

## COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

18<sup>th</sup> October 2011

### PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Mulhall)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Sawdon)

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

Apologies: Councillor Sandy

### **Public Business**

#### **55. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 13<sup>th</sup> September 2011, were agreed as a true record.

#### **56. Return of Catherine Miks, Labour Party, Elected as Councillor for the Lower Stoke Ward**

The Lord Mayor welcomed the return of Councillor Catherine Miks who was elected on 6<sup>th</sup> October 2011 for the Lower Stoke Ward.

## 57. 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 item of business indicated below on the grounds that this 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
74	Lease Negotiation and Land Transfer at Bishop Street and Tower Street	3 and 4

## 58. Coventry Good Citizen Award

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor and his Honour Judge Griffith-Jones, the Honorary Recorder, presented Mr Geoff Swards' with the Coventry Good Citizen Award. Their citation read:

*"Geoff Swards' sole objective has been to serve the people of Finham which he has done tirelessly with efficiency, enthusiasm and objectivity. With his extensive knowledge, expertise and experience in dealing with both councillors and Council officers he has resolved numerous issues.*

*He has always kept in touch with local issues and with his ear constantly to the ground he has proved invaluable to councillors, helping them to serve the residents of Finham. It is nearly all due to him that the Finham Residents Association is one of the most highly regarded residents groups in the city. Indeed, he has been their Secretary for 34 years.*

*In all his public work, for the Residents Association, as a School Governor, as Chairman of the Coventry School Governors Association and as an Election Candidate and Party Official, Geoff has never sought any personal reward or recognition but has worked purely for the good of others.*

*For his selfless and tireless work for the community in Finham, Geoff Swards deserves the accolade of being a Coventry Good Citizen".*

## 59. Death of Joseph Ijoma

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent sad death of Joseph Ijoma who was an Authority Governor at Stivichall Primary School and Chairman of Styvechale Grange Residents Association.

Members noted that the sincere condolences of the Council had been sent to Joseph's family.

## 60. Petitions

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

- (a) Request for the removal of clutter on the highways and obstructions on tactile paving, in accordance with the Highways Act 1980 – 118 signatures, presented by Councillor O’Boyle.
- (b) Opposing any retail use in the design of future buildings on the Tile Hill Social Club site and requesting houses and parking spaces, to be available for users of Jardine Crescent facilities - 76 signatures, presented by Councillor Mrs Hetherton.
- (c) Objection to the use of the green between Studland Green and Shillingstone Close by adults and children over 10 years old for playing football - 17 signatures, presented by Councillor Mrs Dixon.
- (d) Request for the formation of a Young Person’s Council in Tile Hill - 176 signatures, presented by Councillor Mrs Johnson.
- (e) Request for the City Council to commission further investigations by the health Scrutiny Board into water fluoridation - 317 signatures, presented by Councillor Mrs Johnson.
- (f) Objection to increase in the cost of fees for books of visitor permits for the Residents Parking Scheme in Starley Road – 40 signatures, presented by Councillor Nellist.
- (g) Request for dangerous dogs to be assessed by the RSPCA – 115 signatures – presented by Councillor Lancaster.
- (h) Request for a fair wage for Council workers – 261 signatures, presented by Councillor Nellist.
- (i) Objection to the Lyons Park Development – Peugeot Warehouse – 35 signatures, presented by Councillor Kershaw.

**61. Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared interests as follows:

**Interests in Recommendations for the Council**

**Personal Interests**

Minute 63 (Department of Education Consultations: School Funding Reform – Proposals for a Fair System and Implementation of the 2010-2011 Review of Education Capital (The James Review)):

- Councillor Foster (Relative is a teacher)
- Councillor Harvard (Education Lecturer)
- Councillor Howells (City Council appointed Authority Governor)
- Councillor Kelly (City Council appointed Authority Governor)
- Councillor Kershaw (City Council appointed Authority Governor)
- Councillor Lapsa (Education Lecturer)
- Councillor J. Mutton (City Council appointed Authority Governor)
- Councillor Nellist (Relative is a teacher)

Councillor Ridley (Partner is a teacher)  
Councillor Bigham (Relative is a teacher)  
Councillor Field (Relative is a teacher)  
Councillor Williams (Relative is a teacher)  
Councillor Skipper (Education Lecturer)

