

## **COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY**

**8 December 2009**

### **PRESENT**

Lord Mayor (Councillor Harrison)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Kelsey)

Councillor Adalat	Councillor Mrs Lucas
Councillor Andrews	Councillor Matchet
Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Maton
Councillor Auluck	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Bailey	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Bains	Councillor J. Mutton
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor Mrs. M. 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 Mrs Sweet
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Khan	Councillor Mrs. Waters
Councillor Lakha	Councillor Williams
Councillor Lapsa	Councillor Windsor
Councillor Lee	

Apologies:      Councillor Asif  
                      Councillor Lancaster

### **Public Business**

## **71. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 20 October 2009 were signed as a true record.

## **72. Coventry Good Citizen Award**

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor and his Honour Judge Hodson, the Honorary Recorder, presented Betty Pattison with the Coventry Good Citizen Award. Her citation read:

" Betty Pattison, affectionately known as 'Miss Pat' founded Pattison College in 1949 with just fifteen pupils and four teachers. Since then the school complement has increased tenfold and last year was recognised by Ofsted as an 'Outstanding Independent School'.

She gained her love of dance from her father, who taught ballroom dancing in the family home. She started teaching ballet at 16, and later taught many other forms of dance. Her school takes children from the age of three and specialises in the performing arts.

Miss Pattison's students have performed in significant events in Coventry through the years including: the VJ celebrations in the Drill Hall; at the Battle of Britain Celebrations in the Sibree Hall; at the inauguration of Coventry Cathedral in the presence of the Queen; at the Pageant of the history of Coventry in the War Memorial Park; and the first ever Royal Show at Stoneleigh.

She has encouraged the talents of many aspiring actors and her former pupils have pursued different and varied careers and include Kerys Nathan, Michael Jackson's choreographer. Actor Richard Armitage of North and South, Robin Hood and Spooks, and Robert Lisle and James Boyce, both serving in the Parachute Regiment. All her former pupils remember Miss Pat with fondness and recall her favourite line of encouragement, '*There's no such word as can't!*'.

She was awarded an honorary degree by the University of Warwick and a lifetime achievement award by the International Dance Teachers Association. She is held in high esteem by others far and wide but Betty Pattison will always be a permanent and longstanding asset to this City.

In her 90<sup>th</sup> Year she is deservedly called a Good Citizen of Coventry."

## **73. Death of Former Councillor**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of former Councillor Michael Noonan who served on the Council for 7 years representing Wyken Ward until May 2007.

## **74. Death of Professor Yvonne Carter**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of Professor Yvonne Carter CBE who was the Dean of Warwick Medical School and made a unique contribution to medical education and also developed the school into an innovative centre for research and education.

## **75. Civic Engagements**

The Lord Mayor informed the Council of his recent civic engagements, which totalled 328 to date. He had met the Honorary Consul of Conga; the Assistant High Commissioner of Bangladesh; the Ambassador for St Vincent and the Grenadines, the Ambassador for Zimbabwe, and the First Secretary to Angola. His highlights included: Lady Godiva Half Marathon; Visit to HMS Diamond for their Sea Trials Day; Remembrance Sunday Service and Parade; Re-united a lost medal with Dave Batten to the owner's Grandson following a two-year search; admitting Freeman of the City (all representing Jaguar Land Rover); and Christmas Lights switch-on.

