

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

24th February, 2009

PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Matchet)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Harrison)

Councillor Adalat	Councillor Lancaster
Councillor Andrews	Councillor Lapsa
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Lee
Councillor Asif	Councillor Mrs. Lucas
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Maton
Councillor Bailey	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Bains	Councillor J Mutton
Councillor Mrs Bigham	Councillor Mrs Mutton
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Nellist
Councillor Charley	Councillor Noonan
Councillor Chater	Councillor O'Boyle
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor O'Neill
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Miss Reece
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Ridge
Councillor Mrs Dixon	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Ruane
Councillor Field	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Foster	Councillor Skinner
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Smith
Councillor Mrs Johnson	Councillor Sweet
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Khan	Councillor Mrs. Waters
Councillor Lakha	Councillor Williams
	Councillor Windsor

101. **Apology**

An apology was received from Councillor McNicholas. Councillor Taylor informed Members that Councillor McNicholas was in hospital and it was agreed that the Lord Mayor would send a letter on behalf of the Council expressing their best wishes for a speedy recovery.

102. **Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13th January 2009, were signed as a true record.

103. **Phil Robinson**

The Lord Mayor referred to the death of former Councillor Phil Robinson at the end of January, 2009.

Phil was first elected on to the Council in 1964 representing Westwood Ward and served for 32 years. Phil had been Lord Mayor between 1981 and 1982.

Members noted that a letter had been sent to Phil's family expressing the Council's sincere condolences.

104. **Jack Sprung**

The Lord Mayor referred to the death of former Councillor Jack Sprung in January, 2009.

Jack represented Longford Ward for a decade from 1959 and later became General Secretary of the British Pensioners and Trade Union Action Association.

Members noted that a letter had been sent to Jack's family expressing the Council's sincere condolences.

105. **Petitions**

RESOLVED:-

(1) That, in accordance with paragraph 4.9.2.3.5 of the constitution, the following petition be considered as part of the debate on "Improving Services to Vulnerable Children, Young People and Families" (Minute 109/08 below refers):-

(a) Scrapping of Childrens' Clubs- 3677 signatures, presented by Councillor Kelly

(2) That the following petitions be referred to the appropriate City Council bodies:-

(b) Request For Double Yellow Lines at Winsford Avenue – 14 signatures, presented by Councillor Bailey

(c) Opposition to the Granting of a Licence to a local retail business– 693 signatures, presented by Councillor Asif

106. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

107. Motion to Combine Agenda Items

It was moved by Councillor Taylor, seconded by Councillor Foster and carried that, in accordance with paragraph 4.1.35.5 of the Constitution, the following agenda items be combined:

- 6.1.1 Improving Services to Vulnerable Children, Young People and Families
- 6.1.2 Proposed Changes to Car Park Charges
- 6.1.4 Revenue and Capital Budget 2009/10
- 6.1.5 Council Tax Report 2009/10

108. Motion to Suspend Council Procedure Rules

It was moved by the Lord Mayor, duly seconded and carried to suspend procedural rules 4.1.35.7 and 4.1.58 for the duration of the debate on the following combined items, with each member being permitted to speak for five minutes:

- 6.1.1 Improving Services to Vulnerable Children, Young People and Families
- 6.1.2 Proposed Changes to Car Park Charges
- 6.1.4 Revenue and Capital Budget 2009/10
- 6.1.5 Council Tax Report 2009/10

109. Improving Services for Vulnerable Children, Young People and their Families

Further to Minute 176/08 of Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Director of Children, Learning and Young People, which sought approval of outline proposals for the development of new multi-disciplinary teams to provide targeted help and support to families and children. In addition, the Council also considered a petition submitted by Councillor Kelly, a Henley Ward Councillor, bearing 3677 signatures, objecting to the closure of the Children's Clubs and she spoke on behalf of the petitioners (Minute 105 above refers).

The report indicated that 'Every Child Matters' emphasised the importance of early intervention and prevention. Integrated working helps to identify vulnerable children with additional needs who may require early intervention. This intervention could prevent difficulties becoming more entrenched, which may lead to incidents of abuse and neglect. There was an

emphasis on early identification to predict children who may require services at the onset of difficulties. In Coventry there was an existing gap in the provision of family support for children who have additional needs which will be addressed through the development of new teams working closely together to support some of the city's most vulnerable children and their families.