Minute 67 (Replacement of the Financial Information System):

Councillor Foster (Owner and Director of small ICT firm in the City)  
Councillor Williams (Owner and Director of small ICT firm in the City)

Minute 68 (Lease Negotiations and Land Transfer Bishop Street/Tower Street):

Councillor Ridley (Relative is an employee of Royal Mail)  
Councillor Welsh (Royal Mail employee)

**62. Consultation Response on the Allocation Options for Distribution of Additional Funding to Local Authorities for Local HealthWatch, NHS Complaints Advocacy and PCT Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards**

Further to minute 56/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Community Services, which outlined a proposed response to a Government consultation on the allocation options for the distribution of additional funding for Local HealthWatch, NHS Complaints Advocacy and PCT Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards (DOLS), which was required by 24<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

It was proposed that Local HealthWatch would be established in October 2012 and would continue the functions currently provided by Local Involvements Networks (LINKs). Additionally, the Local HealthWatch would also signpost citizens to information about health and social care services, a service currently provided by the PCT Patient Advice and Liaison Services (PALS). The consultation also sought views on whether a minimum allocation for each local authority to reflect the fixed costs of setting up and running a signposting service should be included within the allocation methodology.

The Department of Health currently managed the contract for the NHS advocacy services from the Independent Complaints Advocacy Services (ICAS). This contract was due to end in March 2013 and it was proposed that from April 2013, the commissioning for NHS advocacy would move to local authorities. The service could be commissioned from either a Local HealthWatch organisation or a third party provider.

In addition, the Council currently received funding to undertake Deprivation of Liberty Safeguards assessments in residential care to support and care for people who lack mental capacity. The PCT had responsibility to undertake DOLS assessments in health settings. It was proposed that responsibility for these assessments would transfer to the local authorities from either October 2012 or April 2013.

The allocation options for all services would either be based on the adult working age population, adjusted for area costs, or be based on the social care relative needs formula. The purpose of the consultation was to provide local authorities to indicate their preference on these funding options.

The Council's proposed response was detailed in full in the appendix to the report and, in summary, indicated that the Council's preferred funding option for the Local

HealthWatch, NHS Complaints Advocacy Service and DOLS was that they should be based on the Adult Social Care Relative Needs Formulae. The Council also agreed that the proposal for a minimum allocation in respect of Local HealthWatch and DOLS.

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

**63. Department for Education Consultations: School Funding Reform – Proposals for a Fair System and Implementation of the 2010-11 Review of Education Capital (The James Review)**

Further to minute 57/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Children, Learning and Young People, which sought approval of a proposed response to two consultations from the Department for Education (DfE) in relation to "School Funding Reform – Proposals for a Fair System" and "Implementation of the 2010-11 Review of Education Capital (The James Review)".

The DfE had issued two consultations in July 2011 in relation to school and education funding reform for revenue and capital. The school funding revenue consultation followed an earlier 6 week consultation on the rationale and principles for school funding reform which had ended in May 2011. The education capital consultation followed the publication of the James Review in April 2011. The Cabinet noted that the deadline for responses to both consultations was 11<sup>th</sup> October 2011.

The consultations contained a wide range of proposals for school and education funding, which included:

- Changes to the way that funding for schools and education is distributed nationally to Local Authorities
- Changes to the role of the Local Authority and other partners in relation to revenue and capital funding
- Increased central prescription and scrutiny of Local Authorities in relation to the allocation of funding
- Potentially significant changes in relation to funding for pupils with high needs
- Future arrangements for the distribution of the Pupil Premium Grant
- Introduction of national procurement frameworks for capital projects and national project management arrangements to support procurements
- Timing of move to a new system and potential transitional arrangements

Education revenue funding for the City formed part of the ringfenced dedicated schools grant. This amounted to £234M in 2011/12, and Education capital funding for 2011/12 amounted to approximately £12M. Changes in how funding was distributed could significantly impact upon funding levels for the City and its schools.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Agree the proposed response to the school funding consultation set out in Appendix A to the report.**
- (2) Agree the proposed response to the education capital consultation set out in Appendix B to the report.**

#### **64. Response to Consultation – Local Government Resources Review: Proposals for Business Rate Retention**

Further to minute 58/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which sought approval of a proposed response to a Government consultation on the Local Government Resources Review: Proposals for Business Rate Retention.