## **76. Petitions**

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

- (a) Petition requesting the closure of a gap along the Birmingham Road being used as a short cut to Windmill Hill and surrounding roads – 10 signatures presented by Councillor Gazey.**
- (b) Petition objecting to the issue of recycle bins to the residents of Coventry – 80 signatures submitted by Councillor Bains.**
- (c) Petition requesting the completion of the repair of the cremator at the Canley Crematorium – 273 signatures presented by Councillor Bains.**
- (d) Petition – requesting action to combat dangerous, inconsiderate and illegal car parking in the Hillfields area, to include partners demonstrating what action they are taking to help improve the situation – 158 signatures presented by Councillor O'Boyle.**
- (e) Petition – Requesting assistance from the City Council in solving the car parking problems in the Hillfields area, and calling for other agencies to assist by providing free parking for their staff and users – 163 signatures presented by Councillor Windsor.**
- (f) Petition – Opposing the building of 900 homes at the rear of Walsgrave Hospital – 127 signatures presented by Councillor Dixon.**
- (g) Petition – Requesting action to repair the pavements on Attwood Crescent – 59 signatures presented by Councillor Field.**
- (h) Petition – Requesting that CENTRO reconsider the forthcoming withdrawal of the C37 and C47 bus services and replacing them with new route 37 – signatures presented by Councillor Field.**
- (i) Petition – Objection to the planning application submitted by Friargate Coventry LLP relating to road access proposals affecting junction 6 of the**

**(j) Petition – Opposing the siting of an infant/junior school on Bablake Playing Fields – 205 signatures presented by Councillor Williams.**

**77. Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared interests in the matters referred to in the minutes indicated. The relevant minutes, and recorded decisions, also record where appropriate, the actions that the Members decided to take at the meeting indicated, having regard to the National Code of Local Government Conduct and the City Council's Constitution:

**(a) Interests in Recommendations**

**Personal**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Minute Number</b>
Councillor Skipper	84

**Prejudicial**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Minute Number</b>
Councillor Townshend	79, 80, 81 & 82

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

Further to Minute 70/09 of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee, the City Council considered a report of Interim Assistant Director of Street Services and Public Protection which reported the results of the consultation on the proposed Statement of Gambling Policy 2010 – 2013.

Under Section 349 of the Gambling Act 2005 (the Act), each licensing authority must prepare and produce a Statement of Gambling Policy detailing the principles that they propose to apply in exercising their functions under the Act. The policy would have to be renewed at least every three years in accordance with the Act. The current Gambling Policy was published on 1<sup>st</sup> January 2007.

Before adopting a policy for a three year period, licensing authorities would be required to carry out a wide consultation process. For Coventry, this took place from 26<sup>th</sup> June to 18<sup>th</sup> September 2009 and in accordance with guidance issued by the Gambling Commission. Section 349 of the Act requires the licensing authority to consult the following on the policy or any subsequent revision:-

- The Chief Officer of police for the authority's area.
- One or more persons who appear to the authority to represent the interests of persons carrying on gambling businesses in the authority's area.
- One or more persons who appear to the authority to represent the interests of persons who are likely to be affected by the exercise of the authority's functions under the Act.

This authority consulted with West Midlands Police, premises with a current licence/permit under the Act and the Gambling Commission. In addition to these statutory consultees, the licensing authority may also consult with any individuals or organisations it

deemed appropriate. As a result, West Midlands Fire Service, the Community Safety Team, Safeguarding Children Board, Environmental Health, Building Control, Planning, Trade Associations and Voluntary Organisations were also consulted.

The public consultation exercise finished on 18<sup>th</sup> September and the results were attached as Appendix B of the report together with the Licensing Authority response. Comments raised by the Committee would be submitted to Council on 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009 for consideration. The proposed Statement of Gambling Policy must be published by 3<sup>rd</sup> January 2010 to enable the Council to continue to carry out its functions under the Gambling Act 2005.

The revised Statement of Gambling Policy had been prepared in light of three years experience and legal interpretation of the Act. The Gambling Commission had also produced two further updates on guidance for licensing authorities since the original statement was agreed and the revised policy took these changes to guidance into account.

The Cabinet Office had issued guidance and a Code of Practice on the consultation process recommending a 12 week consultation period, and local authorities were encouraged to follow it. By the end of the consultation period, the authority had only received four responses regarding the policy statement, two of which were just acknowledgements with no changes. The two relevant responses were attached at Appendix B of the report together with the Licensing Authority's response. The Committee commented that any references made to vulnerable people within the policy be made more specific and clearer. In particular they requested that paragraph 10.13 of the Revised Statement of Gambling Policy be strengthened and amended as follows:-

"As regards to the protection of vulnerable persons, this licensing authority would normally consider conditions such as the use of self-barring schemes, provision of information leaflets/helpline numbers for organisations such as GamCare".