The Council and its partners were already successfully using many of the key tools of integrated working, including the Common Assessment Framework (CAF), a standardised assessment tool available for use nationally for all children's workers to help them understand the particular needs that a child may have. This was widely used in Coventry and informed the support that should be offered to a child and its family. Once a CAF had been completed a family support meeting was arranged where professionals from different agencies, the parents and the child came together to plan the services and support that can help. At the end of the family support meeting one professional was identified to act as Lead Professional to co-ordinate the multi-agency working and ensure that the plan was reviewed and updated as required. The parents and child were key to this whole process and any work that was undertaken was with their full support and involvement.

The natural progression of this work was to develop more integrated structures for service delivery at the front line. Multi-disciplinary teams were nationally recognised as good practice in delivering these interventions. Establishing multi-disciplinary teams would require redirection of existing resources and development of an ethos and protocol for working across the city. The resources that could contribute towards this agenda were the two existing Behaviour and Education Support Teams (BESTs) and the children's work resources within the Children and Families Education Service (CAFES).

The report proposed that the resources from the existing BEST (Behaviour Educational and Support Teams) and resources from core budgets funding children's work should be used to develop multi-disciplinary teams (MDTs) within Neighbourhood Services, which would engage in work involving practitioners within universal services such as schools. There were separate proposals contained within the budget report for 2009/10 for savings of £300K from the core City Council funding of the Child and Family Education Service. The impact of these savings was not covered by the report but within the 2009/10 budget report, which was to be considered later at the meeting.

At the Cabinet meeting it had been noted that there had been extensive discussion with stakeholders on the proposal to develop multi-disciplinary teams and on the general strategic approach of strengthening multi-disciplinary early intervention services in the City. This consultation has particularly - but not exclusively - focused on schools. Consultation with service users of the CAFES service had not taken place, as the proposal was to end the service and as the

alternative was not a comparable service it was very difficult to frame a consultation question that would have been helpful.

It was further noted that Scrutiny Board 2 had expressed concern that stakeholders, service users and parents had not been consulted on the proposals and had not been informed about future service provision. The concerns of Scrutiny Board 2 could be met by ensuring, as part of the implementation of the proposals contained in the report submitted, that users of the current service be informed about alternative provision. There was confidence that provision could be found or developed through the extended schools programme for the great majority of children currently receiving services.

To develop these teams the existing Children and Families Education Service would need to be replaced by a new Child and Family Support Function. This would encompass elements of the old service such as Family Learning, the Eagle Street and Edgwick Play Centres and externally grant funded projects as well as the newly formed MDTs. The focus of the new service would be on family support interventions rather than community education which would seek to reduce incidents of abuse and neglect and intervene earlier to address problems such as poor school attendance, behaviour problems and threat of family breakdown. This change in focus would require changes to the ethos of the service, staffing structure and job descriptions of the children's workers within the Children and Families Education Service. The report submitted also outlined other changes required, which included the closure of all children's clubs currently run by the service and stopping the universal delivery of working together programmes in schools. Substantial remodelling of the current workforce to reflect the revised requirements of delivering the new service would also be required.

The report also indicated that, to ensure effective use of resources, there was a need for most of the core funded CAFES resources to be refocused to where there were gaps in services, unmet needs and to meet the needs of children and families at risk of developing serious and substantial difficulties and thus prevent abuse, neglect, anti-social behaviour and criminal activity.

At their meeting, Cabinet had noted that the proposals regarding changes in job roles, terms and conditions would be subject of formal consultation with staff and Trade Unions.

In addition, the Cabinet Member (Children, Learning and Young People) had made it clear that this report would also be considered at this Council meeting as part of the budget-setting process. He had also indicated that the report had been considered by Scrutiny Board (2) and that their concerns had been addressed in paragraph 4.5 of the report submitted.

