

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

6 July 2010

PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Kelsey)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Mulhall)

Councillor Abbott	Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin
Councillor Andrews	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 Cliffe	Councillor O'Boyle
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor Ruane
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Foster	Councillor Sehmi
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Singh
Councillor Hammon	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Smith
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Mrs Sweet
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Taylor
Councillor A Khan	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Lakha	Councillor Walsh
Councillor Lancaster	Councillor Welsh
Councillor Lee	

Apologies: Councillor Asif
Councillor Chater
Councillor Crookes
Councillor Field
Councillor Harrison
Councillor Lapsa
Councillor Mrs Lucas
Councillor Skinner

Public Business

32. Coventry Good Citizen Award

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor and his Honour Judge Hodson, the Honorary Recorder, presented to His Honour, Richard Cole, the Coventry Good Citizen Award. His citation read:

"His Honour Richard Cole was the Resident Judge at the Crown Court in Coventry from 1992 until his retirement in 2007. He was appointed the Honorary Recorder of the City of Coventry in 1999, reinstating an important and historic link between the civic

authority and the judiciary. Over the years in this office, he became an integral part of the City Council, loved and respected by all Council Members for his enthusiasm, impartiality, engagement and, above all, his commitment to the City and its people. Whether it was in his role as the Resident Judge in court or in the less formal addresses he gave to community groups and residents associations, he always upheld the reputation of the City. In 1995 he became a prominent member of a committee to raise funds for the BioMedical Research Institute at Warwick University. The committee was responsible for raising over £6 million enabling new laboratories to be built upon the Warwick University site.

At the conclusion of the fundraising in 2004, Richard Cole was appointed Chairman of Coventry and Warwick Medical Research Fund which continues to raise money to enable doctors and scientists of the highest calibre to work together on research projects with a direct bearing on standards of healthcare not only regionally but also nationally.

In his retirement Richard Cole gives of his time to causes which cross the Warwickshire and Coventry boundary; for example, Independent Advocacy, a charitable organisation that promotes and supports representation for people disadvantaged by disability, illness or social or economic circumstances, of which he is President.

In his role as Honorary Recorder he assisted in the setting up of the Good Citizen Award. It is only fitting that he too should be described as a Good Citizen of the City of Coventry."

33. Petitions

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

- (a) Access to entries at the back of houses 2 to 14 Hipswell Highway – 14 signatures presented by Councillor Mrs Dixon.**
- (b) Objection to Planning Application at 58 Cornelius Street, Coventry – 18 signatures presented by Councillor Singh Sehmi.**
- (c) Request to remedy the dilapidated conditions at 197-199 Melbourne Road – 65 signatures, presented by Councillor Bailey.**
- (d) Requesting the cancellation of the contract for a replacement incinerator at Whitley – 18 signatures, presented by Councillor Nellist.**
- (e) End the Siege of Gaza – 284 signatures, presented by Councillor Nellist.**

34. 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:

Interests in Recommendations:

**Prejudicial
Member**

Minute Number

Councillor Gazey
Councillor Hammon

36 (Coventry Core Strategy)
36 (Coventry Core Strategy)

(Councillors Gazey and Hammon left the meeting for consideration of this item)

35. New Duty to Respond to Petitions

Further to Minute 2/10 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 set out the new process for dealing with petitions as a result of a new statutory duty which all Councils were required to implement.

The Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act (2009) included a new duty on Councils to respond to all petitions submitted. The aim of this new duty was to strengthen local accountability in public services and placed local authorities on the front line of ensuring that local people connected with their decision makers. The Local Authorities (Petitions) (England) Order 2010 was made on 22nd March 2010 and statutory guidance was issued on 30 March 2010. The duty required Councils to establish a petition scheme to handle paper-based petitions from 15th June 2010. The Scheme must be approved by Council prior to it coming into force. Planning and licensing matters and matters relating to an individual or entity where there was a right to hold a review or a right of appeal under any other legal requirement, were exempt under the new requirements of the legislation, but were still provided for in the Council's Scheme, as provision already existed in the Council's rules under the current scheme. From 15th December 2010, the Council must also have an e-petitions facility in place, and the new Scheme provided for this.

Guidance specified that the petition scheme should include the following information:

- a) how we deal with petitions and decide if they are valid
- b) a list of steps to be taken in relation to responding to a petition
- c) notification of steps taken to be given to the petition organiser
- d) provide for a review of the action taken by the Council and
- e) provide a facility for e-petitions (by 15 December 2010 at the latest)

The Council's current petition scheme allowed a petition to be brought by a Councillor if it contained 5 or more signatures. Within the new scheme, a petition could be submitted by a Councillor *or* a member of the public – the requirement for it to have 5 or more signatures remained.