**RESOLVED that the Council notes the responses received following the consultation exercise, attached as appendix B to the report, and adopts the proposed statement of Gambling Policy, attached as Appendix A to the report, for the purposes of Section 349 of the Gambling Act 2005.**

## **79. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution – Proposed Changes to the Call-in Procedure**

Further to Minute 16 of the Standards Committee, the City Council considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive which detailed proposed changes to the Constitution relating to the call-in procedure.

The Constitution Working Group had considered a report which detailed proposed changes to the call-in procedure. The report had also been considered by an Informal meeting of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee held on the 26<sup>th</sup> August prior to being considered by the Constitution Working Group. Since the Council's Constitution was first introduced in 2000, the Council's call-in procedure had been amended from time to time to ensure that it was used appropriately and effectively. However, it had been some years since any changes were made to the procedure set out in the Constitution, during which time the Scrutiny function had been developing. For example:-

- a) Scrutiny now discuss some reports before they are considered by the Cabinet/Cabinet Members and all Scrutiny Members were given the opportunity to contribute to these discussions.

- b) The Committee originally met weekly, but had met less frequently in the past few years because the amount of business did not warrant a weekly meeting. Consequently, it had not been possible for it to take decisions on the appropriateness of the call-ins received, as stated in the Constitution, within a reasonable time. In these circumstances, as also required by the Constitution, these decisions had been taken by the Chair in conjunction with the Assistant Director (Democratic Services) (representing the Director of Customer and Workforce Services) and the Council Solicitor and Assistant Director (Legal Services). The Committee was scheduled to meet fortnightly during 2009/2010, so the Chair would need to continue to take these decisions.
- c) During the last year the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee referred the detailed consideration of a call-in (relating to Belgrade Plaza) to Scrutiny Board 3. Whilst not needed in this instance, this raised the question of how call-ins referred in this way should be referred to Council as a dispute, if this should be needed.

The proposals set out below aim to reflect these recent developments and to make the call-in process even more effective. They have been approved by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee and the Constitution Working Group.

**Recommendation 1:** To address the fact that some reports are now discussed by Scrutiny prior to Cabinet, add the following paragraph to the list of call-in limitations, set out in paragraph 4.5.26 of the Constitution:

"the associated report has already been considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or a Scrutiny Board who have endorsed the recommendations or made recommendations that have been accepted by the Cabinet/Cabinet Member".

This would confine call-ins to issues which had not previously been considered by Scrutiny or which had been discussed and Scrutiny recommendations had not been agreed by the Cabinet/Cabinet Members.

**Recommendation 2:** To address the impact of needing few Scrucos meetings, revise paragraph 4.5.25.4 of the Constitution to enable the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee to decide whether or not a call-in is appropriate, thereby reflecting the changed situation, as follows:

The appropriateness of a call-in under these procedures will be determined by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, in accordance with criteria decided by them, on advice by the Assistant Director (Democratic Services), in conjunction with the Council Solicitor and Assistant Director (Legal Services), unless there is no other business to be considered by the Committee. In such instances, the appropriateness of a call-in will be determined by the Chair (or in her/his absence, her/his nominee) of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee in conjunction with the Assistant Director (Democratic Services) and the Council Solicitor and Assistant Director (Legal Services) in accordance with the criteria. The Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or Chair of the Committee will determine whether the relevant Cabinet Member(s) is required to attend Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee when the matter is considered, taking into account the wishes of the Members calling in the decision, however, this does not preclude Cabinet Member(s) from attending and speaking if they so wish. At this stage, there is no requirement for any Members who called in a decision to be present. If a call-in is rejected as being inappropriate, the Members who have submitted the

call-in will be advised of the decision and the reason for it.

The current and proposed revised wording of the relevant section of the Constitution were set out in Appendix 2 of the report.

### **Referrals to Council in the case of a Dispute**

The procedure for dealing with call-ins is detailed in paragraph 4.5.25 in the Constitution. Whilst paragraph 4.5.25.10 allows Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee to refer any issue which arises during the consideration of a call-in to the appropriate Scrutiny Board, should that issue then become a dispute, paragraph 4.5.25.9 indicates that only Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee can refer that issue to Council as a dispute.

