

# COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

13<sup>th</sup> September 2011

## PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Mulhall)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Sawdon)

Councillor Abbott	Councillor Lancaster
Councillor Andrews	Councillor Lapsa
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin
Councillor Bailey	Councillor Mrs Lucas
Councillor Bains	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor J. Mutton
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mrs. M. Mutton
Councillor Chater	Councillor Nellist
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Noonan
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor O'Boyle
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Mrs Fletcher	Councillor Ruane
Councillor Foster	Councillor Sandy
Councillor Gannon	Councillor Sehmi
Councillor Hammon	Councillor Singh
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Skinner
Councillor Mrs Hetherton	Councillor Skipper
Councillor Howells	Councillor Mrs Sweet
Councillor Mrs. Johnson	Councillor Taylor
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Townshend
Councillor Kershaw	Councillor Walsh
Councillor A. Khan	Councillor Welsh
Councillor T. Khan	Councillor Williams

Apologies: Councillor Crookes  
Councillor Gazey  
Councillor Field  
Councillor Lakha  
Councillor Maton

## **Public Business**

### **36. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2011, were agreed as a true record.

### **37. Coventry Good Citizen Award – Mr John Marriott and Mrs Pat Watson**

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor and his Honour Judge Griffith-Jones, the Honorary Recorder, presented Mrs Pat Watson and Mr John Marriott, with the Coventry Good Citizen Award. Their citation read:

*"Pat Watson and John Marriott are often described as 'pillars of the community' in Henley. They regularly work over forty hours a week at their beloved Community Centre either in the crèche or café, or organising football tournaments and dances.*

*They were founding members of the Craven connection, the group that now runs their community centre, and through their dedication and hard work, the centre has gone from strength to strength.*

*Pat and John have volunteered hours of their time to ensure that there is a community facility in an area of Coventry where it is much needed, and supports local people with valuable resources. They also work closely with the local school, with whom they share some facilities and whose pupils have been delighted to see the growth of the first batch of chicks.*

*They have always worked with passion, drive and commitment and deserve to be recognised as Good Citizens of Coventry"*

### **38. Death of Councillor Harrison MBE. JP**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent sad death of Councillor Jack Harrison, MBE JP, who represented Lower Stoke ward since 1996.

Jack was Lord Mayor of the City for year 2009/10. He served as a Deputy Chair and Chair of Licensing and Regulatory Committee, a Cabinet Member for Community Services and a Cabinet Member for Service Performance and Support. He also served as a member of Scrutiny Boards 1, 2, 3 and many other bodies outside of the Council.

Members noted that the sincere condolences of the Council had been sent to Jack's family and paid tribute to the work carried out by Jack on behalf of the City.

### **39. Death of Former Lady Mayoress**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent sad death of Mrs June Hardy, Lady Mayoress of the City in 1990/91 being the wife of the late Councillor Bill Hardy.

June served the City with great dignity and dedication and Members noted that a letter expressing the Council's sincere condolences had been sent to her family.

### **40. Death of Lady Mayoress – Mrs Norma Mulhall**

The Deputy Lord Mayor referred to the recent sad death of Mrs Norma Mulhall, the current Lady Mayoress.

Norma, who was Lady Mayoress of the City for just two months, served the City with great dignity and dedication and was a great support to the Lord Mayor.

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

#### **41. Illuminated Address**

The Lord Mayor presented Former Councillor Brian Kelsey, Lord Mayor for 2010/11, with his Illuminated Address.

#### **42. Petitions**

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

- (a) Supporting the continuation of the Number 42 bus route - 305 signatures, presented by Councillor Blundell.**
- (b) Improvements to the Number 42 bus service - 282 signatures, presented by Councillor Blundell.**
- (c) Objection to retail use on the Tile Hill Social Club Site - 103 signatures, presented by Councillor Mrs Johnson.**
- (d) Request for barriers on the green space opposite The Shrubberies - 178 signatures, presented by Councillor Blundell. As the petitioners request had already been acceded to, Councillor Blundell asked that his petition be noted.**
- (e) Restriction of delivery times to the Asda Store, Jubilee Crescent - 17 signatures, presented by Councillor Skipper.**
- (f) Opposing application number TEL/2011/0601 (Proposal to erect a Phone Mast at junction of Gregory Hood Road and Leaf Lane) - 369 signatures, presented by Councillor Noonan.**