The Council was expected to determine a threshold number of signatures on a petition which would trigger a debate at a full Council meeting. The guidance states that this was to be set locally but should be no more than 5% of the population (which was 15,525 for Coventry). It was therefore recommended that the threshold should be 15,000. The Council could change this threshold number at any point in the future and if no petitions are received within a year, the Council could reduce the threshold.

The action which a Council must take to deal with a petition depended on which of the following categories it fitted into:

- a) it met the threshold of enough signatures to trigger a Council debate
- b) it had fewer than the threshold number of signatures; or
- c) it holds a named officer to account and met the required threshold for this or
- d) it was a petition on a planning , licensing or regulatory matter in which case it would be dealt with by the relevant Committee under the Committee's rules.

In respect of (c) above, local people had the right to petition for a named senior officer to attend a public meeting of the Council's overview and scrutiny committee and answer questions about their work. For Coventry this would include the following officers:

- Chief Executive
- Corporate Directors
- Monitoring Officer.

The Council needed to set a threshold for the number of signatures on a petition which would trigger an officer being asked to attend a meeting of one of the Scrutiny Boards. There was no specific guidance on this figure. It was therefore proposed that the Council set a threshold of 10,000 signatures on petitions to hold an officer to account.

A Briefing note which gave further information on the Standards Committee's discussions was appended to the report. The City Council noted that Standards Committee had, in general, supported the proposed process for responding to petitions but agreed that the figures in the report of 15,000 signatures to trigger a Council debate and 10,000 signatures to trigger an officer attending and overview and scrutiny committee were too high based on previous petitions submitted to the Council and recommended that Council consider reducing the figure to be more in line with the size/population of a ward.

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Williams, seconded by Councillor Foster and lost:

"Recommendation (1) - at the end of the Recommendation add "at 5000"

Recommendation (2) – at the end of the Recommendation add "at 300"

So that the recommendations now read:

- (1) Approve the threshold for petitions which trigger a council debate at 5000
- (2) Approve the threshold for petitions which trigger an officer attending an overview and scrutiny committee at 300."

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

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Andews	Abbott	
Bailey	Auluck	
Blundell	Bains	
Charley	Mrs Bigham	

Cliffe
Mrs Dixon
Foster
Gazey
Hammon
Lee
Lepoidevin
Nellist
Ridley
Smith
Taylor
Williams
Lord Mayor

Clifford
Duggins
Harvard
Kelly
A Khan
Lakha
Lancaster
Maton
McNicholas
Mulhall
J Mutton
M Mutton
O'Boyle
Ruane
Sehmi
Singh
Skipper
Mrs Sweet
Townshend
Walsh
Welsh

Result: 17 for
25 against
0 abstentions

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (a) Approve the threshold for petitions which trigger a Council debate at 15,000 signatures.**
- (b) Approve the threshold for petitions which trigger an officer attending an Overview and Scrutiny Committee at 10,000 signatures.**
- (c) Approve the petition scheme detailed in Appendix 1 of the report, to take immediate effect and to replace the existing section 4.9 of the Council's Constitution.**
- (d) Approve the remaining changes required in the Constitution to the terms of reference for the Scrutiny Boards and Council procedure rules as detailed in Appendix 2 of the report.**

36. Coventry Core Strategy

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Services and Development which brought to Members' attention the report by the Planning Inspectorate following the independent examination of the Coventry Core Strategy and asked members to identify an appropriate course of action following the letter from the Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government saying that the Regional Spatial Strategies were to be abolished.

Core Strategies had been introduced as part of the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act. They were intended to enhance the strategic role of local

authorities, and set the vision for policies and spatial change. The spatial strategy was based on the principles of sustainability using land effectively and efficiently. This meant not wasting land (for example, by allowing it to become derelict), providing easy movement and ensuring that employment, education and leisure opportunities were within easy reach of everyone. Core Strategies were intended to be developed within the framework established by the Regional Strategy (RS). If they did not reflect this strategic framework they would not have been considered 'sound' by an Inspector and would not be able to form part of the statutory Development Plan for an area. The announcement of the abolition of RS's, without currently any guidance to advise how the future statutory process would operate meant that there was now significant uncertainty about how matters would progress.

Coventry's Core Strategy has been under preparation since Autumn 2005. There had been extensive consultation, in excess of the statutory requirements, ongoing since that time. Early engagement took place with a number of local stakeholders including Coventry Partnership (LSP), the Coventry Community Empowerment Network and other well-established networks and forums including; Coventry By Design and the Residents Liaison Group. This helped to identify issues for the Core Strategy.

