

**COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY**

**7<sup>th</sup> December 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 Bailey	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor J. Mutton
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mrs. M. Mutton
Councillor Charley	Councillor Nellist
Councillor Chater	Councillor Noonan
Councillor Cliffe	Councillor O'Boyle
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Ruane
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Sehmi
Councillor Field	Councillor Singh
Councillor Foster	Councillor Skinner
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Harrison	Councillor Mrs Sweet
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Walsh
Councillor A Khan	Councillor Welsh
Councillor T Khan	Councillor Williams
Councillor Lancaster	
Councillor Lapsa	

Apologies: Councillor Hammon  
Councillor Lakha

**Public Business**

**83. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 19<sup>th</sup> October 2010 were agreed as a true record.

**84. Coventry Good Citizen Award**

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

"Gordon Horne has been involved with athletics in Coventry for almost 30 years. For all that time he has coached at Coventry Godiva Harriers and been involved with coaching and the organisation of schools' athletics and cross-country.

For the last 10 years, he has volunteered with the International Children's Games, taking young athletes around the world to take part in the Games and experience the different cultures. When the Games were held in Coventry in 2005 he organised and managed the athletics event at the Warwick University track.

As a result of his involvement in the sport, he has contributed to giving many young people the opportunity to realise their ambitions and achieve success. He does all this for his passion and love of athletics and seeing young people fulfil their potential.

Gordon is a 'Cov Kid' and, for his contribution to athletics in the City, thoroughly deserves to be recognised as a Good Citizen of Coventry."

## **85. Retirement of Officers**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent retirement of John McGuigan, Director of Strategic Planning and Partnerships at the end of November.

John was first appointed to the Council in 1980 for a period of four years before moving to Walsall. In 1988 he later returned as Assistant City Treasurer. This post he retained until becoming Director of City Development in 2002. John then moved on to become Director of Strategic Planning and Partnerships in September 2009, a post he retained until his retirement.

Members expressed their thanks to John for his service to the Council and wished him a long and happy retirement.

## **86. Petitions**

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

- (a) Request that the Earlsdon Festival be returned to Earlsdon Street – 548 signatures presented by Councillor Andrews.**
- (b) Objection to the proposed development of a single storey A1 Retail Unit with ancillary car parking for 14 vehicles at Unit 489 Holyhead Road Coventry by Tesco Stores Limited – 2,531 signatures presented by Councillor Ridley.**
- (c) Objection to the proposed Netto Store in Cheylesmore – 544 signatures presented by Councillor Foster.**
- (d) Condemning the Coalition Government for £81 billion being cut from public services – 171 signatures presented by Councillor Nellist.**

## **87. 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:

### **Minute 91 – Proposed Settlement of Equal Pay Claims**

#### Personal Interest

Councillor Bigham (Member of Unite)  
Councillor Chater (Member of GMB)  
Councillor Duggins (Member of Unite)  
Councillor Field (Member of Unite)  
Councillor A. Khan (Member of Unite)  
Councillor McNicholas (Member of Unite)  
Councillor M. Mutton (Member of Unite)  
Councillor Mulhall (Member of Unite)  
Councillor Townshend (Member of Unite)

#### **Interests in Debates**

### **Minute 95 – Debate – "Current Proposals for High Speed 2"**

#### Personal Interest

Councillor Skinner (Lives near the proposed route)

### **Minute 96 – Debate – "Abolition of the Education Maintenance Allowance"**

#### Personal Interest

Councillor Harvard (Tutor)  
Councillor Lapsa (Teacher at City College)  
Councillor Ridley (Girlfriend training to be teacher)  
Councillor Skipper (Tutor)

#### Prejudicial Interest

Councillor Foster (Councillor Foster left the Chamber for consideration of this item).

### **88. Amendments to the Constitution – Procedure Rules on Public Speaking at Planning Committee**

Further to Minute 18/10 of the Standards Committee, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services and the Development Manager which had previously been considered by the Constitution Working Group at their meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> November, 2010, which detailed proposed changes to the existing Constitution in respect of Planning Committee and replace them with the proposed Procedure Rules on Public Speaking and Functions Delegated to Employees.