Therefore, in such instances where the appropriate Scrutiny Board considers a call-in, and following disagreement with the Cabinet or Cabinet Member on any recommendation from that Board regarding amending a decision, instead of referring that issue to Council as a dispute, the issue would then have to be referred back to Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee for that Committee to decide whether it should be referred as a dispute.

This issue had arisen because earlier this year, Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee referred a call-in relating to the Belgrade Plaza to Scrutiny Board 3. Whilst Scrutiny Board had heard the call-in, made recommendations to the Cabinet Member and then received a further report back, had the Board then wished to refer the issue to Council as a dispute, the matter would have had to be referred to Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee for them to decide whether or not to refer the matter as a dispute.

**Recommendation 3:** It is recommended that paragraph 4.5.25.10 of the Constitution be amended by the insertion of the following words highlighted in bold:-

Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee may refer any issue which arises during the consideration of a call in to the appropriate Scrutiny Board for further detailed consideration. Where the call in is referred to an appropriate Scrutiny Board, that Board will follow the procedure detailed in paragraphs 4.5.25.8 and 4.5.25.9 above in relation to accepting the original decision, making recommendations to the Cabinet or Cabinet Member to amend a decision, or , in the case of a dispute, referring the matter to Council for decision.

It was considered logical that, where Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee had deemed it appropriate to refer a call-in to a Scrutiny Board, it should then be a decision of that Scrutiny Board to refer the matter to Council as a dispute. To have to refer the matter back to Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee unnecessarily prolongs the decision making process and would require the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee to reconsider the call-in, which represents a duplication of the work already undertaken by the Scrutiny Board.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approves the changes to the Constitution as detailed above and in the Appendix to the report.**

Note: Councillor Townshend declared a prejudicial interest in this matter and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the item.

## **80. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution – Benchmarking on Local Authority Democratic Procedures**

Further to Minute 17 of the Standards Committee, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services and the Director of Finance and Legal Services which outlined the proposed changes to the Constitution in relation to the procedural matters detailed in Part 4. The report had previously been considered by the Constitution Working Group and detailed the benchmarking exercise undertaken by Democratic Services on local authority democratic procedures.

Officers from 15 local authorities were contacted in order to gain an insight into the approaches taken elsewhere in relation to the following :-

- Petitions Procedure – Submission of Identical Petitions by Councillors
- Authenticating Petitions
- Distribution of Papers at (and during) Council Meetings
- Use of Technology at Council Meetings

It was proposed that:-

(1)the Constitution be amended by the insertion of the following Paragraph at 4.9.2.3.8: -

"Where two or more Councillors submit the same petition, normally two but a maximum of three Councillors will be entitled to the rights regarding speaking at Council meetings and attending the appropriate meeting to present the petition as outlined in paragraphs 4.9.2.3.1, 4.9.2.3.2 and 4.9.2.3.3 above."

(2)the Constitution be amended by the insertion of the following wording at the end of paragraph 4.9.1.1: -

"It is expected that petitions submitted should be the original as a way of ensuring authenticity. However, it is recognised that, in exceptional circumstances, a photocopy will be accepted if this is the only version available."

(3)the Constitution be amended by the insertion of the following paragraph at 4.1.2.7: -

"No paperwork may be circulated at the meeting in respect of oral questions"

The Constitution Working Group had noted the responses in relation to the use of technology at Council meetings, particularly having regard to financial resources and the fact that the Council Chamber did not easily lend itself to the use of technology. In addition, it was not a comfortable working environment for members, particularly during lengthy meetings.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approves the necessary changes to the Constitution.**

Note: Councillor Townshend declared a prejudicial interest in this matter and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the item.

**81. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution –Limit to Scope of Questions at Council Meetings**

Further to minute 18 of the Standards Committee, the City Council considered a report of the Assistant Director (Democratic Services) that indicated that the procedure for dealing with questions at Council Meetings was detailed in paragraphs 4.1.20 – 4.1.27 of the Constitution.