It was noted that Cabinet had decided:

- (a) To confirm that this report would also be considered at this meeting of full Council as part of the budget-setting process.
- (b) To note that the report had been considered by Scrutiny Board (2) and that their concerns had been addressed in paragraph 4.5 of the report submitted

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (1) Approve the proposals outlined in sections 4.1, 4.4 and 4.9 of the report to be taken forward to establish multi-disciplinary teams using existing resources from Behaviour Education Support Teams and the Children and Families Education Service.**
- (2) Request the employees to develop detailed proposals for the staffing of the new service for formal consultation with staff and trade unions prior to implementation.**
- (3) Following the consultation, delegate authority to the Director of Children, Learning and Young People, in consultation with the Cabinet Member (Children, Learning and Young People), to decide on the final structure of the service and its implementation.**

110. Proposed Car Park Changes

Further to Minute 177/08 of Cabinet, the Council considered a joint report of the Director of City Development and the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which sought approval for revised car park charges to be implemented from 1 April 2009.

At their meeting, Cabinet had noted that there were currently 7,146 car park spaces available for public use in the city centre. 3,903 spaces were located within Council owned car parks and a further 3,243 through private sector car parks. It was further noted that the Council operated suburban car parks in Far Gosford Street, Clay Lane, Lincoln Street and Warwick Street.

As part of the Council's car park strategy, the usage of city centre car parks had been analysed and proposals developed to ensure that charges for car parking represent good value for money; provide enough spaces for drivers wanting to visit the city centre; encourage drivers to use car parks with available spaces and discourage them from queuing for car parking spaces; encourage shoppers to continue using the city centre, particularly during a difficult time for the retail sector, by limiting price rises and encouraging drivers wanting to park

all day to use long stay car parks on the edge of the city centre; and encourage the use of public transport, particularly following the significant investment in the 'PrimeLines' bus transport scheme

The report indicated that charges for Council car parks had not risen for nearly two years, and some tariffs on Council city centre car parks had not been changed for four years. However the Council was facing a significant financial challenge this year in setting its annual budget, and in order to protect frontline services, needed to ensure that it was generating income effectively. The additional gross income generation required from increases in car park charges in order to support this year's budget proposals was £450k plus inflation of £400k, £850k in total.

In order to achieve this, a number of increases in charges were proposed. However, indiscriminate percentage increases in all city centre car parks was not proposed. Current demand had been carefully considered alongside the importance of providing the right service to all users of the city centre, in order to ensure financial targets were met while not discouraging people from visiting the city centre.

It was proposed to incorporate future proposed changes to the car park budget into the annual budget setting process and to delegate responsibility for implementing the cabinet budget decision to the Cabinet Member (City Development) to determine tariffs and any changes to the car parking structure.

A summary of all the proposed changes in car park tariffs was provided in Appendix 1 of the report submitted.

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (1) Approve, with effect from 1 April 2009, the implementation of the charging structure outlined in the report submitted.**
- (2) Agree to incorporate future proposed changes to the car park budget into the annual budget-setting process and to delegate responsibility to the Cabinet Member (City Development) to approve the implementation of the budget so as to determine tariffs and any changes to the car park structure.**

111. Revenue and Capital Budget 2009/10

Further to Minute 179/08 of Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Management Board (a) seeking approval for the 2009/10 revenue budget proposals, Capital Programme and Treasury Management Strategy, and (b)

informing members of the Government's final Formula Grant allocation for the Council for 2009/10 and of the implications for future years' financial plans.

At their meeting Cabinet had noted that the Council had adopted its current Corporate Plan in September 2008, and a revised Medium Term Financial Strategy in January 2009. These documents, together with the ten Cabinet Member Strategic Plans that were reviewed and adopted in September 2008, provided the context for the 2009/10 budget. The current world financial and economic climates made the budget round for 2009/10 a particularly difficult one for the City Council and for all local authorities.

The report set out the City Council's vision for the City and indicated that there were also a number of management objectives that aimed to improve performance, efficiency and effectiveness. These management objectives set out the key things that the Council needed to achieve to ensure that it was an effective and efficient organisation that delivers services that meet the needs of local people and gives real value for money. The objectives were set out in the report under the headings of money; improving the way we work; and people.

The Council continued to make good progress against its priorities, reinforcing the progress previously recognised by the Audit Commission in awarding Coventry three stars and improving well status under the Comprehensive Performance Assessment framework in February 2009.

It was noted that this year, like other organisations, the Council was preparing plans and allocating resources within the context of the developing UK and international recession. Coventry's relatively diverse local economy was holding up comparatively well but levels of unemployment in the City had begun to rise and it was expected that Coventry, like the rest of the country, to be increasingly affected by the recession in the coming financial year and this had implications for the delivery of Council services and the budget setting process.