Appended to the report were the relevant parts of the existing Constitution (4.10). It was these that were proposed to be amended and replaced with the suggested changes to the Public Speaking procedures for Planning Committee. The changes were proposed to ensure the Planning Committee operated in a more timely and efficient manner which achieved best use of resources in terms of value for money, was legally compliant and was fair and transparent to all elected Members and the public.

The Constitution Working Group had suggested changes to the proposals so that the right balance was struck between timeliness and efficiency whilst also allowing interested parties sufficient time to have their views heard by the Committee.

It was proposed to amend the Planning Committee Procedure Rules on Public Speaking in Sections 4.10.1.3 and 4 of the Constitution such that:

- (1) Members (or registered spokesperson) addressing Planning Committee in whatever capacity would be limited to a maximum of 5 minutes, with a further maximum of 2 minutes to summarise after all public speakers have spoken. All other speakers addressing the Committee (including petition spokespersons, applicants or their nominee) would be limited to a maximum of 3 minutes.
- (2) Previous reports to Standards Committee and Full Council proposed that "*no more than one nominated speaker (apart from a Member) can speak either in support of or against an application*". However, concern was expressed that this would not allow for adequate coverage of all relevant issues, particularly in cases where groups of residents had a wide range of comments regarding larger applications, which invariably raise varied and complex issues. Therefore, in recognition of this and also to strike the right balance with timeliness it was proposed that no more than 2 nominated speakers (apart from a Member) can speak in support of an application and no more than 2 nominated speakers (apart from a member) can speak against an application. But in the case of a planning application that was defined as a Major Application, the limit on the number of speakers would be at the discretion of the Chair of the Planning Committee.

A major application was defined as:-

For dwellings – where 10 or more dwellings were proposed, or if the number of dwellings was not given, the site area was more than 0.5 hectares.

For all other development – where the floor area to be built was over 1,000 sq.m or the site area was more than 1 hectare.

Or any other application as determined by the Chair

- (3) Speakers would be advised to avoid repetition of comments made by other speakers and would only be allowed to speak in respect of comments that had already been submitted in writing in respect of the application. For the purposes of good order, the Chair would be entitled to curtail public speaking where he or she deems necessary.

- (4) A registered speaker wishing to have supporting information displayed to the Planning Committee during the meeting will be required to submit this to Officers 24 hours before the start of the Planning Committee, and the content of the information to be displayed would be with the agreement of the Development Manager or nominee.
- (5) Speakers would only be allowed one opportunity to address the Committee, irrespective of whether the application was deferred to a later Planning Committee. However, if material changes arose following the deferment, or there were exceptional reasons submitted by the speakers to allow them to address the Committee again, the Chair of the Planning Committee had discretionary power to allow registered speakers an opportunity to address the Committee on the new issues.
- (6) No written additional information should be circulated to Members of the Planning Committee on the day of the Committee.

It was further proposed to amend Section 5.5.11 of the Constitution (Public Speaking at Planning Committee) and the accompanying Appendix 1 (Guide to Public Speaking at Planning Committee) in recognition of comments and concerns that had been raised in respect of suggested limitations on the number of speakers at Planning Committee. It was therefore suggested that greater opportunity be given for those persons wishing to register to speak. At present anyone wishing to register to speak must do so only within the 21 day notification period on a planning application. As an alternative it is proposed that anyone wishing to register to speak for or against an item that was required to be reported to Planning Committee could now do so up to 48 hours before the time of the Committee meeting (subject to limitations on the number of speakers proposed in (2) above). As the Committee schedule was normally compiled up to 2 weeks before the date of the meeting, writing to all persons who had commented on a planning application; the applicant or their agent; and Members could then inform them of their opportunity to register to speak. 48 hours would allow for sufficient notice for the applicant or their representative to be contacted and to organise having their right to reply.

In the event of elected Member requesting that an application be reported to Planning Committee, that they give material planning reasons for this in writing.

It was anticipated that, by reducing the number of less-contentious applications and enforcement matters that were reported to the Committee, these changes would improve the quality of decision and level of scrutiny given to larger, complex and significant planning applications by Planning Committee whilst still allowing Members and public representations to be fully covered in a succinct and timely manner that avoids unnecessary duplication or repetition of comments.