At a recent Council Meeting, a Cabinet Member was asked a written question which did not relate to his portfolio or indeed to Council business. Whilst paragraphs 4.1.20 and 4.1.25 allow Councillors to ask written and oral questions respectively of a Cabinet Member, it was not explicit that those questions should relate to the Cabinet Member's portfolio or Council business. In addition, paragraph 4.1.20 indicated that Councillors may ask a written question concerning any matter to be answered by the appropriate Cabinet Member, Chair or any Councillor. Similarly, it was not explicit that questions to Chairs of Boards, Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or other Bodies should be asked questions that relate to the work of that Board, Committee or Body.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve that paragraphs 4.1.20, 4.1.21, and 4.1.25 of the Constitution be amended by the insertion of the following words highlighted in italics:-**

**4.1.20 A Councillor may put in writing a question concerning any matter *relating to Council business* to be answered at the meeting by the appropriate Cabinet Member, Chair or other Councillor.**

**4.1.21A Councillor may ask a Chair of a Scrutiny Board, the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or the Chair of any other Body any oral question *relating to the work of that Board, Committee or Body.***

**4.1.25A Councillor may ask a Cabinet Member an oral question at the meeting without prior notice being given on any other matter relating *to the Cabinet Member's portfolio.***

Note: Councillor Townshend declared a prejudicial interest in this matter and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the item.

**82. Proposed Amendments to the Constitution –Review of Members' Allowances Scheme**

Further to minute 19 of the Standards Committee, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services which detailed a proposal that all of a Member's allowance be suspended in the event that the Member was fully or partially suspended when found in breach of the Member Code of Conduct.

The Local Authorities (Members' Allowances) (England) Regulations 2003 provides that a Local Authority should have a scheme providing for payment of allowances to Members. The current Coventry City Council Scheme was appended to the report.

Under the Local Government Act 2000, as amended by the Local Government and Public Involvement in Health Act 2007, Standards Committees of local authorities were charged with the responsibility of investigating complaints against Members and imposing sanctions, if a Member was found to be in breach of the Code of Conduct. Regulations had been issued by the Secretary of State setting out how such matters with (the Standards Committee (England) Regulations 2008), including what sanctions could be imposed by a Standards Committee, if a Member was found to have breached the Code of Conduct. Sanctions could include a full or partial suspension of a Member.

Guidance had also been issued by Standards for England (the successor body to the Standards Board), to assist Standards Committee when determining complaints. This Guidance was mandatory and any Standards Committee or Sub-Committee must have regard to it.

The current Members' Allowance Scheme does not provide for the suspension of payment of allowances, in the event that the Standards Committee had imposed a sanction that included a suspension. Therefore, where a Member was suspended, the appropriate allowance would still be paid. In view of the recent determination of a complaint against a Member, the Chair of the Standards Committee had requested that the position be reviewed by that Committee with a view to recommending to the City Council that an Independent Remuneration Panel be set up to consider amending the Members' Allowances Scheme.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approves:**

- (1) that the current Members' Allowance Scheme is amended so that should a Member be suspended from office as a result of breaching the Member's Code of Conduct, that all their allowances should also be suspended.**
- (2) that an Independent Remuneration Panel be set up to consider amending the Members' Allowance Scheme to reflect recommendation (1) above.**

Note: Councillor Townshend declared a prejudicial interest in this matter and withdrew from the meeting during consideration of the item.

**83. 2010/2011 Budget Report**

Further to Minute 63 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which sought approval of the final revenue spending and savings options for 2010/11 and future financial years and the Capital Programme for 2010/11 to 2014/15.

The report followed on from the Pre-Budget Report which had been approved by Cabinet on 22nd September 2009. Within that report the Council's Corporate Management Board proposed a range of budget options that have since been subject to a period of public consultation. It was intended that the proposals within the report now submitted would form the basis of the Council's final budget for 2010/11. This included the Council's proposed increase in Council Tax and a range of budget savings. The final Council Tax Setting and Budget Requirement report would be concluded in February once

the Government's final Formula Grant settlement, the Council's tax-base and the final precepts of the Fire and Police Authorities are known.