#### **43. 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, having regard to the National Code of Local Government Conduct and the City Council's Constitution:

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

###### **Personal Interests**

Minute 49 (Government Consultation Responding to the "Open Public Services" White Paper):

Councillor Foster (Owner and director of a small ICT firm in the City).  
Councillor Hammon (His company provides public services)  
Councillor Williams (Director of ICT company in the City)

Minute 54 (A Play Policy for Coventry):

Councillor Abbott (Friends of Caludon Castle)

**(b) Interests in Debate**

**Personal Interests:**

Councillor Chater (Son is Police Community Support Officer)

Councillor Lepoidevin (Husband is a Police Officer)

Councillor Taylor (Son is a Police Officer)

Councillor Williams (Brother in law is a Police Officer)

**44. Coventry City Council Code of Corporate Governance 2011 - 2014**

Further to Minute 3/11 of the of the Cabinet Member (Policy, Leadership and Governance), the City Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services which sought approval of the revised Coventry City Council's Code of Corporate Governance. The Code contained the six principles of good corporate governance and details of how Coventry City Council were meeting these principles. The Code provided a broad ethical framework for the Council and was last approved by the Council in March, 2009 (minute 120/08 refers).

The Council were responsible for ensuring that business was conducted in accordance with the law and proper standards and that public money was safeguarded and appropriately accounted for; used in an economical, efficient and effective manner. The Council were duty bound under the Local Government Act 1999 to make arrangements to secure continuous improvement in the way in which functions were exercised and having regard to a permutation of economy, efficiency and effectiveness. In discharging this overall responsibility the Council were responsible for putting in place proper arrangements for the governance of its affairs, including arrangements for the management of risks.

It was good practice for councils to have a Code of Corporate Governance that would lead to quality management, excellent performance and good stewardship of public money. Good governance enabled the authority to pursue its vision effectively as well as underpinning that vision with systems for management control. The Code was a public document which set out the way the Council met its commitments in demonstrating that it had the necessary corporate governance arrangements in place to perform successfully. Best practice was set out in the 2007 publication by CIPFA/SOLACE (CIPFA Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy and SOLACE Society of Local Authority Chief Executives) 'Delivering Good Governance in Local Government'. The Council first approved and adopted its Code of Corporate Governance in March 2009. The adopted Code was consistent with the principles of the CIPFA/SOLACE framework.

The Code had now been reviewed and updated, to reflect changes that had taken place since its publication in 2009. The draft Code of Corporate Governance had been considered by relevant officers including officers in Finance, Legal, Performance and Scrutiny and Corporate Policy in order to update the Code as part of the review, as well as members of the Constitution Working Group. The review of the Code did not identify any areas of non-compliance.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the revised three year Code of Corporate Governance 2011-2014.**

#### **45. Audit Committee Annual Report 2010-11**

Further to Minute 8/11 of the Audit Committee, the City Council considered the Annual Report of the Audit Committee 2010/11.

During 2010/11, the Audit Committee had met formally on seven occasions. Meetings were held in June, July, September, November and December 2010, and in February and April 2011. The report gave details of the reports considered by the Audit Committee in 2010/11 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, Asset Management, Foster Care Payments, Business Continuity, ICT Service, Purchasing Cards, Capital Receipts 2010/11 and Future Forecasting and Data Quality.

The Council had made significant enhancements to its Audit Committee arrangements over the last few years and this was supported through the setting up of a 'stand alone' Audit Committee. However, there were still areas for development for the Audit Committee, which included formalising training arrangements, gaining an independent view as to how well the Committee is performing, and keeping abreast of national development and their potential impact on the operation of the Audit Committee.