The Standards Committee had noted:-

- (1) that the Planning Committee would be asked to amend the current functions Delegated to Employees in the Land and Property Affecting Amenity part of the Constitution, such that the Head of Planning, Highways and Transportation and the Development Manager be delegated authority to make decisions relating to Building Control matters.

- (2) that the changes would be for an initial 12 month trial period, however, if significant issues arose, these could be reconsidered earlier, and in any event, a verbal report to be submitted to the Constitution Working Group on the changes would be made after 6 months.

Councillor Williams moved the following amendment which was seconded by Councillor Ridley and lost:

"That the Recommendations to Minute 18 of the Standards Committee, as set out on Page 4 of amended Booklet 1, be amended as follows:-

"Delete the whole of Recommendation 4 and insert the following new Recommendation 4:-

*There will be an opportunity for an unlimited number of nominated speakers to speak in support of an application and an opportunity for an unlimited number of public speakers to speak against an application.*

Delete the whole of Recommendation 5 and re-number Recommendations 6 and 7 accordingly".

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 Andrews	Councillor Mrs. Abbott	
Councillor Bailey	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 Field	Councillor Harrison	
Councillor Foster	Councillor Harvard	
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Kelly	
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor A. Khan	
Councillor Lapsa	Councillor T. Khan	
Councillor Lee	Councillor Ms Lancaster	
Councillor Mrs. Lepoidevin	Councillor Mrs. Lucas	
Councillor Nellist	Councillor McNicholas	
Councillor Noonan	Councillor Maton	
Councillor Ridley	Councillor Mulhall	
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor J. Mutton	
Councillor Skinner	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

The Council then voted on the recommendations of the Standards Committee as detailed above, a further recorded vote being requested 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 Mrs. Abbott	Councillor Andrews	
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Bailey	
Councillor Bains	Councillor Blundell	
Councillor Bigham	Councillor Charley	
Councillor Chater	Councillor Cliffe	
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Crookes	
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Mrs. Dixon	
Councillor Harrison	Councillor Field	
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Foster	
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Gazey	
Councillor A. Khan	Councillor Mrs. Johnson	
Councillor T. Khan	Councillor Lapsa	
Councillor Ms. Lancaster	Councillor Lee	
Councillor Mrs. Lucas	Councillor Mrs. Lepoidevin	
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Nellist	
Councillor Maton	Councillor Noonan	
Councillor Mulhall	Councillor Ridley	
Councillor J. Mutton	Councillor Sawdon	
Councillor M. Mutton	Councillor Skinner	
Councillor O'Boyle	Councillor Taylor	
Councillor Ruane	Councillor Williams	
Councillor B. Singh	Lord Mayor	
Councillor Singh Sehmi		
Councillor Skipper		
Councillor Mrs. Sweet		
Councillor Townshend		
Councillor Walsh		
Councillor Welsh		

Result: 28 for  
 22 against  
 0 abstentions

**RESOLVED that the Council approve the following amendments to Parts 4.10 and 5.5 of the Constitution as detailed below and shown as tracked changes in the attached extract from the Constitution.**

1. **Members (other than in a private resident capacity) can speak for 5 minutes and all other speakers for 3 minutes for petitions**
  2. **Members (other than in a private resident capacity) can speak for 5 minutes (plus a further 2 minutes to summarise) and all other speakers for 3 minutes for planning applications**
  3. **Speakers only allowed one opportunity to address the committee. However, if there are material changes that arise following a deferred application, or there are exceptional reasons submitted by the speakers, the Chair of Planning Committee has discretion to allow registered speakers to speak on new issues**
  4. **There will be no more than 2 nominated speakers (apart from a member) speaking in support of an application and no more than 2 nominated speakers (apart from a member) speaking against an application**
  5. **Where there is a Major Application the Chair of Planning Committee will have discretion to determine the number of speakers.**
  6. **No written additional information shall be circulated to Members of the Planning Committee on the day of the Committee. Supporting information must be submitted 24 hours before the start of the Committee meeting and the content of the information to be displayed will be with the agreement of the Development manager or nominee**
  7. **Those wishing to speak at Committee must register no later than 48 hours before the start of the Committee meeting.**
- 89. Licensing Act 2003 – Revised Statement of Licensing Policy**

Further to Minute 85/10 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Community Services, which sought to advise Members of the results of the consultation on the draft revised Statement of Licensing Policy under the Licensing Act 2003. The Licensing Policy had to be renewed every three years and this policy needed to be approved and in place by 6th January 2011 to allow Council to continue to carry out the functions of a licensing authority.

