

**COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY**

**17<sup>th</sup> January 2012**

PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Mulhall)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Sawdon)

Councillor Mrs Abbott	Councillor Lakha
Councillor Andrews	Councillor Lapsa
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin
Councillor Bailey	Councillor Mrs Lucas
Councillor Bains	Councillor McNicholas
Councillor Mrs. Bigham	Councillor Maton
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Mrs Miks
Councillor Clifford	Councillor J. Mutton
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Mrs. M. Mutton
Councillor Mrs. Dixon	Councillor Nellist
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Noonan
Councillor Field	Councillor O'Boyle
Councillor Mrs Fletcher	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Foster	Councillor Ruane
Councillor Gannon	Councillor Sandy
Councillor Gazey	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 Walsh
Councillor Kershaw	Councillor Welsh
Councillor A. Khan	Councillor Williams
Councillor T. Khan	

Apologies: Councillor Chater  
Councillor Lancaster  
Councillor Townshend

**Public Business**

**91. Minutes**

The minutes of the meeting held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2011, were signed as a true record.

## 92. 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.

<b>Minute No.</b>	<b>Subject</b>	<b>Relevant Paragraphs(s) of Part 1 of Schedule 12A</b>
108	Commissioning Proposal for Supported Accommodation and Floating Support Services for Homeless Clients	3

## 93. Coventry Good Citizen Award

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor presented Mr Alan Tyrell with the Coventry Good Citizen Award. His citation read:

*'Coventry Kid' Alan Tyrell was a boxer of high standards in his youth, and he has continued to fight for good causes to improve facilities in his community for almost 50 years.*

*He encouraged residents to apply for New Deal for Communities (NDC) funds for the Wood End, Henley Green, Manor Farm and Deedmore Road (WEHM) area and, once achieved, sat on various task groups to ensure that the money was spent wisely and priorities and initiatives were met.*

*Alan is chair of the Residents Association, is a member of the Street Pride judging panel, and was also on the NDC project board for four years. He has been instrumental in having improved road markings, speed humps, bus shelters installed, and having vandalised garages demolished in the area. He is also an active member of his local church and keeps the church grounds and gardens well-maintained.*

*His time commitment and care for his community is typical of Alan. He regularly keeps in contact with his neighbours and does their gardening, runs errands and gives them lifts to the local shops or to keep doctor's appointments.*

*Alan is a shining example of community engagement, promotes social cohesion and encourages others to participate. He inspires people by his behaviour and deserves to be called a Good Citizen of Coventry."*

## 94. New Year Honours

The Lord Mayor referred to the awards made to the following Coventry citizens in the recent New Year's Honours List.

- **CBE** to Professor Madeleine Atkins, Vice Chancellor of Coventry University, for her services to higher education.
- **MBE** to Janet Finch, a foster carer, for her services to children and families taking in more than 150 children over 35 years.
- **MBE** to Sean O'Donovan, former assistant head at Cardinal Wiseman Catholic School for his services to education.

Members noted that the Lord Mayor had written letters of congratulation to all the recipients.

#### **95. Death of Former Councillor – Rob Windsor**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of former Councillor Rob Windsor, who represented St Michael's Ward from 2000-2004 and 2006-2010.

Rob served as a member on South Central Area Forum, Licensing and Regulatory Committee, Scrutiny Boards 3 and 4 and Planning Committee.

Members noted that the Lord Mayor would be writing to Rob's family expressing the Council's sincere condolences and paid tribute to the work carried out by Rob on behalf of the City.

#### **96. Death of Clive Rosher**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of Clive Rosher, former Consort to the Lord Mayor, Maggie Rosher in 1998/9.

Members noted that a letter expressing the Council's the sincere condolences had been sent to Clive's family and paid tribute to the work carried out by Clive.

#### **97. Death of Councillor Mrs Johnson's Husband**

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of Paul Johnson, Councillor Heather Johnson's husband.

Members noted that a letter expressing the Council's sincere condolences had been sent to Councillor Mrs Johnson and her family and paid tribute to the work carried out by Paul.