In 17 March 2009, the City Council approved the Core Strategy Proposed Submission Document. This was published for pre-submission representations from 19 March 2009 until 7 May 2009. The Secretary of State appointed an independent Inspector to conduct an examination to determine whether the Core Strategy was sound and legally compliant. The examination was held during November 2009, which culminated in the Council being sent the Inspector's Report on 27th May 2010. The report was binding, as were all Inspectors' Reports under the current planning regime. It stated that subject to amendment in accordance with the recommendations made, Coventry's Core Strategy was sound. The recommendations consisted of minor editorial changes and addition/deletion of specific site allocations, particularly in relation to proposed residential development. Details of the recommendations were highlighted in bold at the end of each section of the Inspector's report, which was available in full on the Council's web site.

The Core Strategy was approved by the City Council for submission to the Secretary of State following a lengthy debate at Council, during which concern was expressed by a number of Members as to the appropriate amount of development the City Council should be planning for. In particular the necessity to develop Green Belt and Greenfield sites was questioned.

With the pending abolition of the RS, the report stated that it would be prudent to consider whether, in the light of the proposal contained in the Secretary of State's letter, that levels of development should be determined locally, these issues should be revisited

The report indicated there were some existing Greenfield sites that had previous approvals for development e.g. as part of the Canley Regeneration Area and school rebuilding schemes and as part of the statutory Coventry Development Plan 2001. There were also some small pockets of degraded land, which whilst not currently developed could play a more positive role in improving and contributing to the quality of the local environment if suitable development were to go ahead

During the course of the examination, the Inspector considered proposals for a number of individual sites. These were either proposed for development by the City Council or by others. Those put forward by others were referred to as 'omission sites'. Site specific details were included in the report submitted.

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Ridley, seconded by Councillor Sawdon and lost:

"that, at paragraph 2 of the report, the following recommendation be added:

3. Council further resolves that the review outlined in Paragraph 5.4 will not include green belt/green field sites being sold for housing development and that the results of the review will be presented to Full Council."

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (a) **Suspend further work on the Coventry Core Strategy, pending the publication of further legislation and/or further advice from the Government regarding arrangements following the proposed abolition of the Regional Strategy.**
- (b) **Instruct Officers to explore the options available for putting in place a Core Strategy that reflected the wishes of the Council for future development and report back to the Council at a future meeting.**

37. Question Time

The appropriate Members provided a written response to all the questions set out in the Questions Booklet, together with an oral response to 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:

No	Question Asked By	Question Put To	Subject Matter
1	Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Bains (as lead member of the West Midlands Police Authority)	Dispersal Orders in the City Centre
2	Councillor Williams	Councillor A Khan	Butts Theatre
3	Councillor Lee	Councillor A Khan	Cost of Screen in Millennium Place
4.	Councillor O'Boyle	Councillor Kelly	BSF
5.	Councillor Townshend	Councillor Mutton	Budget deficit

38. Statement by the Leader of the Council – Impact of job losses on the Coventry Economy

Councillor Mutton addressed the City Council on the impact of job losses on the Coventry economy. The Statement provided members with an update on the ongoing work being undertaken in light of the recent job losses in the City following the impending closure of QCDA and Becta as part of Government cuts. He reported that he had met with

the Public and Commercial Services Union in order to offer assistance to their members and had written to Michael Gove, Secretary of State for Education. Councillor Mutton also made reference to the Government's announced series of spending cuts and tax increases which would be confirmed in the forthcoming Comprehensive Spending Review and which would further impact on all public services.

Councillor Taylor responded to the statement and, in accordance with paragraph 4.1.84 of the City Council's Constitution, it was moved and seconded that paragraph 4.1.39 be suspended to allow Councillor Nellist to also respond to the Statement.

39. Debate – Emergency Budget Statement

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

"This Council condemns the recent emergency budget statement made by Chancellor George Osborne as an ideological attack on public services as well as the previous announcement by the Coalition that called for £1.16 billion of in year cuts demanded of local Government – with its emphasis on Area Based Grant cuts.

This Council is concerned about the adverse impact that these measures will have on local services, local jobs, general economic recovery and the wellbeing of the people of Coventry."

RESOLVED that the Motion as set out above be adopted.

40. Debate – Pool Meadow Bus Station

Councillor Ridley moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Taylor:

"This Council fully supports the retention of Pool Meadow Bus Station in its current location"

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Mrs Bigham and seconded by Councillor Lakha:

"After the word "location" add: "and will work with other agencies to address antisocial behaviour there"

This amendment was carried giving rise to the following substantive motion:

"This Council fully supports the retention of Pool Meadow Bus Station in its current location and will work with other agencies to address antisocial behaviour there"

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

(Meeting closed: 7.00 pm)

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

14 September 2010

PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Kelsey)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Mulhall)

Councillor Abbott	Councillor Lee
Councillor Andrews	Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Mrs Lucas
Councillor Bains	Councillor Maton
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Charley	Councillor J. Mutton
Councillor Chater	Councillor Mrs. M. Mutton
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor Nellist
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Noonan
Councillor Crookes	Councillor O'Boyle
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Ruane
Councillor Foster	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Sehmi
Councillor Hammon	Councillor Singh
Councillor Harrison	Councillor Skinner
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Smith
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Mrs Sweet
Councillor A Khan	Councillor Taylor
Councillor T Khan	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Lakha	Councillor Walsh
Councillor Lancaster	Councillor Welsh
Councillor Lapsa	Councillor Williams

Apologies: Councillor Asif
Councillor Bailey
Councillor Field

Public Business

44. Minutes

The minutes of the meetings held on 24th June and 10th August 2010 were agreed as true records.