The report had also been considered by the Licensing and Regulatory Committee at their meeting on 10th November 2010. Details of their comments on the proposed amendments to the Policy were appended to the report.

Before determining policy for any three-year period, licensing authorities are required to carry out a wide consultation process. In addition to those consultees specified by the Act the Council had authority to include in the process any individuals or organisations it deemed appropriate. The revised Statement of Licensing Policy, which had been produced in compliance with revised government guidance, was attached to the report submitted as Appendix A. All the responsible authorities under that Act (West Midlands Police, West Midlands Fire Service, Coventry City Council - Planning, Trading Standards, Health & Safety, Environmental Protection, Coventry's Safeguarding Children Board) and the Community Safety Team, had already been involved in the drafting of the revised policy.

The Cabinet Office had issued guidance and a Code of Practice on the policy consultation process, which recommending a 12-week consultation period, and local authorities were encouraged to follow it.

A new consultation document, Rebalancing the Licensing Act, issued by the Home Office at the end of July 2010 outlined major changes to the Licensing Act 2003, however, licensing authorities have been advised to continue with their revisions to current licensing policies as the dates for implementation of any legislative changes were not yet fixed.

The public consultation exercise finished on 22nd October, and had included mail shots to local businesses and key partners; mail shots to residents groups and trade organisations; some consultation through residents' forums and access through the City Council website.

**RESOLVED that the City Council adopt the Revised Statement of Licensing Policy, attached as Appendix A to the report submitted, for the purposes of Section 5 of the Licensing Act 2003.**

#### 90. **Medium Term Financial Strategy 2011-2014**

Further to Minute 88/10 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which presented a Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) for 2011-2014 for adoption by the City Council. The previous strategy was approved in October 2009. The Strategy underpinned the medium term policy and financial planning process that was at the heart of setting the Council's revenue and capital budgets.

The report had also been considered by the Finance, Corporate and Neighbourhood Services Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board 1) at their meeting on 24th November 2010. A briefing note detailing their recommendations had been submitted to the Cabinet.

The Strategy was put forward at a time of massive financial challenges being faced both nationally and locally. The Spending Review (SR) announced by the Government on 20th October confirmed that local government faced headline cuts in resources in the region of 27% over four years. It was also clear from the large number of policy developments and reviews announced since the General Election that the Government was taking a new approach to public service provision. The MTFS submitted provided the financial framework to enable the Council to start to meet those financial challenges and the flexibility to continue to respond to the impacts of Government policy change over this period.

The Council's ABC Transformation Programme was now into its second year and would continue to be one of the fundamental parts of the Council's response to the current financial and policy environment. However, the scale and pace of the changes facing the Council mean that further radical change is required affecting the range of services that the Council provides, the organisational structures of these services, relationships with its key partners and its human resources policies.

Notwithstanding the results of the Spending Review, uncertainty remained over much of the detail of how it will affect the Council including the actual Formula Grant

settlement that it will receive. Therefore, the impact on the Council indicated in the report continued to be an estimate. More precise Formula Grant settlement and specific grant information was expected to be released over the coming weeks. The possibility remained that the impact would be so significant that the MTFS may need to be changed subsequently and this would be kept under review in the coming months.

In summary, the objectives of the Strategy were to provide the stable medium term financial base and sound financial planning framework required to enable the Council to meet the financial challenges posed by the Government's Spending Review; deliver its priorities and the ABC transformation agenda; and move towards a more strategic longer-term approach to delivering its revenue and capital plans and deliver effective financial management across all services.