The report included a significant change of direction, including the first budget decisions driven by the Council's ABC Programme and its programme of transformation projects. It also incorporated bringing forward the budget setting process by approximately three months to allow more time to implement budget decisions and to maximise their effectiveness for the start of the new financial year.

The budget proposals have been driven by a very challenging financial position that faces the Council, the wider local government sector and the world economy. This has required the Council to achieve significant savings over the medium term. It was also a budget that planned ahead by investing in some key areas designed to improve the City's future. A list of savings options for the Council's revenue programme was included in Appendix 3. These savings options totalled £10.2m in 2010/11. A list of new expenditure proposals was included in Appendix 4. These totalled £10.5m in 2010/11.

These proposals would enable the Council to set a balanced budget. Based on the current financial analysis the Council expects its net revenue budget to increase from £261.9m in 2009/10 to £269.3m in 2010/11.

The report also included a proposed Capital Programme for 2010/11. In the main, this consisted of schemes and programmes that had already been approved plus programmes of essential expenditure in the areas of property, highways maintenance and ICT infrastructure. This programme required a level of prudential borrowing of £18m in total, £5m to support the investment in ICT infrastructure and a further £13m of temporary borrowing to balance the overall Programme. The revenue impact of this was taken into account in the revenue budget.

Councillor Duggins moved an amendment, as detailed in the appendix to these minutes, which was seconded by Councillor Mutton and lost.

**RESOLVED** that the City Council approved the following substantive proposals:

- (1) Approve the final savings proposals in Appendix 3 of the report and expenditure proposals in Appendix 4, as the basis of the City Council's 2010/11 revenue budget.
- (2) Approve the draft net revenue budget requirement of £269.3m in Appendix 2 pending final confirmation on 23rd February 2010, based on an assumed Council Tax increase of 2.4%, and recognising the conditions and risks set out in Section 2 and Section 7 of the report.
- (3) Approve the Capital Programme of £77.5m for 2010/11 and the future years' commitments arising from this programme of £300m in 2011/12 to 2014/15 as detailed in Section 6 and Appendix 6.
- (4) Approve the proposed Treasury Management Strategy for 2010/11 as detailed in Section 8 of the report, and the revised investment policy in Appendix 7 for immediate implementation, and adopt the prudential indicators and limits described in Section 9 and summarised in Appendix 8.

Note: In respect of the above, at the request of Councillor Foster, in accordance with paragraph 4.1.84 of the City Council's Constitution, paragraph 4.1.58 was suspended in respect of Councillor Field's speech and that there was no time limit.

#### **84. Special Responsibility Allowances for the Chair and Deputy Chair of the City Council's Audit Committee**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services that considered the recommendations contained in the report of the Independent Remuneration Panel (IRP) on the Special Responsibility Allowances for the Chair and Deputy Chair of the City Council's Audit Committee.

The Annual Meeting of the City Council on 20<sup>th</sup> May, 2009, resolved that up to 5 persons be appointed by the Director of Customer and Workforce Services, after consultation with the Group Leaders, to an IRP. The Panel was subsequently appointed and comprised:- Stephen Banbury, CEO Voluntary Action Coventry; Louise Bennett, CEO Coventry and Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce and Jeanne Jenner, CEO Coventry Arts and Media.

The City Council at the same meeting also appointed an Audit Committee for the first time and the Independent Remuneration Panel considered the Special Responsibility Allowances for the Chair and Deputy Chair of that Committee.

The work of the IRP was facilitated by Stephen Hind, a consultant with the West Midlands Leaders Board (the regional local government organisation) who had experience in working with Members' Allowances schemes.