The Government had stated that its intention would be to allow authorities to benefit from future increases in Business Rates. The downside of this approach was the risk of local authorities losing resources if the level of Business Rates was reduced. The report detailed the current system of local government funding along with the Governments' design principles and the key issue resulting from the proposals.

In summary, the Government intended to establish a baseline position in 2013-14 for each local authority in terms of the amount of money they receive from central government via their Formula Grant Allocation and the level of business rates that were collected in the area. Using the baseline position, the Government would develop a process of tariffs or top ups, with the intention of achieving a fair starting point for all areas. From the first year of introducing this new model (expected to be 2013), local authorities whose level of business rates increases would be able to benefit by keeping a "significant proportion" of any increase in business rates yields above the baseline position, while those whose level of business rates declines would lose overall resources.

To manage the possibility that some local authorities with high business rate taxbases could see disproportionate financial gains, the Government proposed that they collect a levy recouping a share of disproportionate benefit; and use the proceeds to help manage large, unforeseen negative volatility in individual authorities' budgets.

In addition, the proposed new system would have features to enable it to be reviewed or "reset" in the future, if the Government felt that the level of business rates no longer met local service needs/pressures. The proposed system included voluntary pooling arrangements of local authorities within a geographic area, to share the benefits of growth, help avoid the impacts of displacement and smooth the impact of volatility across a wider economic area.

The consultation response made it clear that the Council favours the principle of giving local authorities greater financial autonomy and strengthening the incentives to support local economic growth. However, the Government's proposals represented a move away from settlements based on resourcing needs and the response expressed opposition to this change in approach.

The Cabinet noted that there was a strong possibility that the Council would suffer a reduction in funding as a result of these proposals and, in addition, they introduced a significant uncertainty into funding arrangements. It was felt that this uncertainty would have a detrimental effect on the Council's ability to carry out effective financial planning.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the proposed response to the consultation as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report.**

## **65. Government Consultation – Responding to the Localising Support for Council Tax in England Consultation**

Further to minute 59/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which sought approval of a proposed response to a Government consultation on Localising Support for Council Tax in England.

The Government's Welfare Reform Bill 2011 included provision for the establishment of a Universal Credit (UC) to replace a range of existing means-tested benefits. The Bill made provision for the abolition of housing benefit and council tax benefit, which were both currently administered by local authorities on behalf of the Department for Works and Pensions (DWP). Support for housing costs to replace housing benefit was to be included within the new UC. However, via this consultation, the Department for Communities and Local Government was proposing that support for council tax, which was due to be cut by 10 per cent (£490m), be localised for Council's to design and administer their own schemes of support. A 10 per cent cut in funding would mean that Coventry would have £3m less than it currently receives to help low income households with their council tax costs.

The proposed response, which was appended to the report, covered the following themes:

- The 10 per cent funding reduction for localised schemes would cause significant hardship to low income households and it was unreasonable to expect Councils to protect work incentives whilst administering such significant cuts in support;
- The Council argued that there should be a properly funded national system of council tax support and that, if the Government is determined to proceed with reform of the welfare system then, UC should include an element for council tax which should be credited directly to the council tax account. This represented a better outcome for benefit claimants and for the Council in terms of financial risk;
- Councils would bear the financial risk of fluctuations in eligibility for support. Council tax collection rates would be adversely affected as Councils were forced to collect additional council tax from people who had been put in hardship as a result of the 10 per cent cut in funding;
- The April 2013 timescale was challenging and it was unclear how the implementation costs would be met;
- Localised support for council tax appeared contrary to the Government's wider programme of Welfare reform which would centralise and rationalise existing benefits under the UC;
- The consultation identified a key benefit of localised schemes as giving Councils a greater stake in tackling unemployment. This purported benefit was illusory; broadly Councils did not need further incentives to tackle unemployment as this was already high on the agenda for local authorities. The task of tackling unemployment would be made significantly more difficult with the existence of disparate local schemes administering 10 per cent less support than was currently provided to low income households;
- It was unclear whether support for council tax would be included within the proposed total benefits cap. If it were to be included, and council tax support was restricted as a result of the cap, this would increase the administrative complexity of local schemes and increase financial risk to the Council.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the proposed response to the Localising Support for Council Tax in England consultation as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.**

## **66. Medium Term Financial Strategy 2012-15**

Further to minute 60/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which sought approval of the Medium Term Financial Strategy (MTFS) 2012-15. The Strategy underpinned the medium term policy and financial planning process that was fundamental to setting the Council's revenue and capital budgets.