The Strategy was appended to the report in full and was set within the context of the Council's commitment to delivering its vision, the Coventry Sustainable Community Strategy and the Corporate Plan. This would be particularly challenging at a time when a much lower level of funding would be available to local authorities through government grant. In order to meet this challenge and to strive to deliver better services, the Council indicated it was continuing to implement its ABC Transformation Programme. Over the coming medium-term period the Programme would incorporate a number of fundamental developments to the way the Council works including the delivery of more efficient and flexible services, greater collaboration with city and sub-regional partners, taking some difficult decisions and increasing focus on the Council's core business and policy priorities.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the Strategy as the basis of its medium term financial planning process.**

(NOTE:- Councillor Nellist voted against the proposed Medium Term Financial Strategy and asked that his opposition be recorded)

## **91. Proposed Settlement of Equal Pay Claims**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services which detailed the proposed settlement of Equal Pay Claims. The report indicated that the Council's Single Status Terms and Conditions were imposed in June 2005, and Single Status was introduced to eliminate traditional differences in pay and conditions between former officer and manual workers and introduce Equal Pay in the Council's workforce. Approximately 10,500 employees were affected by the introduction of single status. All councils had to implement similar schemes by April 2007, in accordance with the National Implementation Agreement of 2004.

The system was based on a job evaluation scheme, which scored jobs and fitted them into a new grading system. There was a 5 year protection scheme, negotiated previously with the Trade Unions, to protect, in cash terms, losses in pay suffered as a result of the introduction of Single Status.

In February 2006 the Birmingham Employment Tribunal began to receive equal pay claims from council employees, many of whom were gainers, (i.e were being paid more as a consequence of the introduction of single status than they had been previously) who felt they had a claim for equal pay because they had previously been in receipt of lower pay levels than an equivalent comparator. The majority of claims were brought by Trade Unions on behalf of employees, although some individual claims have been brought

by non union members. The number of current equal pay claims in the case in question stands at approximately 894. This multiple claim was closed by the Tribunal to new claimants after 9 August 2010. Since this date the Council have received a further 15 equal pay claims. These would be determined separately and were not the subject of this report.

Between September and December 2007 an employment tribunal heard those equal pay claims brought by female employees comparing themselves with refuse collectors and drivers who, prior to single status imposition, were in receipt of bonus payments. The council unsuccessfully defended these claims and appealed the tribunal's decision but subsequently lost its appeal.

The trade unions, on behalf of the claimants, also argued at the tribunal that the Council's five year pay protection agreement for Losers continued the inequality in pay and argued that the claimant in addition to being entitled to up to 6 years back pay were also entitled to compensation equivalent to an additional 5 years' pay protection for the years we continued to protect the comparator Losers. This issue had now been considered twice by a tribunal and on each occasion the Council had successfully defended this point. However, the trade unions have now lodged a further appeal against the tribunal's decision. This could take several months to be considered.

As a result of the commitment of the new administration of the Council in May, negotiations with the trade unions began in July 2010 in respect of the settlement of the current equal pay claims against the Council.

It was recognised that given their current vulnerability to litigation Trade Unions were not willing to recommend any negotiated settlements to their members of less than 100% of the claim for fear of being sued. However, at the close of the negotiations on 23<sup>rd</sup> November 2010, the trade unions confirmed that the terms of the proposed offer were such that they would not recommend rejection of the offer to their members.

The proposed settlement offer was not made to all 894 claimants. There were a number of claimants, currently 154, that were excluded where the Council was not satisfied that the claims were valid – for example where claimants were on a lower grade than their comparator; where claims were brought out of time or claimants were employed at Voluntary Aided schools, or the claims do not involve bonus earning comparators and significant further evidence was needed to determine whether there was a valid case.

The cost of settlement with the 740 of the 894 total claims totals approximately £5.6 million. The settlement of claims would be accompanied by a waiver from employees to the current and any future claims in respect of equal pay including claims against the pay protection scheme.

Discussions between the Council's and Trade Union legal advisors continue with regard to the legitimacy of the outstanding 154 claims and it was envisaged that a small number of these may be added to the settlement population at a later date.