45. Coventry Good Citizen Award

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

"Rhoda Hackett is a committed community volunteer and has worked on many projects in Longford over a number of years, including organising voluntary football sessions, raising funds for equipment and starting a breakfast club in Longford.

She is a champion for local young talent and arranges for bands to play at local events, and was a prime 'mover and shaker' in the Longford Community Fayre, which became an annual event.

Rhoda has spent many hours on voluntary committees and at meetings over the years, working hard for the Longford area.

Rhoda puts in 200 per cent effort into the projects for both the young and older people in her community, but she asks for no reward. Her reward is seeing her local community thrive and bonding together to support and encourage each other.

Rhoda is an absolute star and deserves to be called a Good Citizen of Coventry."

46. Exclusion of Press and Public

RESOLVED that under Section 100A(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the press and public be excluded from the meeting for the items of business indicated below on the grounds that that item involves the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in the Paragraphs of Part I of Schedule 12A of that Act as indicated.

Minute No.	Subject	Relevant Paragraphs(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A
65	Validation of i-Cov Project's Value for Money	3
66	Ricoh Arena Car Park C – Hotel Development Heads of Terms	3

47. Presentation of Illuminated Minute

Members noted that the presentation of the Illuminated Minute relating to the Vote of Thanks to former Lord Mayor, Councillor Jack Harrison MBE.JP, had taken place privately at his request due to his current personal circumstances.

48. Death of Former Lord Mayor

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent sad death of former Councillor and Lord Mayor, Don Ewart.

Don served as a member of the City Council for 25 years representing Wyken Ward. He was Chair and Vice-Chair of various Committees including City Development and Property Management, Leisure Services, Community and Leisure Policy Co-ordinating Committee and Sports and Parks Policy Team.

He was Lord Mayor in 1992-1993.

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

49. Death of former Coventry MP

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent sad death of former Coventry MP Bill Wilson.

Bill served as a Member of Parliament for 19 years from 1964 to 1983 representing Coventry South.

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

50. Petitions

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

- (a) Opposing proposed closure of the local Neighbourhood Management Centre, One Stop Shop, Barley Lea House – 400 signatures presented by Councillor McNicholas.**
- (b) Proposed closure of One Stop Shop, Stoke Aldermoor – 117 signatures, presented by Councillor Nellist.**
- (c) Requesting regeneration of Coventry City Centre – 205 signatures presented by Councillor Bains.**
- (d) Basketball Court, Yardley Street – 22 signatures, presented by Councillor Welsh.**
- (e) Asian Christian Christmas lights switch on – 353 signatures, presented by Councillor Lapsa.**
- (f) Proposed closure of Neighbourhood Office, Vine Street – 134 signatures, presented by Councillor Nellist.**

51. 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:

Interests in Recommendations

Minute 54 and Minute 65 – Validation of i-Cov Project's Value of Money

Personal Interests

Councillor Foster (Director of ICT firm in the City)

Councillor Williams (Director of ICT firm in the City)

Minute 57 – Council Response to the Home Office Consultation – Policing in the 21st Century, Reconnecting Police and the People

Personal Interest:

Councillor Lepoidevin (Employed by the Police Service)

Minute 58 – Response to Petition Submitted on the End of the Siege of Gaza

Prejudicial Interests:

Councillor Mrs Johnson

Councillor Williams

(Councillors Mrs Johnson and Williams left the meeting during consideration of this item).

Personal Interest:

Councillor Cliffe (On the Electoral Role at Coventry Cathedral)

Minute 61 – 'Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS' White Paper

Personal Interests

Councillor Harrison (Non-executive Director of UHCW)

Councillor Sawdon (Non-executive Director of UHCW)

Councillor Townshend (Chairman of UHCW)

Note: As a Director of ACL, the Chief Executive declared an interest in Minutes 56 and 66 (Ricoch Arena Car Park C – Hotel Development Heads of Terms). He, together with Chris West, Director of Finance and Legal Services and John McGuigan, Director of Strategic Planning and Partnerships, who were also Directors of ACL, left the meeting during consideration of this item.