In 2011/12, the Audit Committee's initial focus would be on ensuring that effective action was taken in response to areas for improvements highlighted in the Annual Governance Statement 2010/11. From an audit perspective, the following five areas were identified as a result of work carried out by the Council's Internal and External Auditors:-

- (a) Addressing the recommendations highlighted in the Audit Commissions Annual Audit Letter.
- (b) Developing processes to support the implementation across Coventry schools of the proposed new Schools Financial Value Standard.
- (c) Ensuring the effectiveness of arrangements in place to oversee the Council's ICT requirements, post the implementation of the Council's new ICT Service.
- (d) Ensuring that the Council's key financial systems continue to provide adequate safeguards against the risk of fraud, especially in the current economic climate.
- (e) Continue to embed systems covering corporate governance arrangements with the Council, such as declarations of interests and hospitality registers. This will also include gaining assurances that effective arrangements are in place to oversee such activities.

In addition, the Audit Committee would continue to focus on providing challenge and scrutiny of the Council's financial position in 2011/12 and beyond; assessing the quality of work of both Internal and External Audit to ensure that the Council obtains maximum value from its investment in audit work carried out; and ensuring that officers respond promptly to issues highlighted at the Audit Committee meetings. This could range from the implementation of audit recommendations through to responding to budgetary control pressures and, as part of this process, officers will be asked to attend meetings, if appropriate, to justify their actions especially where progress made had failed to match expectations.

**RESOLVED that the City Council receive the Audit Committee 2010/11 Annual Report and note the Committee's priorities for 2011/12.**

#### **46. The Coventry Local Development Plan 2013 - 2030**

Further to Minute 41/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development which set out the Council's draft Local Development Plan, which was proposed to replace the Coventry Development Plan 2001.

The Coventry Local Development Plan (LDF) was the development plan for Coventry, which would replace the Coventry Development Plan 2001. The key document was the Core Strategy, which set out the guiding principles, and to which more detail would be added. This would be through a combination of other development plan documents considering Site Allocations, a new City Centre Area Action Plan, and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), as well as Supplementary Planning Documents.

The Council had considered a report on the Core Strategy at their meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2010 (their minute 36/10 refers). Following consideration of that report, employees had worked together with Members to identify issues facing the City, and options to best manage the future development of Coventry. The Proposed Core Strategy appended to the report was a result of this joint working.

The Core Strategy had to be prepared under the reformed planning system, introduced through the 2004 Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act ("the Act"). The Act, together with the associated regulations, emphasised that community engagement should be 'frontloaded'. It also set out the procedures that were to be followed, including carrying out Sustainability Appraisal and that the Core Strategy must conform generally with the Regional Spatial Strategy. This currently required Coventry to accommodate 14,800 new homes between 2001 and 2021. The Core Strategy had to run for 15 years from the date it would be adopted (2013) so would go beyond the 2021 cut off date for the Regional Spatial Strategy. This meant that the Council would have to agree its own target for new homes, but taking the 14,800 figure into account. It did not mean that the Council would be forced to accept 33,500 new homes between 2006 and 2026, because that version of the Regional Spatial Strategy was never formally adopted.

The Government had indicated that it wished to retain development plans, including Core Strategies, and was considering a presumption in favour of 'sustainable development' in areas that were not covered by an up to date development plan. The Proposed Core Strategy document sought views on what the strategy should be to guide the future development of Coventry.

The revised Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was also appended to the report and set out how the Council would involve local people, as well as all other stakeholders with an interest in the development of Coventry. It had been revised following the Planning Peer Review, which was completed by an independent panel including both senior officers of other Councils and a Member of a Council's Planning Committee.

The Peer Review identified engagement with the community as a potential improvement, and as a result the SCI was subject to independent scrutiny by a consultancy firm. However, Planning Policy Statement 12 (PPS12) stated that when producing a new or revised Core Strategy, following a major change in circumstances, a rather different level of consultation may be appropriate where some specific aspect of the

Core Strategy was being revised.

The Cabinet had considered the two realistic options available to the Council. The first was to do nothing and rely on the national planning policies, currently Planning Policy Guidance (PPG), Planning Policy Statements (PPS), and the draft National Planning Policy Framework. However, this option was rejected because it also risked the development of Green Belt and other Greenfield land, in an ad-hoc way.