In moving the recommendations, the Leader of the Council, Councillor John Mutton, provided updated figures which he indicated may be subject to further slight variations due to the complex nature of the circumstances of the cases.

In seconding the recommendations, the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor

Duggins, placed on record the Council's appreciation of the Leader's hard work in trying to resolve this issue and in moving the issue forward and bringing it to a conclusion.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:-**

- 740
- (1) **Approve the proposed settlement offer set out in the report to the claimants, to be met from within the estimated financial provision of up to £7.5m.**
  - (2) **Delegate authority to the Director of Customer and Workforce Services and the Director of Finance and Legal Services, in liaison with the Leader of the Council to accept any additional claims from those currently rejected and fund payments as outlined in the report and following recommendations from the Council's legal advisors. These additional claims were potentially drawn from the 154 rejected as referred to in section 2 of the report.**
  - (3) **Allow payments to be made on the proposed settlement up to a maximum total of £7.5 million.**

**92. Amendments to Appointments**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services which sought approval to amend appointments made at the Annual Meeting of the City Council in May 2010 and to nominate two representatives to the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) Board.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:-**

- (1) **Approve the replacement of Councillor Raja Mohammed Asif with Councillor Bally Singh as Deputy Chair of Children, Young People, Learning and Leisure Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board 2) with immediate effect.**
- (2) **Approve the replacement of Councillor Raja Mohammed Asif with Councillor Bally Singh on the Cabinet Advisory Panel – School Organisation with immediate effect.**
- (3) **Approve the nominations of Councillors Linda Bigham and John Mutton to the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Board in advance of its establishment before 1<sup>st</sup> April, 2011.**

**93. Question Time**

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

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question Asked By</b>	<b>Question Put To</b>	<b>Subject Matter</b>
1	Councillor Field	Councillor Mutton	Council Policy – Temporary

## Employment Contracts

2	Councillor Nellist	Councillor Mutton	Use of Agency Workers
3	Councillor Nellist	Councillor Mutton	ABC Programme
4	Councillor Lapsa	Councillor Khan	Kite Mark for Sports Facilities

**94. Statement by the Leader of the Council**

There was no statement by the Leader of the Council.

**95. Debate - High Speed 2**

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

"This Council formally objects to the current proposals for High Speed 2, noting its route would bypass the city and have a massive effect on the current fast service both North and South served well by Coventry Station. It would also devastate the long term development plans for the City Centre. We agree to formally work with Warwick District Council in support of their objections."

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Mutton, and, in accordance with Paragraph 4.1.62 of the City Council's Constitution, accepted by Councillor Lee:-

"That the debate as set out on the Council agenda at item 11.1 be amended as follows:-

In the final sentence, delete the words "Warwick District Council" and insert the words "Warwickshire County Council and the District Councils"

**RESOLVED that the following motion be adopted:-**

**"This Council formally objects to the current proposals for High Speed 2, noting its route would bypass the City and have a massive effect on the current fast service both North and South served well by Coventry Station. It would also devastate the long term development plans for the City Centre. We agree to formally work with Warwickshire County Council and the District Councils in support of their objections."**

**96. Debate – Education Maintenance Allowance**

Councillor Kelly moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Maton:-

"This Council opposes the abolition of the Education Maintenance Allowance. This is a retrograde step which will negatively affect the ability of the poorest and most disadvantaged young people to access further education, and will impact negatively on attainment at all levels and also on access to higher education."

The following amendment was moved by Councillor Sawdon, seconded by Councillor Mrs. Johnson, and lost:

"That the debate as set out on the Council agenda at item 11.2 be amended as follows:-

In the first sentence, delete the word "opposes" and replace with the word "regrets".

Delete all text after "Education Maintenance Allowance" on the first line, including the full stop and insert the following

", notes that it will be paid in full in the 2010/11 academic year and recognises, with a budget deficit of £150 billion, that difficult decisions have to be taken".

The amended debate now to read:-

This Council regrets the abolition of the Education Maintenance Allowance, notes that it will be paid in full in the 2010/11 academic year and recognises, with a budget deficit of £150 billion, that difficult decisions have to be taken. "

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

(Meeting closed at 6.15 p.m.)