52. Amendments to Capital Programme Expenditure 2010/11

Further to Minute 25/10 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development and the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which reviewed the 2010/11 Capital Programme for Highways Maintenance and Investment, as approved by Cabinet on 30th March 2010, in response to the following:

- Reductions of government grant totalling £1.36m.
- Overspends on Hill Street Footbridge and the 2009/10 Highways maintenance budget totalling £0.931m.
- Transfer of £1m from integrated transport schemes and other City Services and Development budgets to support the £3m additional capital funding approved for pothole and road repairs agreed by Cabinet on 15th June 2010.

A revised programme was presented that balanced the budget, taking advantage of a relaxation to the ring-fencing of the de-trunking grant. In reallocating funding within the integrated transport block, the emphasis had been on maintenance and safety.

The appendices to the report set out in detail the spending programmes for maintenance and local safety schemes.

The reduced requirement from the Integrated Transport Programme would, in response to concerns expressed by members, allow funding levels to be restored on local safety schemes, safer routes to school and Stoney Stanton Road to the levels agreed on 30th March 2010.

Councillor Foster moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Noonan and lost:

"That Council amends the recommendations on page 2 of the report as follows:

At the end of recommendation (1) delete "." and insert ", with the exception of the proposed reduction in the Resident Parking scheme budget contained in paragraph 2.13 and appendix A."

Then, after recommendation (2) on page 2 insert an additional recommendation to read:

"(3) That the £68k required for the residents parking budget be identified from the additional £1.1m allocated to the Pension Strain Reserve by Cabinet on 22nd June 2010."

Amended recommendations to then read:

- (1) The amendments to the 2010/11 Highways Investment and Maintenance Programme as set out in Appendix A, with the exception of the proposed reduction in the Resident Parking Scheme Budget contained in paragraph 2.13 and appendix A
- (2) The detailed spending programmes set out in Appendices B to G.
- (3) That the £68k required for the residents parking budget be identified from the additional £1.1m allocated to the Pension strain Reserves by Cabinet on 22nd June 2010.

RESOLVED that the City Council notes the Cabinet's decision to approve:

(1) The amendments to the 2010/11 Highway's Investment and Maintenance Programme as set out in Appendix A.

(2) The detailed spending programmes set out in Appendices B to G.

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

For

Councillor Andrews
Councillor Blundell

Against

Councillor Abbott
Councillor Bains

Abstain

Councillor Charley	Councillor Mrs. Bigham
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor Chater
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Clifford
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor Duggins
Councillor Foster	Councillor Harrison
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Harvard
Councillor Hammon	Councillor Kelly
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor A Khan
Councillor Lapsa	Councillor T Khan
Councillor Lee	Councillor Lakha
Councillor Lepoidevin	Councillor Lancaster
Councillor Nellist	Councillor Mrs Lucas
Councillor Noonan	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Ridley	Councillor Maton
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Mulhall
Councillor Skinner	Councillor J. Mutton
Councillor Smith	Councillor M. Mutton
Councillor Taylor	Councillor O'Boyle
Councillor Williams	Councillor Ruane
Lord Mayor	Councillor B Singh
	Councillor Singh Sehmi
	Councillor Skipper
	Councillor Mrs Sweet
	Councillor Townshend
	Councillor Walsh
	Councillor Welsh

Result: 22 for
28 against
0 abstentions

53. Audit Committee Annual Report 2009/10

Further to Minute 18/10 of the Audit Committee, the City Council considered the Audit Committee Annual report for 2009/10.

During 2009-10, the Council's Audit Committee met formally on seven occasions, with an additional session for training purposes held in January 2010. Meetings were held in June, August, September and November 2009 as well as in January, February and April 2010. The report gave details of the reports considered by the Audit Committee in 2009-10 which included Accountancy, Internal Audit and Risk Management, and External Audit reports. The Committee had also considered other reports and briefings on Housing Benefit Fraud, Data Quality and ICT Network Storage.

The Committee had also received a training session in January 2010 which covered Performance/Financial Management, Treasury Management, International Financial Reporting Standards, and Risk Management.

In 2010-11, the Audit Committee's initial focus would be ensuring that effective action be taken in response to areas for improvements highlighted in the Annual Governance Statement for 2009-10.

RESOLVED that the City Council note the activity of the Audit Committee

during 2009-10 and its priorities for 2010-11.

54. Validation of i-Cov Project's Value for Money

Further to Minute 31/10 of the Cabinet, this City Council considered a report of the Chief Executive and the Director of Customer and Workforce Services which outlined work undertaken to provide an independent report into the value for money aspect of PwC's work on the implementation of the i-Cov project.

A corresponding private report, detailing commercially confidential and financial aspects of this matter, was also submitted to the meeting (Minute 65 below refers).