The Pre-Budget Report to Cabinet in December 2008 underlined the importance of planning for and investing in the future of the City to be ready to benefit from the economic upturn when it comes. To help achieve this, the Council was in the process of developing major schemes that would have a significant impact on the future of Coventry and on the Council's resource allocation for the foreseeable future. It was important to recognise that these developments – Building Schools For the Future, the Waste Strategy (including Project Transform, which was looking to fund a new disposal facility), the Highways and Lighting PFI project and the redevelopment of the city centre – would influence significantly the shape of forthcoming revenue and capital budgets.

The City Council was committed to actively promoting equality so that people from different backgrounds have similar life opportunities. In line with this,

Coventry's Sustainable Communities Strategy was clear in its aims to promote better equality of opportunity and to ensure that all Coventry people should enjoy its outcomes regardless of age, gender, faith, ethnicity, sexual orientation, physical or learning disability, community, neighbourhood or background. In order to achieve this, it was important that the Council take account of how changes in its services and policies impact on people. The Council undertake equality impact assessments to help it analyse whether such changes would have an adverse impact on equality of opportunity or access to services and how any adverse impact could be addressed. The potential impact of the financial proposals in the report was being assessed and would inform the implementation of the budget decisions.

Like other local authorities Coventry was facing a range of other pressures that were essentially externally driven and over which it had little or no control. These included future real-terms reductions in resources being made available through the Comprehensive Spending Review, demographic pressures in social care for adults and older people and services for children, increasing costs of waste disposal and recycling, the effects of Equal Pay legislation and increasing costs of pensions.

The Council's budget was set in the context of the Corporate Plan and the budget setting process was aligned with the Council's performance management framework. This had included aligning the formal consideration of the Council's half-year performance in delivering the Corporate Plan and Cabinet Member Strategic Plans alongside the initial budget proposals and within the context of the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The Council's Corporate Plan was aligned with the Sustainable Communities Strategy and the mechanisms for carrying it out.

The Medium Term Financial Strategy ensured that the Council's financial plans supported the delivery of the objectives laid out in the Corporate Plan whilst setting a sound financial planning framework to underpin the effective financial management of the Council. Inevitably, in aiming for a robust medium term position, the Council's budget needed to reconcile corporate spending priorities, available resources including agreed council tax increases and the availability of reserves. Importantly, the Council has needed to take into account the spending pressure being faced by all local authorities arising from national issues in delivering a sustainable balanced budget in the medium term through the achievement of efficiency and value for money savings.

The current economic downturn and the increasingly tight financial settlements from Central Government have inevitably limited the degree to which the Council were able to invest beyond current policy boundaries with some notable exceptions, for example the expansion of its kerbside collection service. Given the relatively low level of reserves available to the City Council compared with previous years, the option of using reserves to support the bottom line has

not been available for it to use to a significant degree this year. The Council have used the flexibility afforded it from the Area Based Grant (introduced in 2008/09) to re-allocate resources within its bottom line.

In the medium term a number of capital expenditure developments were anticipated that together would represent some of the most significant proposals to have taken place in the City for many years. These developments were being incorporated within the medium term planning projections in so far as the Council were able to predict their anticipated financial impacts. The budget report is creating the sound financial footing that would be essential to ensure that these projects could be delivered successfully over the coming years.

An extensive round of public consultation process was led by the Deputy Leader of the Council and supported by senior Council staff. This consultation focused on the Council's strategic priorities and direction, current performance and the budget proposals set out in the December 2008 Cabinet report (Minute 129/08 refers). The consultees included the Council's Trade Unions; Coventry Youth Council; the business community through the Coventry and Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce; community and voluntary sector organisations; and a range of individual partner organisations. A summary of the responses received in respect of the public consultation was attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted.

The responses arising from the consultation process were considered when producing the final budget proposals and changes made after the consultation process were included within Appendix 4 of the report submitted. In addition, the wider consultation responses would be used to inform future policy-making decisions, including the review of the Corporate Plan in June 2009.