The alternative option was to proceed towards an up to date LDF. This option offered greater protection for Green Belt and other Greenfield land, as well as numerous other advantages. It offered the opportunity to set local targets to address specific local priorities, and manage the development of Coventry in a cogent rather than ad-hoc way.

It was therefore recommended that each of the documents appended to the report (the Coventry Local Development Plan Proposed Core Strategy 2011; the Revised Local Development Scheme 2011 and the Revised Statement of Community Involvement 2011) be subject to public consultation for six weeks from Monday 19th September 2011.

The Economy, Regeneration and Transport Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board (3)) would also be formally consulted as part of this process, as well as Residents' Groups and Ward Forums.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Approve a six week period of consultation, from 19<sup>th</sup> September - 31<sup>st</sup> October on the proposed Core Strategy and Statement of Community Involvement**
- (2) Agree the submission of the Local Development Scheme to the Secretary of State.**

**47. A Play Policy for Coventry**

Further to Minute 43/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development and the Director of Children, Learning and Young People which sought approval for a corporate Play Policy.

The Cabinet had approved the development of the Play Policy in October 2009 (their minute 71/09 refers), following the development of the draft policy in conjunction with the Children, Learning and Leisure Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board (2)).

Coventry was awarded nearly £2m from the Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) Playbuilder and Big Lottery Play Programme to develop and improve 22 play areas in Coventry by March 2011. The report identified the play areas that had been completed or were at implementation stage.

Through the delivery of this programme, areas of work such as design, community engagement and risk management had developed and progressed to take into account national good practice and guidelines. Over the past three years there had been a lot of work developed nationally in terms of guidance and policy and good practice recommendations.

The work of the Play Strategy had been evaluated and four case studies had been

identified, the recommendations of which had been fed into the development of the Play Strategy. Details of the four case studies, located at Canley Brook, Parwood Meadows, Primrose Hill Park and Sovereign Row, were provided at Appendix 3 of the report.

As recommended by Cabinet in October 2009 the development of a corporate Play Policy became part of the work programme for Scrutiny Board 2. The Policy covered the principles of play; practice; community engagement; design; risk management; inspection and maintenance; planning; partners and governance.

Once the Playbuilder and Big Lottery Play Programme came to an end, Children, Learning and Young People's Directorate would cease to play a role in the development or refurbishment of play areas or in the co-ordination of services across the Council. The Play Policy was a means of embedding the good practice which had been developed and the policy decisions which had been taken over the last 3 years. It was important to identify how the policy would be monitored and evaluated. The current Play Champion, Councillor Kelly, had proposed that this be done through regular performance management reports to the Play Champion from the City Services and Development Directorate, where the delivery services responsible for play areas and maintenance sat. It was therefore recommended that these arrangements be embedded into the portfolio responsibilities for a Cabinet Member, as the Play Champion, currently Cabinet Member (Education).

The draft Play Policy, which was appended to the report, covered the first three recommendations from the report Developing a Corporate Play Policy which was considered by the Children, Young People, Learning and Leisure Scrutiny Board (2) in July 2010 (their minute 6/10 refers).

Scrutiny Board 2, as part of their task and finish group, had recommended that employees draft an agreed form of wording for signs that could be erected on land in housing developments at the start of the construction work, that would be used to mark out space which has been allocated for play. The costs of this would be funded by the contractor.

The Play Policy had a section dedicated to community engagement, based upon the model that had been developed through the Play Strategy. The content of the Play Policy has been developed with the support of Scrutiny Board 2 and play professionals had been consulted and provided an input into the Policy through the North East Play Practitioners group. In addition, children from Broad Heath Urban Explorers after-school club had been consulted on the content of the Play Strategy.