The report indicated that SOCITM (Society of ICT Managers – an independent group) had been commissioned to produce a report benchmarking the value of PwC's involvement on this project against typical rates and services available in the wider UK market. To further support this, the Council had sought additional independent information from the Office of Government Commerce and the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation on behalf of Pro Five and had spoken to other local Authorities who had used PwC or other management consultants.

In summary, the data gathering exercise had found the cost of PwC's involvement to be towards the top end of the expected financial range for consultancy fees, but that given the complexity, breadth and depth of the ICT transformation programme and the current lack of managerial capacity within the department, that the high calibre of support provided by PwC's involvement represented value for money for the Council.

RESOLVED that the City Council note the outcome of the independent report into the value for money aspect of PwC's work on the implementation of the i-Cov project.

55. Appointment to the Bus Lane Adjudication Service Joint Committee (BLASJC)

Further to Minute 30/10 of the Cabinet Member (City Services) meeting, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development that sought approval for Coventry City Council to join the Bus Lane Adjudication Service Joint Committee (BLASJC) and to appoint a representative and deputy representative to the BLASJC to act on behalf of the Authority.

The Cabinet Member, had, at his meeting on 19th August 2010, agreed that the City Council join the Bus Lane Adjudication Service Joint Committee (BLASJC) and details of the purpose of the Committee were detailed in the report.

RESOLVED that the City Council appoint the Cabinet Member (City Services) and the Cabinet Member (City Development) to the BLASJC to act as Coventry City Council's representative and deputy representative respectively.

56. Ricoh Arena Car Park C – Hotel Development Heads of Terms

Further to Minute 41/10 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development which indicated that, to help with the future successful development of commercial activity at the Ricoh Arena, there had been a long held aspiration and commercial understanding of both the City Council and Arena

Coventry Limited (ACL), the company responsible for the management and successful development of the multipurpose arena and conference facilities, to deliver additional hotel bed spaces close to this regionally important development.

ACL along with the Council had recently been approached by two hotel operators who in two facilities were seeking to provide in the region of two hundred additional bed spaces with ancillary leisure facilities. Hotel site 1 & Hotel site 2 were the proposed locations for the hotel developments within car park C and were identified on Plan 1 attached to the report.

A corresponding private report, which detailed commercially confidential and financial aspects of the proposal, was also submitted to the meeting (Minute 66 below refers).

The proposal was for further hotel accommodation to facilitate the Ricoh Arena's current and future commercial activities, which it was considered appropriate to encourage and facilitate. The displacement of parking spaces as a result of the Hotel developments had been recognised and considered. The area of land needed for both hotels developments equated to approx 2 acres with Hotel site 1 affecting approximately 200 spaces and Hotel Site 2 affecting approximately 30 coach spaces. The Arena did not rely on the car parking spaces within car park C for its average day to day activities. In order to operate the major events ACL were required to comply with the existing Arena planning requirements and produce a Green Travel Plan. This identified the travel needs for each event and how these were to be accommodated. Site A would be added to ACL's Arena lease, offering the opportunity to provide additional car parking spaces if required as part of their Green Travel Plan.

The hotel development would need to be completed in advance of the development moratorium imposed by the Olympic Games; a start on site would have to be made by the end of 2010 with completion no later than early 2012. If the heads of terms of within the report were approved, then it was anticipated that development agreements with the developers/hotel companies would be completed before the end of 2010.

The report detailed the legal and financial implications of the proposal.

RESOLVED that, subject to the consideration of the additional information contained in the associated private report (Minute 66 below refers), the City Council:

- (1) Approve the main terms set out in the report as a conditional contract on a subject to planning basis, for the surrender or assignment of the existing lease and the grant of new long leases up to a maximum term of 150 years to facilitate one or both hotel developments, subject to the grant of planning permission.**
- (2) Delegate authority to the Director of City Services and Development and Assistant Director of Special Projects Finance/Assistant Director Financial Management, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member (City Development), to conclude all necessary documentation required to complete the land transaction based on the current assumption as to the parties concerned, in the most tax efficient way for the Council and to agree any costs that may result from complying with the heads of terms, providing that they did not exceed £250,000.**

57. Proposed Response to the Home Office Consultation on Policing – 'Policing in the 21st Century, Reconnecting Police and the People'

Further to Minute 46/10 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive which detailed the Council's proposed response to a Home Office consultation on the future of policing.

The appended paper set out the Government's vision for policing, which focussed on reducing crime, ensuring value for money and greater accountability to the public, through the provision of directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners. The consultation three state aims were:

- Transferring power back to the people by introducing directly elected Police and Crime Commissioners and establishing Police and Crime Panels. Both of these are to be at a force level;
- Transferring power away from Government by scrapping central targets and trusting the Police to use their professionalism to fulfil their role; and
- Shifting the focus from Government on national issues by creating a new National Crime Agency to lead on dealing with organised crime, protecting the borders and providing services best delivered at the national level.