Members stood for one minute's silence in memory of all of the above

#### **98. Petitions**

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

- (a) **Help save Foleshill Leisure Centre – 1,067 signatures, presented by Councillor Auluck.**
- (b) **Re-instate Right Hand Turn from Norton Hill Drive to Ansty Road – 120 signatures, presented by Councillor Sweet.**
- (c) **Reverse Shared Spaces Decision – 268 signatures, presented by Councillor Nellist.**

## **99. Declarations of Interest**

The following Members declared interests as follows:

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

#### **Personal Interests**

Minutes 100 and 108 (Commissioning Proposal for Supported Accommodation and Floating Support Services for Homeless Clients)

Councillor Nellist – Works for a voluntary organisation (H2H being a consortium made up a number of voluntary organisations in the City)

### **(b) Interests in Debate – Health and Social Care Bill**

#### **Personal Interests**

Councillor Noonan (daughter works for NHS)

Councillor Welsh (sister is a nurse)

Councillor Williams (wife works as a carer for an agency which has a contract with NHS)

#### **Prejudicial Interests**

Councillor Sawdon

## **100. Coventry City Council's Response to Government Consultations on City Mayors**

Further to Minute 98/11 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the of the Chief Executive which indicated that the Government was committed to creating directly elected mayors in the twelve largest English cities outside London, subject to referendums. The Government was planning for referendums in eleven cities, including Coventry in May 2012. In cities where the vote was in favour of an elected mayor, the Government intended that mayoral elections would follow rapidly.

In November 2011, the Government launched a consultation exercise in each of twelve English cities (the eleven cities due to hold a referendum, plus Leicester, which

already has an elected mayor) on how best to give powers to an elected mayor and what powers should be transferred to a mayor if one were to be elected. The proposed City Council's response to the consultation was appended to the report.

Due to the short eight week period of consultation, which straddled the Christmas period, it was recommended that the proposed response be approved by Cabinet and sent to the Government to meet the consultation deadline of 3<sup>rd</sup> January, 2012, subject to the approval of the City Council on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2012. The results of the consultation would be used to inform the debate in Parliament on the secondary legislation required to specify which cities must hold a referendum on elected mayors in May 2012.

The report indicated that the Council's response had been informed by the views expressed by local people and local organisations and the debate that had taken place in Coventry on this issue. Local people and organisations were able to respond separately to Government on this consultation.

Whilst there was no specific cost attached to the consultation response, Cabinet noted that holding the referendum would cost in the region of £130k and that the Leader, Councillor Mutton, had written to the Government requesting that funding be provided for the cost of referendum.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approved the response to the Government's consultation on city mayors as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.**

Note: In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with paragraph 4.1.69 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 Mrs Abbott	Councillor Andrews	
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Foster	
Councillor Bains	Councillor Noonan	
Councillor Mrs Bigham	Councillor Taylor	
Councillor Blundell		
Councillor Clifford		
Councillor Crookes		
Councillor Mrs Dixon		
Councillor Duggins		
Councillor Field		
Councillor Mrs Fletcher		
Councillor Gannon		
Councillor Gazey		
Councillor Hammon		
Councillor Harvard		
Councillor Mrs Hetherton		
Councillor Howells		
Councillor Mrs Johnson		
Councillor Kelly		

Councillor Kershaw  
Councillor A. Khan  
Councillor T. Khan  
Councillor Lakha  
Councillor Lapsa  
Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin  
Councillor Mrs Lucas  
Councillor McNicholas  
Councillor Maton  
Councillor Mrs Miks  
Councillor J. Mutton  
Councillor Mrs M. Mutton  
Councillor Nellist  
Councillor O'Boyle  
Councillor Ruane  
Councillor Sandy  
Councillor Sawdon  
Councillor B. Singh  
Councillor Singh Sehmi  
Councillor Skinner  
Councillor Skipper  
Councillor Mrs Sweet  
Councillor Walsh  
Councillor Welsh  
Councillor Williams  
Lord Mayor

Result: 45 for  
4 against  
0 abstentions

(Note: Councillors Bailey and Ridley were not present when this vote was taken)

**101. Statutory Guidance on the Roles and Responsibilities of the Director of Children's Services and the Lead Member for Children's Services – Consultation Response**

Further to Minute 100/11 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Director of Children, Learning and Young People which detailed the City Council's proposed response to the Department for Education (DfE) Consultation on the Statutory Guidance on the roles and responsibilities of the Director of Children's Services and the Lead Member for Children's Services. A copy of the proposed response was appended to the report.

The DfE first issued Statutory Guidance on the roles of the Director of Children's Services (DCSs) and the Lead Member for Children's Services (LMCSs) in 2005. The guidance was updated in 2009 so this was the third updating of the guidance. In part, the driver for the updating of the guidance was the recommendation in Professor Eileen Munro's Review of Child Protection that the Government should amend the statutory

guidance to establish the principle that it should not be considered appropriate to give additional functions (that do not relate to children's services) to DCSs and LMCSs unless exceptional circumstances arise. Local Authorities should assure themselves that they have sufficiently robust arrangements for the discharge of Director of Children's Services and Lead Member of Children's Services responsibilities. The proposals aimed to meet that objective and had also sought to shorten the guidance and update it in relation to current Government policy priorities.