Approval of the Policy would mean that the learning and good practice from the implementation of the Play Strategy 'Something to do' would be mainstreamed into practice and would continue to build upon the successful work developed over the last three years.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Agree that the role of Play Champion be included in the portfolio of the Cabinet Member (Education), to be nominated on an annual basis by Council.**
- (2) Agree that authority be delegated to the Director of City Services and Development (or their delegated Senior Officer) to draft an agreed**

**form of wording for signs that could be erected on land in housing developments at the start of the construction work which will be used to mark out space which.**

- (3) Approve the adoption of the attached draft Play Policy as Council Policy (Appendix 1 of the report submitted)**
- (4) Agree that the Play Policy, once adopted, sits under the Core Strategy or equivalent.**

**48. Response to Consultation Paper – "Implementing Social Housing Reform: Directions to the Social Housing Regulator"**

Further to Minute 44/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Community Services which outlined the Council's proposed response to a government consultation on the draft directions from the Secretary of State to the newly appointed Social Housing Regulator.

On 7<sup>th</sup> July 2011, the Government published a consultation on the draft directions from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government to the Social Housing Regulator. In April 2012 responsibility for social housing regulation will transfer from the Tenants' Services Authority to the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA).

The directions would help inform the set of standards for Registered Social Housing Providers, and included, amongst others, the following proposals:

- Tenure Reform – to allow flexible tenancy agreements
- Rent – to make changes to reflect the introduction of the "affordable rent" model
- Quality of Accommodation – to reinforce the need to maintain housing stock at an appropriate level.

In considering the proposed response, the Cabinet had expressed concern at the lack of security for tenants in flexible tenure agreements, and suggested that there should be a number of safeguards for vulnerable households in those circumstances. The Council's full response to the consultation was at Appendix 1 to the report.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the consultation response.**

**49. Government Consultation Responding to the "Open Public Services" White Paper**

Further to Minute 45/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Assistant Chief Executive, which outlined the proposed response to a Government consultation on the "Open Public Services" White Paper. The White Paper sets out an outline vision of modernised public services where:

- Wherever possible, increase choice
- Public services should be decentralised to the lowest appropriate level
- Public services should be open to a range of providers
- Fair Access is assured
- Public Services should be accountable to users and to taxpayers

The City Council was ahead of many authorities in that it already commissions its services from a range of providers, and works closely with the voluntary sector in the development of services. The proposed response to the consultation document was detailed in full at Appendix 1 of the report submitted.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the consultation response.**

#### **50. Draft National Planning Policy Framework Consultation**

Further to Minute 46/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development which outlined the proposed response to a Government Consultation paper on the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Government was consulting on the development of a National Framework to replace various documents issued which provided supplementary guidance on planning matters, in order to consolidate these into a single volume.

Cabinet had expressed concern over the proposal to remove offices from the "town centres first" policy, in that it represented a significant risk to the regeneration of the city centre. Recent re-developments such as the relocation of the Severn Trent building had made a significant impact on the retail economy in the city centre.

The framework included the "presumption in favour of sustainable development", in the event that a local plan is out of date, silent, absent, or indeterminate. The implication of this in the short term at least is significant, as existing plans (in Coventry's case the 2001 Coventry Development Plan) would effectively be superseded by the Framework. There would inevitably be a period of policy vacuum between the Framework coming into force and the new Coventry Core Strategy being formally adopted. During this time, the focus would be shifted from determining Planning Applications in accordance with the Development Plan (unless there were material reasons for not doing so) to a presumption of sustainable development unless it could be proven that the harm caused clearly outweighed the benefits of the development.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the consultation response.**

#### **51. Delegation of Responsibility for Approval of Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services which sought approval to give the Audit Committee the constitutional power to approve the City Council's Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement on an annual basis. This power currently resided with Council.

The City Council's Constitution currently required the Council to approve the annual Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement. In recent years the City Council's Audit Committee had become the key body in respect of understanding, analysing and discussing the content of these statements and Audit Committee members had received training to allow them to undertake these duties. Subsequent consideration by full Council had been undertaken only because the Audit Committee within its terms of reference was not empowered currently to approve the Statements.

When the Audit Committee was set up in 2009, the Council adopted its terms of reference which was reflective of CIPFA guidance titled "Audit Committees – Practical

Guidance for Local Authorities". CIPFA guidance did not specifically consider whether the Audit Committee could also approve the accounts (including the Annual Governance Statement) but the Accounts and Audit Regulations 2003 did allow this as it stated that the accounts should "be approved by a resolution of a committee of the relevant body or otherwise by a resolution of the members of the body meeting as a whole".