The proposed changes to the governance arrangements would be outlined in the draft Police Reform & Social Responsibility Bill to be put before Parliament in the Autumn.

The response to the consultation focussed on the issues which are relevant to the Council's role in the local Community Safety Partnership; relating to increasing democratic accountability and tackling crime through partnership working.

The City Council also considered a briefing note detailing the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee's consideration of the consultation response noting that the Cabinet had concurred with the Committee in that it was felt that the new policing model would be unsuitable for a large, diverse area such as the West Midlands.

RESOLVED that the City Council approve the consultation response.

58. Response to Petition – "End the Siege in Gaza"

Further to Minute 11/10 of the Cabinet Member (Policy, Leadership and Governance) meeting, the City Council considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive concerning a petition, bearing 382 signatures, which had been submitted by Councillor Nellist, a St. Michael's Ward Councillor. The petition asked the City Council to protest to the Israeli authorities on behalf of the city about the killing of aid volunteers during the attack on a flotilla of ships attempting to break the blockade of Gaza and to demand the end of the blockade.

The report set out a brief summary of the background to the current position in Gaza and of the UK government's position, in-line with the petition, and asked the Cabinet Member to recommend to Council that he should write as Leader of the Council to the Israeli Ambassador to deplore the loss of life during the assault on the Gaza flotilla and welcome the resumption of direct peace talks and ask Israel to lift the restrictions on

access to Gaza (as set out in UN Security Council Resolution 1860).

RESOLVED that the City Council agree:

- (a) That the Leader of the Council write to the Israeli ambassador to:**
 - (i) Deplore the loss of life during the assault on the Gaza flotilla in May 2010**
 - (ii) Welcome the resumption of direct Israeli-Palestinian peace talks;**
 - (iii) Ask that Israel lift its restrictions on access to Gaza in compliance with UN Security Council resolution 1860 (2009).**

- (b) That this Council's decision be sent to the Local Government Association with a request to invite other Councils to follow our example**

59. Amendment to Appointment of Outside Body

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services which sought approval to amend the City Council's representative on the Birmingham Airport Holdings Limited Board of Directors following the resignation from the Board of Councillor John Mutton.

RESOLVED that the City Council appoint Councillor John McNicholas as the City Council's representative on the Birmingham Airport Holdings Limited Board of Directors and that Councillor McNicholas be authorised to exercise the Council's vote at General Meetings.

60. Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report to Council 2009/2010

The City Council considered the Scrutiny Boards' Annual report to the City Council for 2009/10.

It was noted that the report had been approved by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee on 1st September 2010 (their Minute 25/10 refers).

Resolved that the City Council note the Scrutiny Boards' Annual Report 2009/10.

61. 'Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS' White Paper – City Council Consultation Response

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Community Services which introduced the response to the public consultation on 'Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS', a White Paper published by the Government on 12 July 2010 (9.3(i)). Members also considered a political response from the ruling Labour Administration (9.3(ii)) and a briefing note from the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board 5).

The White Paper proposals represented the most radical restructuring of the NHS since its inception in 1948. Accompanying the White Paper were five detailed documents which addressed Transparency in Outcomes, Regulating Health Care Providers, Commissioning for Patients, Local Democratic Legitimacy in Health and a review of arms length bodies.

Councillor O'Boyle moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Lucas and carried:

"To move that reports numbered 9.3(i) and 9.3(ii) will be treated as one response to the Consultation: "Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS White Paper" from Coventry City Council, with report 9.3(ii) becoming the substantive response and report 9.3(i) becoming an appendix to the consultation response.

This will then be entitled: **Coventry City Councils response to Equity and Excellence: Liberating the NHS.** The first sentence in report 9.3(ii) will now read: Coventry City Council does not support these proposals. Paragraph 2.4 of the appendix will now read: Coventry City Council welcomes the opportunity to expose the political dimension within the White paper and therefore the response is written in that vein."

In moving the amended recommendation, the Cabinet Member agreed to incorporate the comments made by the Health and Social Care Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board 5) in the response. It was also clarified at the meeting that report 9.3 (i) would no longer be an officer report.