In response to the consultation the Council was expressing its concern about the prescriptive nature of aspects of the guidance. In particular, that the guidance was unnecessarily prescriptive in the way that the Lead Member role was to be undertaken and appeared to require the appointment of a single Lead Member for Children's Services who had responsibility for both Education and Children's Services. The City Council believed that these roles could be separated without reducing the required levels of accountability.

In addition, the guidance was prescriptive in suggesting that Lead Members and Directors of Children's Services should actively promote the development of Academy and Free Schools. This was contrary to Council policy and goes well beyond what one might expect in terms of the Council's discretion in how it will implement Government policy.

It was recommended that the proposed response be approved by Cabinet and sent to the DfE to meet the consultation deadline of 6<sup>th</sup> January, 2012, subject to the approval of the City Council on 17<sup>th</sup> January, 2012.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the response to the DfE consultation on the statutory guidance on the roles and responsibilities of the Director of Children's Services and the Lead Member for Children's Services as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.**

## **102. Commissioning Proposal for Supported Accommodation and Floating Support Services for Homeless Clients**

Further to Minute 101/11 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Director of Community Services and the Director of Finance and Legal Services which outlined proposals for the future delivery of a Homeless Service for homeless clients in Coventry. A corresponding private report detailing financially confidential aspects of the proposal was also submitted to this meeting (Minute 108 below refers).

The report indicated that the Comprehensive Spending Review 2010 (CSR) announced in October 2010 heralded cuts to local government Formula Grant of 27% over four years and significant further cuts to specific grants. For Coventry this led to an overall reduction in resources of £38m for 2011/12 as well as further reductions in the coming three years. The impact of the economic recession and the need to reduce the deficit did not only have an impact on the City Council, but on the public sector more widely. Reductions in public spending were taking place in the context of increasing levels of homelessness in the city. The number of homelessness applications made to the City Council had increased over the last year to over 1700. The number of

households that have been accepted as being owed the main homelessness duty had increased by 30% between 2009/10 and 2010/11, and had more than doubled since the low of 336 in 2006/07. The Council had also seen an increase in the number of non-statutory clients over the last few years from 468 in 2006/07 to over 1000 individuals in 2010/11.

Changes to Housing Benefit and the expected impacts of the Welfare Reform proposals and introduction of Universal Credit, as well as other economic factors, such as rising unemployment, would increase the pressure on the Council's housing service and lead to an increase in the number of people who are homeless.

Since 2010, the Government had instigated a series of legislative changes and launched a number of policy papers setting out their vision for a reformed public sector, including the Localism Act and the Open Public Services White Paper. The Localism Act 2011 aimed to strengthen the role of local government and give new rights and powers to local communities and organisations by decentralising power to the local level. As part of these changes, local authorities were required to consider an expression of interest from 'relevant bodies', such as voluntary or community bodies, who were interested in providing or assisting in providing a service on behalf of the Council.

In addition, revisions made to the Best Value Statutory Guidance in September 2011 placed a duty on local authorities to be responsive to the benefits and needs of voluntary and community sector organisations of all sizes and to have regard to the social value of its contracts.

The Open Public Services White Paper was published in July 2011 and argued that a centralised approach to public service delivery was broken, and that the alternatives are choice, fair access to a range of providers and decentralisation. This meant that public services no longer had to be run by the public sector and instead, increasing the diversity of public service provision, and thereby the range of choice that was available to individual service users, was key to improving services. The White Paper saw the private, the voluntary and community sectors, social enterprises and mutual organisations as playing a key role in this. These policy changes would have a significant impact on the way in which the Council commissions and procures goods and services in the future. It was in this context that the Council had been working with the voluntary sector in the City to explore new approaches to commissioning and opportunities for greater collaborative working.

In the current economic climate, the voluntary sector was experiencing very difficult times, both in Coventry and nationally as funding reduces but service demands increase. It was widely recognised in the sector that organisations would have to close, merge or co-operate with each other to ensure funding was not used on administration to support individual organisations, but was used to provide services for vulnerable residents.

In recognition of the challenging financial environment facing them, a number of voluntary sector organisations in Coventry had joined together to form a consortium, called Here 2 Help (H2H), so that they could work together to deliver their services and take part in either grant funded services or as a company in formal procurement



exercises. H2H was a company limited by guarantee and was applying for registered charitable status. The aim of H2H was to "win significant resources to sustain and grow local, high quality voluntary and community sector provision in response to identified needs". H2H would provide a new way for local voluntary organisations to work with the Council and other statutory agencies to deliver cost-effective services for the people of Coventry. H2H would enable local voluntary organisations, including some of the smaller agencies, to work collaboratively together to compete more effectively against larger, national commercial organisations, thus helping to keep a strong local provider base in the city, close to Coventry's communities.