The agenda facing the Council especially in the current economic climate continued to be challenging. The aim of the proposals in the budget report was to continue to move towards having well managed resources based on key strategies and investment decisions so the Council can best meet the needs of the people of Coventry.

The budget proposals would enable the Council to sustain a good level of service delivery. The budget would also allow the Council to respond to the needs of residents and commence new initiatives, improving both the infrastructure of the City and the way it delivers services to the public. Also, as part of the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy, the budget sets the framework that supports the ongoing delivery of the Council's corporate objectives.

The Budget Requirement was funded from a combination of Council Tax resources and Formula Grant from central government. The Council Tax resources combined the tax revenue from 2009/10 plus the Council Tax

estimated surplus or deficit at the end of 2008/09. The 'Formula Grant' was made up of two elements, these being the Revenue Support Grant and the redistributed Business Rates.

The Government published the 2007 Comprehensive Spending Review on 8th October 2007. In this document, they set out their spending plans for the three-year period 2008/09, 2009/10 and 2010/11. Subsequent Government announcements in November 2008 and January 2009 confirmed the level of Formula Grant allocated to individual authorities for the next two years and given indicative information for what might happen in 2011/12. Recent turbulence in international and national economic circumstances clearly makes the prediction of future financial settlements very difficult. The figures in the report use the most up to date government information available regarding future years. The final figures for 2010/11 and 2011/12 will be announced in January 2010 and January 2011 respectively.

The level of Formula Grant that an authority received was dependent on its spending needs relative to other authorities, as determined by the Government. It also took into account each authority's Tax Base, which reflected the amount of money it could raise through Council Tax.

The Government confirmed the 2009/10 figures in the Final Settlement at £149,400,000. The amounts for 2010/11 and 2011/12 were still provisional at £153,000,000 and £155,800,000, respectively.

After taking into account the Government's measure of inflation (the Gross Domestic Product deflator – 1.5%), Coventry's 2009/10 Formula Grant increase of 2.8% became a real terms grant increase of 1.3%. The increase had been significantly limited by the "damping" that was built into the allocation methodology (a financial mechanism to pay for protection for those authorities which have benefited least well from the settlement). Coventry has lost £4.3m as a result of damping in the 2009/10 settlement.

The General Fund budget recommended within the report submitted reflected the final settlement; the Council's Priorities; and the approach outlined in the Medium Term Financial Strategy. The budget recommendation also included an increase in Council Tax of 3.8 per cent. The Pre-Budget report in December 2008 indicated a budget deficit position of £0.9m. The principal movements that had happened since then, including the actions identified to balance the budget were identified within the report.

Table 4 provided a summary of the General Fund Revenue Budget. This information was shown in greater detail in Appendix 2, which set out the Cabinet Portfolio revenue budgets and sources of revenue funding. The savings proposals requiring decisions within the report were outlined in detail in Appendix 4.

As in previous years, all expenditure shown in the Budget Requirement was net of direct grants received (primarily from Central Government); and fees and charges. The 2009/10 budget at £261.9m compared with the 2008/09 budget of £257.7m, showed an increase of £4.2m or 1.6%. The budget requirement increase was broadly in line with the Formula Grant increase of £4.1m.

A range of savings and pressures had been identified in the pre-budget report to Cabinet in December 2008. Since the pre-budget report, the Management Board had been working to balance the revenue budget and capital programme for 2009/10 onwards, and the outcome of that work was included in the report submitted. Spending and saving proposals that had changed since December 2008, were indicated in the text of Appendix 4.

Overall, the recommended budget for the General Fund included £4.5m of spending pressures that were viewed as being unavoidable or which reflect the additional cost of existing policies. These were listed in Appendix 5.

Budget proposals therefore focussed on protecting services valued by Coventry tax payers and deliver a realistic balance between service delivery and keeping rises in Council Tax levels as low as possible for residents.

The report indicated that a value for money approach had been adopted for the year's budget to avoid, where possible, cuts in frontline services. These proposals included streamlining some services and delivering efficiencies in others. Around 190 posts would be deleted if these proposals were adopted.

In order to finance the additional revenue funding required to deliver the Council's corporate objectives and balance the overall revenue budget, it was necessary to make savings and to reduce the level of some Council services. The budget proposals identify savings and alternative sources of funding amounting to £9.5m. Where posts were to be deleted as a result of these proposals, not all losses of posts would lead to losses of individual employees given the Council's redeployment policy and the fact that some posts were vacant.