Since the Audit Committee had been set up, it had provided critical independent challenge over all aspects of the Council's financial performance including the annual accounts. Given this role, as well as the change in presentation to International Financial Reporting Standards and the training received by Audit Committee members for considering these statements, it was considered appropriate to change the responsibility for approval of the Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement from Council to the Audit Committee. This would align the expertise required and current constitutional responsibility for considering the two statements with the power for approving them. It represented a natural extension of the existing remit of the Audit Committee and provided for a more efficient process than the current one in which Council approved the accounts based on the advice of the Audit Committee.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve a change to the Constitution regarding the Terms of Reference for Audit Committee to allow it to approve the City Council's Statement of Accounts and Annual Governance Statement.**

## **52. 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:

<b>No.</b>	<b>Question Asked By</b>	<b>Question Put To</b>	<b>Subject Matter</b>
1.	Councillor Foster	Councillor Noonan	Attendance by Police representatives at Cheylesmore Ward Forum to provide update on work in the Ward
2.	Councillor Blundell	Councillor B Singh	To include 'Save our City Centre' on agenda for the Whoberley Ward Forum
3.	Councillor Williams	Councillor Duggins	Removal of e-petition from Council's website
4.	Councillor Lapsa	Councillor Khan	Use of ERDF funding
5.	Councillor Blundell	Councillor Bigham	Review retail offer in the City Centre
6.	Councillor Sawdon	Councillor J Mutton	HS2 consultation debate
7.	Councillor Mrs Dixon	Councillor Duggins/ Councillor Kelly	Reason for cancellation of meeting in respect of Caludon Castle's Academy Status.

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

There was no statement.

#### 54. Debate – Call for Review of Reduction in Police Funding

Councillor Bains moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Mrs Lucas:

"The events of disorder seen across the West Midlands and our City in recent weeks serve to remind us of the relevance of policing numbers. It has only been through the ability of West Midlands Police Force to draw upon large numbers of highly trained and experienced officers – in the shorter term to deal with disturbances and the longer term to provide reassurance to our communities – that, in Coventry and the rest of the West Midlands, we have not seen an escalation of disorder of the level that has been experienced in the past – be that in West Midlands or elsewhere in the Country.

However, while forces like West Midlands Police have expended high levels of resource responding to the disorder, under this Tory – led government, they also face the largest reductions in their budgets.

Consequently, this Council calls on the Government to undertake an urgent review of the total proposed reduction in police funding and the distribution of the cuts. Furthermore, in consideration of the potential for violent disorder the same time next year when the Olympic Games will be taking place in some of our Cities, including Coventry, this Council calls upon the government to commission HMIC (Her Majesty's Inspector of Constabularies) to undertake an urgent review of resilience.

Finally, we should remind the government, that if our calls are ignored, not only will the safety of our own people and others – such as visitors to the games - be placed at risk, but so will the reputation of this City and our Country."

**RESOLVED that the 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 amendment were as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillor Abbott	Councillor Andrews	
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Bailey	
Councillor Bains	Councillor Blundell	
Councillor Mrs Bigham	Councillor Mrs Dixon	
Councillor Chater	Councillor Foster	
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Hammon	
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Mrs Johnson	
Councillor Mrs Fletcher	Councillor Lapsa	
Councillor Gannon	Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin	
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Noonan	
Councillor Mrs Hetheron	Councillor Ridley	
Councillor Howells	Councillor Sawdon	
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Skinner	
Councillor Kershaw	Councillor Taylor	
Councillor T Khan	Councillor Williams	

Councillor Lancaster  
Councillor Mrs Lucas  
Councillor McNicholas  
Councillor J Mutton  
Councillor Mrs M Mutton  
Councillor Nellist  
Councillor O'Boyle  
Councillor Ruane  
Councillor Sandy  
Councillor Singh  
Councillor Sehmi  
Councillor Skipper  
Councillor Mrs Sweet  
Councillor Townshend  
Councillor Walsh  
Councillor Welsh  
Lord Mayor

Result: 32 for  
15 against  
0 abstentions

(Meeting closed: 5.15 p.m.)