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

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

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillor Abbott	Councillor Andrews	
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Blundell	
Councillor Bains	Councillor Charley	
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor Cliffe	
Councillor Chater	Councillor Crookes	
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Mrs. Dixon	
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Foster	
Councillor Harrison	Councillor Gazey	
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Hammon	
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Mrs. Johnson	
Councillor A Khan	Councillor Lapsa	
Councillor T Khan	Councillor Lee	
Councillor Lakha	Councillor Lepoidevin	
Councillor Lancaster	Councillor Noonan	
Councillor Mrs Lucas	Councillor Ridley	
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Sawdon	
Councillor Maton	Councillor Skinner	
Councillor Mulhall	Councillor Taylor	
Councillor J. Mutton	Councillor Williams	
Councillor M. Mutton	Lord Mayor	
Councillor Nellist		
Councillor O'Boyle		
Councillor Ruane		
Councillor B Singh		

Councillor Singh Sehmi
 Councillor Skipper
 Councillor Mrs Sweet
 Councillor Townshend
 Councillor Walsh
 Councillor Welsh

Result: 30 for
 20 against
 0 abstentions

62. Question Time

The appropriate Members provided a written response to all the questions set out in the Questions Booklet, together with an oral response to 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:

No	Question Asked By	Question Put To	Subject Matter
1	Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Bains	CCTV Cameras
2	Councillor Ridley	Councillor Mrs Bigham	Blitz Memorial
3	Councillor Williams	Councillor Mrs Bigham	German Federal Railways test at Channel Tunnel
4.	Councillor Mrs Lucas	Councillor Townshend	Police House in Holbrooks
5.	Councillor Welsh	Councillor Kelly	GCSE and A-level results
6.	Councillor Welsh	Councillor Clifford	Recruitment of Social Workers from overseas
7.	Councillor Noonan	Councillor O'Boyle	Media coverage of an unkempt garden of a vulnerable individual
8.	Councillor Lapsa	Councillor Skipper	i-Cov Review
9.	Councillor Skinner	Councillor Mrs Bigham	Sounding of sirens in connection with the 70 th Anniversary of the Blitz

10. Councillor Crookes Councillor Harvard Temporary traffic arrangements on Gibbet Hill Road

63. Statement by the Leader of the Council – Regional Spatial Strategy and City Centre Action Plan

The Leader of the Council made a statement relating to the recently scrapped Regional Spatial Strategies and City Centre Action Plan indicating that it was an opportunity to re-work a new Core Strategy which would take into account regeneration, growth, and the employment and house building needs of the City.

The Leader informed members that a report on a new Core Strategy was being drafted and would be presented to a future meeting after which a consultation process would be undertaken.

The Leader of the opposition group responded to the Statement.

64. Debate – Coventry's Links with Warwickshire

Councillor Ridley moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Foster:

"This Council welcomes Bob Ainsworth's call for a public consultation on Coventry's links with Warwickshire"

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Mrs Bigham, seconded by Councillor Townshend, and carried:

Delete the word 'welcomes' and insert the word 'notes'.

Delete the words 'call for a public consultation' and insert the word 'views'.

The amendment now reads:

"This Council notes Bob Ainsworth's views on Coventry's links with Warwickshire."

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

Private Business

65. Validation of i-Cov Project's Value for Money

Further to Minute 36/10 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Chief Executive and the Director of Customer and Workforce Services which outlined work undertaken to provide an independent report into the value for money aspect of PwC's work on the implementation of the i-Cov project.

A corresponding public report was also submitted to the meeting (Minute 54 above refers).

The report indicated that SOCITM (Society of ICT Managers – an independent

group) had been commissioned to produce a report benchmarking the value of PwC's involvement on this project against typical rates and services available in the wider UK market. A copy of this document was appended to the report. To further support this, the Council had sought additional independent information from the Office of Government Commerce and the Eastern Shires Purchasing Organisation on behalf of Pro Five and had spoken to other local Authorities who had used PwC or other management consultants.

In summary, the data gathering exercise had found the cost of PwC's involvement to be towards the top end of the expected financial range for consultancy fees, but that given the complexity, breadth and depth of the ICT transformation programme and the current lack of managerial capacity within the department, that the high calibre of support provided by PwC's involvement represented value for money for the Council.

At their meeting, Cabinet had authorised officers to undertake negotiations on the lines now indicated, based on the information contained in the report.

RESOLVED That the City Council endorse the Cabinet's decision that officers be delegated authority to undertake negotiations on the lines now indicated, based on the information contained in the reportl.

66. Ricoh Arena Car Park C – Hotel Development Heads of Terms

Further to Minute 56 above relating to the public aspects of this matter, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development, which sought approval to proposals to facilitate hotel developments on Ricoh Arena car park C.

The report detailed commercially confidential and financial aspects relating to the proposal.

RESOLVED that the City Council:

- (1) Approve the main terms set out in the report as a conditional contract, on a subject to planning basis, for the surrender or assignment of the existing lease and the grant of new long leases up to a maximum term of 150 years to facilitate one or both hotel developments subject to the grant of planning permission.**
- (2) Delegate authority to the Director of City Services and Development and Assistant Director of Special Projects Finance/Assistant Director Financial Management, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member (City Development), to conclude all necessary documentation required to complete the land transaction based on the current assumption as to the parties concerned, in the most tax efficient way for the Council and to agree any costs that may result from complying with the heads of terms, providing that do not exceed £250,000.**

(Meeting closed: 7.35 pm)