The report submitted also included details of the proposed capital programme of £73.9m. Full details of the proposed programme were included at Appendix 9 of the report. It was noted that the proposed capital programme included £37m for Children, Learning and Young People's services, the majority of which was to be invested in schools across the City and £9m on the City's highways programme involving the Local Transport Plan; completion of works in the Burges and Ironmonger Row and works to fulfil health and safety responsibilities in relation to safety barriers and street lights. Capital spending was also proposed in relation to the Wide Area Network, Urban Traffic

Management Control and PrimeLines projects. The report indicated that the main sources of funding for capital expenditure came from supported borrowing, unsupported (prudential) borrowing, capital receipts, capital grants from external parties, revenue funding (including reserves) and leasing.

In relation to the 2009/10 supported borrowing and grant allocations, the Government departments had set borrowing allocations based on plans submitted by councils. Notwithstanding these allocations, authorities were free to spend them on whatever capital purposes they determined. The Government had provided revenue support for borrowing through the 2008/09 Formula Grant and also provided grant funding for certain sectors.

Members had received regular updates on the recent economic conditions and their affect on the delay in achieving previously anticipated receipt levels. This had reduced the overall level of resource available for recent, current and future financial years and had led to a significantly lower level of programme than would otherwise have been possible. Forecast receipts would be used to fund the proposed future Capital Programme. In view of the recent deceleration of receipts the Council would continue to monitor closely the achievement of these projected levels and the ability to generate further receipts in the future.

The report also provided detailed information in respect of other budgets; the Council Tax and the Impact on Future Years; Fees, Charges and Grants; Budget Risks; the Robustness of the Budget; Adequacy of Reserves; Treasury Management; the Prudential Code; and Leasing.

In response to a question from Councillor Chater regarding a post at the Clothing Resource Centre funded by LEGI, Councillor Ridley (Cabinet Member (City Development)) indicated that he would provide clarification in a written response.

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (1) Determine that its budget requirement calculated for the financial year 2009/10 in accordance with the requirements of Section 32 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 be £261,920,573 as outlined in Paragraph 5.1, Table 1 of the report submitted, it being noted that this incorporates a Council Tax rise for the City Council of 3.8%.**
- (2) Note the implications of the budget for the 2010/11 and 2011/12 financial years in Section 8 of the report and to instruct the Management Board to implement the strategy outlined to deliver a fully balanced budget in the medium term.**

- (3) Approve the savings and expenditure proposals in Appendices 4 and 5 and the fees and charges proposals referenced in Section 9 of the report.**
- (4) Note the comments of the Director of Finance and Legal Services confirming the robustness of the budget and adequacy of reserves in Sections 12 and 13 of the report.**
- (5) Approve the Capital Programme of £73.9m for 2009/10 and the future years' commitments arising from this programme of £117m in 2010/11 to 2013/14 (Section 10 and Appendix 9 of the report).**
- (6) Authorise the Head of Housing Policy and Services to vire between the elements of the Housing Capital Programme in line with previous years to achieve spend during the year (Paragraph 10.17 of the report).**
- (7) Note the risks facing the City Council as outlined in Section 11 of the report, which risks, given the world economic climate and the financial pressure facing the UK public sector, are considerably greater than in recent years.**
- (8) Approve the proposed Treasury Management Strategy for 2009/10 (Section 14), and the revised investment policy (Appendix 10), and adopt the prudential indicators and limits described in Section 15 and summarised in Appendix 11 of the report submitted.**

112. Council Tax Report 2009/10

Further to Minute 180/08 of Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services calculating the council tax level for 2009/10 that results from the Collection Fund revenue estimates for the year, making appropriate recommendations to the full City Council, and also assessing the wider impact of the tax on the City.

The figures presented in the report represented a Council Tax increase, from 2008/09 figures, of 3.80% for the City's Council Tax and 3.74% overall (i.e. including the effect of the precepts from the Police and Fire Authorities).

It was noted that the recommendations follow the structure of resolutions drawn up by the local authority associations, to ensure that legal requirements were fully adhered to in setting the tax. As a consequence, the wording of the proposed resolutions was necessarily complex.