The Panel have met and set out a series of recommendations, detailed in an appendix to the report, in relation to the Special Responsibility Allowances for the Chair and Deputy Chair of the Audit Committee.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approved the following recommendations of the Independent Remuneration Panel:-**

- (1) That the positions of Chair and Deputy Chair of Coventry City Council's Audit Committee should attract Special Responsibility Allowances.**
- (2) That the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Chair of the Audit Committee be set at £6,204 pa.**
- (3) That the Special Responsibility Allowance for the Deputy Chair of the Audit Committee be set at £2,484 pa.**
- (4) That the payment of these Special Responsibility Allowances be backdated to the beginning of the 2009/10 Municipal year and be subject to the same index linking mechanism as may be applied to other allowances.**
- (5) That the City Council considers constituting a standing Independent Remuneration Panel with membership on a fixed term basis.**
- (6) That the City Council consider undertaking, at an appropriate time, a full review of its Members' Allowances scheme.**

Note: Councillor Skipper declared a personal interest in this matter and remained in the meeting for consideration of the item.

## **85. Appointments to Scrutiny and Whitefriars Housing Group**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services that amended the appointments to Scrutiny and Whitefriars Housing Group made at the City Council's Annual Meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> May 2009.

At its Annual Meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> May, 2009, the City Council nominated elected members to the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, Chair of Scrutiny Board (3) and Whitefriars Housing Group. Since the Annual Meeting it had become clear that some minor amendments were required to those appointments. An appendix to the report set out the members currently appointed to the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, Chair of Scrutiny Board (3) and Whitefriars Housing Group, the changes required and the reason for those changes.

**RESOLVED that the following changes be made to Committee Memberships and Outside Body Nomination to Whitefriars Housing Group:**

### **(1) Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee**

**Councillor Ms Reece replaces Councillor Charley as a member of the Committee**

### **(2) Scrutiny Board 3**

**Councillor Ms Reece replaces Councillor Ridge as Chair of the Board  
(Councillor Ridge remains a Member of the Board)**

### **(3) Whitefriars Housing Group**

**Councillor Bailey replaces Councillor Adalat**

## **86. Statement by the Leader of the Council**

Councillor Taylor addressed the Council on the future of Ericsson at Ansty, Coventry Rugby Club, Coventry Airport and Sub-Regional Issues, to which Councillors Mutton and Nellist responded.

## **87. Debate – The Building of New Homes in Coventry**

Councillor Bigham moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Mutton and was lost:

"This Council believes that at the moment there is no case to prove the need to use Greenbelt land in Coventry or the surrounding area for house building. Sufficient Brownfield land is already available to build 26,000 homes in the City.

This Council therefore states unequivocally that we have no intention of building homes on Greenbelt land at least until the majority of Brownfield sites have been developed.

We also confirm that land designated for employment use will in the majority of instances be retained for employment use".

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Ridley, seconded by Councillor Foster:

"After the words "The Council" on the 1<sup>st</sup> line, insert the following "condemns recent attempts by the Labour Government to bounce the City Council into building an eco-town on greenbelt land at Keresley.

Although the Council is actively promoting the building of eco-friendly homes on existing brownfield developments the Council resolves to oppose the building of an eco-town in or around Coventry."

On the 3<sup>rd</sup> line of the 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph change "26,000 homes" to "22,760 new homes".

In accordance with paragraph 4.1.62, Councillor Ridley accepted an amendment proposed by Councillor Field that the word "overwhelming" be inserted before "majority of" in the penultimate paragraph of the amendment.

The above amendment was carried giving rise to the following substantive motion:

"This Council condemns recent attempts by the Labour Government to bounce the City Council into building an eco-town on greenbelt land at Keresley.

Although the Council is actively promoting the building of eco-friendly homes on existing brownfield developments the Council resolves to oppose the building of an eco-town in or around Coventry.

This Council believes that at the moment there is no case to prove the need to use greenbelt land in Coventry or the surrounding area for house building. Sufficient brownfield land is already available to build 22,760 new homes in the City.

Excluding developments in the Canley and NDC regeneration projects this Council therefore states unequivocally that we have no intention of building homes on greenbelt land at least until the overwhelming majority of brownfield sites have been developed.

We also confirm that land designated for employment use will in the majority of instances be retained for employment use".