This Strategy was the first following the Spending Review announced by the Government on 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010 which outlined headline cuts in local government resources from central government of around 27 per cent over four years, plus a dramatic decrease in the level and number of specific grants.

The report indicated that further massive uncertainty remained resulting from a very large number of areas of policy development. These, and a wide range of other reviews, reports, proposals and initiatives, affected just about every service provided by local government. Individually and collectively they presented a massive challenge to the future working of the sector, some significant financial threats and a smaller number of financial opportunities.

There was continued uncertainty in the world economy marked by a number of sovereign debt crises and low growth across most economic regions with no current signs of recovery. In this environment it was essential that this MTFS provided the financial framework to enable the Council to start to meet these financial challenges and the flexibility to continue to respond to the impacts of Government policy change over this period.

The Cabinet noted that the Council's ABC Transformation Programme was now into its third year and it continued to be the single most fundamental element of the Council's response to the financial and policy environment. It was important, despite the difficulties that existed, to maintain the pace and extent of changes that could be delivered from such a programme as it moved into a more mature phase of its development because the scale of the external changes facing the Council meant that further radical change would be required into the foreseeable future. This meant that the Council must continue to make changes across the whole range of activity, including how it delivered its services, the organisational structures of these services, relationships with its key partners and its human resources policies. The Medium Term Financial Strategy provided the financial context to these changes and the financial frameworks to help enable them to be delivered.

The initial medium term financial position shown in section 3.2 of the report indicated that there was a bottom line gap of £17.4m in 2012/13 which increased to £20.2m in 2013/14. Initial work had begun to identify proposals to balance the position for 2012/13 and the results of this work would be brought forward as part of the budget setting process. However, the anticipated future years' impact of the Spending Review, the massive turmoil anticipated from reforms in a number of areas affecting local government finance and underlying expenditure pressures indicate that the Council may face a massive 'cliff-edge' in the region of £33.9m in the gap between spending needs and resources moving into 2014/15. The overall medium term financial position would be kept



under constant review during this time but it was already clear that there would be a need for significant transformation beyond that envisaged within the existing ABC programme.

It was noted that the Resources, Communities and Sport Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board 1) had considered the report at their meeting on 13<sup>th</sup> October 2011 (their minute 30/11 refers).

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

## **67. Replacement of the Financial Information System**

Further to minute 61/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which sought approval of spending up to £2m to replace the Council's Financial Information System.

Coventry City Council implemented its current Financial Information System in 1997. The version currently in use was of such an age that it was no longer supported by the provider, Oracle Financials, and was in need of replacement. An interim upgrade was planned to take place in September 2011 which would bring the system temporarily back into support. However, a full upgrade to the latest version of Oracle would then be required in 2013.

The Money Matters Project, a fundamental service review of financial management, had considered future ways of working to improve the way that the Council manages financial information. The findings of the review concluded that existing systems were inefficient and inconsistent across the organisation. The review also identified a significant level of savings that could be delivered in the short to medium term by transforming the way in which financial management activity was undertaken across the organisation. While some improvements in processes could be made using existing IT systems, more significant savings and benefits would require the re-implementation of the Financial Information System.

Analysis of ICT systems showed that there were numerous operational systems which interact with the Financial Information System. These systems combined operational activity and financial data which could lead to duplication of effort. The specification for any replacement finance system, would also incorporate functionality for HR and Payroll and may also be evaluated on the criterion of any additional modules that may be available for use.

In the longer-term, additional modules would be considered in order to enable the retirement or consolidation of other operational systems in a phased approach. The retirement of other systems may be in full, or in part by replacing financial elements of existing systems to ensure that as much financial activity takes place in the finance system as possible.

