Windsor	
Councillor Skinner		
Councillor Taylor		
Councillor Mrs Waters		
Councillor Williams		
Lord Mayor		

Result: 29 for
 24 against
 0 abstention

The motion having being carried, the Council then proceeded to a vote on the substantive motion.

RESOLVED that the City Council endorse the actions indicated in 1 to 3 above.

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:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillor Adalat	Councillor Bains	
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Batten	

Councillor Asif	Councillor Benefield
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mrs Bigham
Councillor Charley	Councillor Chater
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor Clifford
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Duggins
Councillor Mrs Dixon	Councillor Field
Councillor Foster	Councillor Harrison
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Harvard
Councillor Mrs Griffin	Councillor Kelly
Councillor Mrs Harper	Councillor Lakha
Councillor Ms Hunter	Councillor Mrs Lancaster
Councillor Mrs Johnson	Councillor Mrs Lucas
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Ms McKay
Councillor Lee	Councillor Maton
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 Townshend
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Windsor
Councillor Skinner	
Councillor Taylor	
Councillor Mrs Waters	
Councillor Williams	
Lord Mayor	

Result: 29 for
 24 against
 0 abstention

68. Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report to the City Council 2005/2006

The City Council considered the Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report to the City Council, which gave details of the work of the Scrutiny Boards and the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee during 2005/06, set out evaluation of their performance and outlined future developments. This was the fourth annual report by the Council's Scrutiny Boards and set out factual information about the Scrutiny Boards and their work and other information relating to the scrutiny function as well as providing an analysis of the performance of Scrutiny.

RESOLVED that the City Council note and endorse the Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report for 2005/06.

69. Appointment to Outside Bodies – Coventry Citizens Advice Bureau Management Committee

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services asking the Council to appoint an elected member to the place allocated to the

City Council on the Coventry Citizens Advice Bureau Management Committee for the three-year period to December 2009.

RESOLVED that Councillor Mrs Griffin be nominated to the place allocated to the City Council on the Management Board of the Coventry Citizens Advice Bureau for the three-year period to December 2009.

70. Review of Political Balance of the Council and Changes to the Membership of Committees

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services which requested Council to agree the revised political balance of the Council following a change to the membership of the Conservative Political Group on the Council and to approve changes in the membership of various committees requested by the Conservative Group.

RESOLVED that:

- (1) The revised political balance of the Council as shown in Appendix 1 of the report submitted be approved.**
- (2) Councillor Williams replace Councillor M Noonan on the Licensing and Regulatory Committee.**
- (3) Councillor Kelsey replace Councillor Williams on the Planning Committee.**
- (4) Councillor Ms Hunter replace Councillor Mrs Harper on Scrutiny Board 4**
- (5) The place on the Licensing and Regulatory Committee formerly allocated to the Independent member be allocated to the Conservative Group and that Councillor Ms Hunter take that seat.**

71. Debate – Job Losses at the Royal Mail

Councillor Mutton moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Duggins:

"This Council is concerned at the number of jobs that are disappearing from this City, usually by multi-national organisations.

To try to curtail job losses from the Royal Mail sorting office in Bishop Street, this Council agrees to identify a suitable piece of land and then enter into discussions with Royal Mail to try to keep the jobs in Coventry."

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Arrowsmith, seconded by Councillor Taylor and carried, giving rise to the following substantive motion:

"This Council is concerned at the number of jobs that are disappearing from this City, usually be multi-national organisations.

To try to curtail job losses from Royal Mail, this Council agrees to identify suitable sites and enter into discussion with Royal Mail to try to keep the jobs in Coventry."

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

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:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillor Adalat	Councillor Bains	
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Batten	
Councillor Asif	Councillor Benefield	
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mrs Bigham	
Councillor Charley	Councillor Chater	
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor Clifford	
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Duggins	
Councillor Mrs Dixon	Councillor Field	
Councillor Foster	Councillor Harrison	
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Harvard	
Councillor Mrs Griffin	Councillor Kelly	
Councillor Mrs Harper	Councillor Lakha	
Councillor Ms Hunter	Councillor Mrs Lancaster	
Councillor Mrs Johnson	Councillor Mrs Lucas	
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Ms McKay	
Councillor Lee	Councillor Maton	
Councillor H Noonan	Councillor McNicholas	
Councillor O'Neill	Councillor Mulhall	
Councillor Miss Reece	Councillor Mutton	
Councillor Ridge	Councillor Nellist	
Councillor Ridley	Councillor Patton	
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Skipper	
Councillor Skinner	Councillor Townshend	
Councillor Taylor	Councillor Windsor	
Councillor Mrs Waters		
Councillor Williams		
Lord Mayor		

Result: 27 for
 24 against
 0 abstention

72. **Debate – Building Schools for the Future**

Councillor Blundell moved the following motion, which was seconded by Councillor Lee:

'This Council supports Coventry's application to the Building Schools for the Future Programme, and while acknowledging the significant issues, including possible funding gaps, which will need to be addressed, believes that it is a key opportunity to secure a transformation for schools and the wider community in the City.'

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Nellist, seconded by Councillor Ms McKay and lost:

Delete "after Council" and insert: "believes that substantial investment is needed in modernisation and improvement of the City's school buildings, but believes that the 'Building Schools for the Future' programme carries significant problems, including an estimated £90m funding gap, and also opens the door with the 'Local Educational Partnership', to far wider and deeper privatisation initially in education but potentially in other Council services".

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Field, seconded by Councillor Benefield and lost:

Add new paragraph "No academies are going to be included in this scheme"

RESOLVED that the main debate, as set out above, be adopted.

(NOTE: The meeting closed at 11.30 p.m.)