**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 Auluck	
Councillor Andrews	Councillor Bains	

Councillor Arrowsmith	Councillor Mrs. Bigham
Councillor Bailey	Councillor Chater
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Clifford
Councillor Charley	Councillor Duggins
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor Harvard
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Kelly
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor Khan
Councillor Field	Councillor Lakha
Councillor Foster	Councillor Mrs Lucas
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Kelsey	Councillor Maton
Councillor Lapsa	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Lee	Councillor J. Mutton
Councillor Matchet	Councillor Mrs. M. Mutton
Councillor Noonan	Councillor Nellist
Councilloe O'Neill	Councillor O'Boyle
Councillor Miss Reece	Councillor Ruane
Councillor Ridge	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Ridley	Councillor Mrs Sweet
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Skinner	Councillor Windsor
Councillor Taylor	Lord Mayor
Councillor Mrs. Waters	
Councillor Williams	

Result:            26 for  
                   24 against  
                   0 abstentions

## **88. Debate – Project Transform – Sub-Regional Residual Waste Treatment Solution**

Councillor Nellist moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Windsor and lost:

"This Council believes that the current evaluation criteria being proposed for Project Transform - Sub Regional Residual Waste Treatment Solution - would not allow for major potential increases in recycling in Coventry or for the flexible use of cheaper or newer green technologies; recognises that the inbuilt affordability gap would be too great given the current financial climate; and, therefore, agrees to notify our partners in Solihull and Warwickshire that we wish to defer for one year the making of the decision on this matter."

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Noonan and seconded by Councillor Lee:

"After Project Transform on the second line, delete the remainder of the Motion and insert the following:-

"will enable evaluation under DEFRA guidelines of all forms and types of cheaper, newer and greener technologies of waste treatment that potential bidders would be invited to submit.

This Council also recognises that Project Transform will continue to look at all possible options for future funding for a Sub Regional Residual Waste Treatment Solution."

The above amendment was carried giving rise to the following substantive motion:

"This Council believes that the current evaluation criteria being proposed for Project Transform will enable evaluation under DEFRA guidelines of all forms and types of cheaper, newer and greener technologies of waste treatment that potential bidders would be invited to submit.

This Council also recognises that Project Transform will continue to look at all possible options for future funding for a Sub Regional Residual Waste Treatment Solution."

The following amendment to the substantive motion was moved by Councillor Harvard, seconded by Councillor Mutton and lost:

Delete the whole of the first paragraph

On the first line of the second paragraph delete the word "will" and replace with the word "should".

Insert the following paragraph:-

"We object to the fact that Project transform is to allow tenderers to decide the technology and believe that the Audit committee should look at what has been happening.

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

### **Private Business**

Nil

(Meeting Closed: 11.00 p.m.)

**COUNCIL MEETING 8<sup>TH</sup> DECEMBER 2009**

**REVENUE AND CAPITAL BUDGET 2010/11**

**LABOUR GROUP AMENDMENT**

**Saving Proposals Not to be Taken**

<b>Report Ref</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount £000</b>
3	Neighbourhood Services - Childcare	100
9	Performing Arts	150
11	Dol-Y-Moch	26
21	Public Protection	84
27	Social Care Service Redesign	540
34	Raise Fees and Charges Above Inflation	200
36	3% Efficiencies from Partner Organisations	83
44	Post and Fast-print	30
50	Internal Audit and Special Projects	50
	<b>Total</b>	<b>1,263</b>

**Saving Proposal Increased**

<b>Report Ref</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount £000</b>
35	Vacancy and Turnover Factor	(550)
39	Management Structures	(300)
51	Procurement Strategy	(500)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>(1,350)</b>

**New Saving Proposal**

<b>Report Ref</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Amount £000</b>
	Reduction in Corporate Communication Team	(75)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>(75)</b>

## New Spending Proposals

Report Ref	Description	Amount £000
	Increase KILO 2 to a 24/7 Service	135
	One Additional Empty Homes Officer	27
	<b>Total</b>	<b>162</b>

**Total Revenue Impact** (£0k)

Additional Capital Proposal – Match funding of £2m to provide an Older People's Drop In Centre (not before 2011/12)