It was therefore proposed that a full tender process be commenced to ensure that the Council could procure a system that best meets its requirements within the resources available. The report indicated that this resource would be up to £2m.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Authorise the Director of Finance and Legal Services to commence procurement for a replacement to the Financial Information System.**
- (2) Authorise the procurement funding and the contract award and implementation by the Director of Finance and Legal Services using the funding options outlined in Section 5 of the report.**

**68. Lease Negotiation and Land Transfer at Bishop Street and Tower Street**

Further to minute 63/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development that detailed lease negotiations that had taken place and sought approval of proposed land transfers at Bishop Street and Tower Street. A corresponding private report detailing financially confidential aspects of the proposals was also submitted to this meeting (Minute 66 below refers).

Barberry Group Ltd, a privately owned Property Company based in the West Midlands, acquired the freehold interest in the former Royal Mail sorting office on the corner of Bishop Street and Tower Street in January 2011. Barberry also acquired, at risk, the leasehold interest in 50 Bishop Street, the former Kingston furniture store, to assist with facilitating their proposed scheme, to be known as Bishop Gate.

In April 2011 following initial discussions with the Council, Barberry submitted proposals for a £50m, 400,000sqft retail led mixed use development on both their site and adjoining Council owned land, which they received outline planning consent for in June 2011.

This significant investment would create a prominent new building in the city centre, provide improved retail, leisure and parking facilities along with substantial job opportunities. It would also deliver significant public realm improvements (linking to the Council's investment in the city centre's public realm) and included a new, improved, pedestrian link connecting the Canal Basin and the wider area beyond with the city centre.

To deliver their proposed scheme, Barberry needed to acquire Council land including a surface car park and amend existing leasehold interests. In addition to the land on which Barberry Group held freehold ownership, they required two further areas of land on which they had the benefit of leases until 2058 and 2070 respectively, with the Council owning the freehold, and the 110 space surface car park on which the Council held the freehold.

It was therefore proposed that the existing ground leases' over the sites identified as 2 and 4 at Appendix A, be surrendered and a new 150 year lease be granted across the Council owned sites including the land currently comprising the Tower Street public surface car park. To enable this car park to form part of the development scheme approval was also sought to commence the process for closing the car park.

Barberry had agreed to pay a premium for the new leases. In addition to the premium, Barberry would be obligated to undertake offsite improvement works at their expense. Tower Street car park was currently designated as a long stay car park and had, until the Royal Mail vacated the Bishop Street sorting office, been an important car park for those working there. Income from this car park had fallen year on year from 09/10 to 10/11. Although adjacent to the Coventry Transport Museum, the museum

directed its patrons to park in the Belgrade Plaza multi story car park, giving visitors to the city a better first impression of Coventry. The Bishop Gate scheme proposed to provide a public car park of 585 spaces and although it was recognised that these spaces would in the main be used by the development they would, through agreement with the developer, also be made available to the general public at the prevailing parking rate across the city centre. The supermarket operator would have the flexibility to incentivise its customers parking if it chose to do so.

The proposal would also require the stopping up of part of Tower Street. The Council, as highway authority, would undertake the stopping up with any costs attributable to this being underwritten by the developer.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve:**

- (1) The terms presented in section 2 of the report and delegate authority to Cabinet Member (City Development,) in consultation with the Director of City Services and Development and the Director of Finance and Legal Services, to complete the disposal of the site based on these terms.**
- (2) The commencement of the formal car park closure procedures, outlined in paragraph 2.3 of the report.**
- (3) Pursuant to section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972, once the car park closure has been made, that the site be appropriated and hereafter held for planning purposes.**
- (4) The making of a Stopping Up Order for that section of Tower Street cross hatched on the attached plan.**

**69. Appointments to Council and Outside Bodies**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services which sought Council's approval to appoint Councillor Mrs Miks, newly elected Councillor for Lower Stoke, to two Council bodies and to a number of outside bodies; to appoint to vacancies on the Coventry Church (Municipal) Charities and the Coventry Refugee Centre; and to appoint to vacancies for Academy governors.