RESOLVED that the City Council:

(1) Note that at their meeting on 27th January 2009 the Council's Cabinet approved the following amounts as its Council Tax base for the year 2009/10 in accordance with Regulations made under Section 33(5) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

a) 88,623.8 being the amount calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 3 of the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 1992, as its Council Tax base for the year;

b)

Allesley	407.8
Keresley	213.7

being the amounts calculated by the Council, in accordance with Regulation 6 of the regulations, as the amounts of its Council Tax Base for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate.

(2) That the following amounts be now calculated by the Council for the year 2009/10 in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992:

a) £ 736,656,573 being the aggregate of the amounts that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(2)(a) to (e) of the Act, other than any expenditure estimated to be incurred which will be charged to a Business Improvement District (BID) revenue account as set out in section 43(2)(a) of the Local Government Act 2003. (*Gross Expenditure including the amount required for the working balance*);

b) £ 474,736,000 being the aggregate of the amounts that the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 32(3)(a) to (c) of the Act, other than any income estimated to be received which will be credited to a BID revenue account as set out in section 43(2)(b) or (c) of the Local Government Act 2003. (*Gross Income including reserves to be used to meet the Gross Expenditure*);

c) £ 261,920,573 being the amount by which the aggregate at 2(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 2(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 32(4) of the Act, as its budget requirement for the year;

d) £ 147,345,583 being the aggregate of the sums which the Council estimates will be payable for the year into its general fund in respect of Formula Grant (the sum of Revenue Support Grant and National Non Domestic Rates) [£149,445,929] and the amount of the sums which the Council estimates will be transferred in the year from its Collection Fund to its General Fund in accordance with the Act as amended by the 1994 Regulations (Council Tax Deficit) [-£2,100,346] and pursuant to the Collection Fund (Community Charge) directions under Section 98(4) of the Local Government Finance Act 1988 (Community Charge Surplus) [£0].

$$\text{e) } \pounds 1,292.82 \quad \frac{2(c) - 2(d)}{1(a)} \quad = \frac{261,920,573 - 147,345,583}{88,623.8}$$

being the amount at 2(c) above, less the amount at 2(d) above, all divided by the amount at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 33(1) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year. (*Average Council Tax at Band D for the City including Parish Precepts*).

f) £ 4,800 being the aggregate amount of all special items referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act. (*Parish Precepts*);

$$\text{g) } \pounds 1,292.77 \quad = \quad \frac{2(e) - 2(f)}{1(a)} \quad = \quad 1,292.82 - \frac{4,800}{88,623.8}$$

being the amount at 2(e) above, less the result given by dividing the amount at 2(f) above by the amounts at 1(a) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of the area to which no special item relates. (*Council Tax at Band D for the City excluding Parish Precepts*);

h)

Coventry Unparished Area	1,292.77
Allesley	1,300.86
Keresley	1,299.79

being the amounts given by adding to the amount at 2(g) above, the amounts of the special item or items relating to dwellings in those parts of the Council's area mentioned above divided in each case by the amount at 1(b) above, calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(3) of the Act, as the basic amounts of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which one or more special items relate. (*Council Taxes at Band D for the City and Parish*).

i)

Valuation Band	Parts to which no special item relates £	Parish of Allesley £	Parish of Keresley £
A	861.85	867.24	866.53
B	1005.49	1011.78	1010.95
C	1149.13	1156.32	1155.37
D	1292.77	1300.86	1299.79
E	1580.05	1589.94	1588.63
F	1867.33	1879.02	1877.47
G	2154.62	2168.10	2166.32
H	2585.54	2601.72	2599.58

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

(3) That it be noted that for the year 2009/10 the West Midlands Police Authority and West Midlands Fire Authority have stated the following amounts in precepts issued to the Council, in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, for each of the categories of dwelling shown below:

Valuation Band	West Midlands Police Authority £	West Midlands Fire Authority £
A	65.32	31.27

B	76.20	36.48
C	87.09	41.69
D	97.98	46.90
E	119.75	57.32
F	141.52	67.74
G	163.30	78.17
H	195.96	93.80

- (4) That having calculated the aggregate in each case of the amounts at 2(i) and 3 above, the Council, in accordance with Section 30(2) of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the following amounts as the amounts of Council Tax for the year 2009/10 for each of the categories of dwellings shown below:

Valuation Band	Parts to which no special item relates	Parish of Allesley	Parish of Keresley
	£	£	£
A	958.44	963.83	963.12
B	1118.17	1124.46	1123.63
C	1277.91	1285.10	1284.15
D	1437.65	1445.74	1444.67
E	1757.12	1767.01	1765.70
F	2076.59	2088.28	2086.73
G	2396.09	2409.57	2407.79
H	2875.30	2891.48	2889.34

113. **Municipal Waste Strategy for Coventry – Formal Adoption and Results of Public Consultation**

Further to Minute 178/08 of Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Director of City Services which, following a twelve-week period of public consultation (the results of which were detailed in section 7 of the report), sought approval of Coventry's Municipal Waste Strategy (2008-2020).

At their meeting, Cabinet had acknowledged that Sustainable Waste Management was a priority for the City Council and was an integral part of the Sustainable Community Strategy.

The report submitted charted the progress made in recent years, which had led to the Council's present waste management performance. It then summarised the wider strategic context both nationally and locally before describing the key components of Coventry's Municipal Waste Strategy (2008-2020) and outcomes from the twelve-week public consultation exercise. The final

version of the strategy was attached in full at appendix 1 and the results of the public consultation questionnaire were attached at appendix 2.

When presented for consultation the draft municipal waste management strategy was supported by three supporting documents of a technical nature. These were a Strategic Environmental Assessment, Options Appraisal – Prevention and Recycling and Options Appraisal – Disposal. Following evaluation of the responses to the consultation a further technical report was commissioned to test and review a number of assumptions made in the original Options Appraisal – Prevention and Recycling. The results of this exercise validated the original recommendations and were detailed in sections 6 and 7 of the report. The various technical reports had been commissioned by the Council from specialist waste management consultancies, BeEnvironmental and ENTEC, and were available as background documents.

There were specific DEFRA guidelines for the development of Municipal Waste Management Strategies. These guidelines had been followed in the development of Coventry's Municipal Waste Strategy.

Coventry's Municipal Waste Strategy (2008-2020) followed the framework of the "Waste Hierarchy", an integral feature of Waste Strategy for England 2007. Given that this was a Municipal Waste Strategy, it focused primarily on household waste and commercial waste which is collected by the City Council. It did not seek to address issues such as industrial waste, construction / demolition and agricultural wastes.

The key issues and recommendations drawn out in the report covered the areas of Waste Prevention; Re-Use; Recycling and Composting; Energy Recovery; and Disposal.

It was noted that the report had also been considered by Scrutiny Board 3 at their meeting on 3 December 2008 and a briefing note had been circulated detailing their consideration of this matter, indicating that they had considered the relevant document, and had asked the Cabinet to consider and decide whether to agree the following recommendations of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, that is, that the Scrutiny Board offered its full support for the Municipal Waste Strategy, that it asked the Cabinet to note the issues raised by the Scrutiny Board, and that it recorded its thanks and appreciation to the Cabinet Member (City Services) and the Director of City Services and his staff for their assistance in enabling the Scrutiny Board to contribute to the various stages of the development of the Strategy.

It was noted that at the meeting of the Cabinet, the Cabinet Member (City Services) had expressed her thanks to City Services staff for their hard work on the report submitted.

In addition, at her suggestion, the Cabinet had decided to acknowledge the involvement and support of Scrutiny Board (3).

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (1) Adopt Coventry's Municipal Waste Strategy (2008-2020). (Attached at Appendix 1 to the report submitted), taking on board the comments of Scrutiny Board 3 summarised above.**
- (2) Approve the proposals contained in section 6 of the report submitted to expand household kerbside recycling services city-wide.**
- (3) Note that the proposed expansion of household kerbside recycling city-wide was subject to the approval of capital and revenue funding requirements which are included in the Council's 2009/10 budget proposals (Minute 111 above refers)**
- (4) Note that, subject to the approval of the above-mentioned budget proposals, contracts will be let for the purchase of wheeled bins and supply of a Materials Recycling Facility as described in section 14 of the report submitted.**

114. Statement by the Leader of the Council

There was no statement.

(NOTE: The meeting closed at 8.15 pm)