**Resolved to approve the following appointments:**

**(1) Membership of City Council Bodies**

**The appointment of Councillor Mrs Miks to the Economy, Regeneration and Transport Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board 3) and the Environment and Community Safety Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board 4) with immediate effect.**

**(2) Membership of Outside Bodies**

- (a) The appointment of Councillor Mrs Miks to the following outside bodies with immediate effect:**

- (i) **Coventry and Solihull Waste Disposal Company Limited – Advisory Forum**
  - (ii) **Leicester University Court**
  - (iii) **Annie Bettmann Foundation**
  - (iv) **Coventry General Charities Trustees**
  - (v) **Sir Charles Barratt Memorial Foundation**
  - (vi) **Soothern and Craner Educational Foundation**
  - (vii) **Tom Mann Centre Trust Management Committee**
- (b) **The appointment of Councillor Kershaw to the Coventry Church (Municipal) Charities.**
- (3) **Appointment of Academy Governors**
- a) **The appointment of Ms. Eleanora Hollings to the Coventry Blue Coat Church of England School and Music College (Academy)**
  - b) **The appointment of Councillor Maton to the The Tile Hill Wood School and Language College (Academy)**
  - c) **The appointment of Councillor Mrs Hetherington to the The Woodlands Academy**

## **70. 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 Nellist	Councillor Walsh	Clarification of information given by the West Midlands Fire Service regarding a reduction in the numbers of firemen
2.	Councillor Foster	Councillor Duggins	Examination of the adoption of a local living wage
3.	Councillor Lepoidevin	Councillor Mutton	Request for financial contribution to the Christmas lights in Tile Hill
4.	Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Harvard	Consideration of switching traffic lights off at night to save energy

- |    |                    |                    |   |
|----|--------------------|--------------------|---|
| 5. | Councillor Nellist | Councillor Skipper | Homeless – (i) the impact that increasing staff numbers had on the number of homeless (ii) information on accommodation provided for homeless women (iii) Chace Hostel – number of places available |
| 6. | Councillor Gannon  | Councillor O’Boyle | Impact of Government’s Employment Policy on young people in Coventry  |
| 7. | Councillor Howells | Councillor Mutton  | Dynamic Leadership – Elected Mayors   |

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

There was no statement.

**72. Debate – Call for Greater Protection for Child Victims of Trafficking**

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

"That this Council supports the petition from ECPAT U.K that calls upon the Government to PROVIDE GREATER PROTECTION FOR CHILD VICTIMS OF TRAFFICKING. In particular, we call for a system of guardianship for child victims of trafficking in the UK. Such a system would mean that every child victim of trafficking would have someone with legal authority to take decisions based on their best interests and to care and support them. A guardian would ensure that these children receive the educational, medical, practical and legal support they need."

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

**73. Debate – City Centre Redevelopment**

The following motion was moved by Councillor Blundell, seconded by Councillor Mrs Dixon and lost:

"This Council recognises the importance of regenerating our city and in particular the city centre to ensure the long term prosperity of local people. In doing so Council also recognises that there is a need to support existing businesses through incentives to bring shoppers into the city, as was highlighted by the Save our City Centre petition launched by Cllr Bally Singh.

Council believes that the removal of buses from Broadgate, and the linked decision to remodel the recently refurbished Ironmonger Square after no effective consultation, will be counterproductive to these aims."

The following amended motion was moved by Councillor Mrs Bigham, seconded by Councillor Harvard, and carried:-

"This Council recognises the importance of regenerating our City and has set in motion various means of doing so, particularly in the City centre, to ensure the long

term prosperity of local people. In doing so, Council also recognises that there is a need to support existing businesses, through incentives, to bring shoppers into the City.

Council believes that the relocation of buses and taxis from Broadgate, after extensive consultation and the linked decision to remodel a part of Ironmonger Square, in order to bring buses close to shops, will be productive in achieving these aims.”

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

## **Private Business**

### **74. Lease Negotiation and Land Transfer at Bishop Street and Tower Street**

Further to Minute 68 above, and minute 63/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development that detailed financially confidential information in relation to lease negotiations that had taken place and sought approval of proposed land transfers at Bishop Street and Tower Street.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve:**

- (1) The terms presented in section 2 of the report and delegate authority to Cabinet Member (City Development), in consultation with the Director of City Services and Development and the Director of Finance and Legal Services, to complete the disposal of the site based on these terms.**
- (2) The commencement of the formal car park closure procedures, outlined in paragraph 2.3 of the report.**
- (3) Pursuant to section 122 of the Local Government Act 1972, once the car park closure has been made, that the site be appropriated and hereafter held for planning purposes**
- (4) The making of a Stopping Up Order for that section of Tower Street cross hatched on the attached plan.**

(Meeting closed: 5.50 p.m.)