Preliminary discussions had taken place about how the Council could work differently with the sector through H2H to minimise the impact of the likely cuts in funding on the sector and service users. Discussions had continued around involving H2H and its members, where it was appropriate, in co-designing services, and where it might be appropriate, to look at how funding could be maximised by a cohesive joined up approach between H2H and its members to provide a more outcome focused service under a grant agreement.

The Council had been working with a number of voluntary sector providers, over the last few months, to design a better homeless service which would deliver more provision and an improved customer experience and outcomes. The Council was currently considering enabling the delivery of this new service through H2H via a new grant agreement.

Tackling homelessness was a priority of the Coventry Partnership and the Council due to the cost and the impact this had on residents in the city. The City Council was the lead agency for homelessness prevention in the city and currently committed £1,396,583 per annum for service provision. This was funded through Formula Grant, following the abolition of the Supporting People grant funding stream.

Coventry currently had 13 homeless Supported Accommodation and Floating Support services provided by a range of organisations. This service provision had been in place since September 2009 and it was recognised that the current services did not meet current needs and were not responsive to the needs of the homeless population in the city.

During 2010 and early 2011 work had progressed with H2H, and the providers to understand the issues with the current service provision and to develop a model for the future service. A proposal was presented at the Homelessness Strategy Implementation Group in August. From the review work undertaken by the Council and its partners, and taking account of the messages from stakeholders, including customers, the outcomes that the homelessness service would aim to deliver and the headline points of the proposed service were set out in the report

The management of service delivery through H2H had the potential to improve the level of service provided to users by putting in place a single point of access which would enable service users to access the right service first time, reduce duplication of effort between organisations and the double funding associated with this, and remove inconsistencies between service delivery that have arisen as a result of having separate

service provision in place. By cutting back on administration for all agencies involved, it would enable the grant to go into services rather than back office support.

In future, this would mean that service users would have their needs assessed by a single person and would only need to provide their personal information once, rather than be assessed several times by different organisations, each with their own assessments. Based on their identified needs, service users would be referred to the most appropriate accommodation and support service, rather than placed with services on an ad hoc basis. The improved service would also be more responsive to the support needs of users by providing different levels of support and utilising a range of specialisms within a menu of services. This would help to reduce the incidence of repeat homelessness, as more successful outcomes are expected. In addition, there would be a greater focus on preventative services to support those individuals at risk of homelessness.

Delivering the service through a grant agreement would also provide the Council a more flexible framework to work within. A non-competitive approach would allow the Council to respond to changes in demand, client needs and outcomes and changes in national policy/legislation, without having to change fundamental contract arrangements or spot purchase services outside the scope of this project at costly rates, therefore preventing the Council from incurring significant additional costs. The model being proposed was new and innovative - a grant funded approach was intended to help strengthen the voluntary/community sector market and seek much better value and secure better outcomes by commissioning more intelligently. However, moving to this new model of service delivery exposed the Council to significant risks which were detailed in the private report.

This grant agreement would be based on an outcomes focused performance management framework. This approach would require H2H to measure and report on the needs of individuals and monitor their journey to independent living, allowing services to be more tailored, rather than reporting on outputs. This approach allowed the Council to capture and measure the wider impacts of its investment and respond to the Personalisation agenda and give individuals more choice and control over the services they receive.

H2H would be required to deliver the outcomes identified through the grant agreement and payment would be made on the results achieved. H2H would also provide performance reports on a regular basis and would be subject to annual, six monthly and ad hoc monitoring to promote the maintenance of quality. Further details on the performance management arrangements were outlined in the List of Service Requirements attached at Appendix 1.

There were three service delivery options considered for the provision of this service which were detailed in the report. It was considered that commissioning a service through a grant funded approach with H2H (option B) would ensure the provision of a more flexible and joined up service that was responsive to changes in demand and user needs and reduces duplication. It would allow the Council to streamline its procurement and contract management costs and, through greater cooperation between the voluntary sector, would ensure that funding was put towards frontline service delivery. It did

however carry greater risk.

The report outlined consultations undertaken with individuals directly using the service, as well as current service providers, details of which were contained in Appendix 1 of the report.

The Cabinet approved proposed amendments to the recommendations contained in the report made by the Leader, Councillor Mutton, in relation to the delegation of authority to officers and appropriate Cabinet Members to negotiate and complete a grant agreement with the H2H Consortium and in relation to a requirement to carry out a full evaluation of the service by September 2013.

In moving the recommendations, in accordance with Paragraph 4.1.45, Councillor Skipper, Cabinet Member (Neighbourhood Action, Housing, Leisure and Culture), moved that the contract now commence from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Agreed to provide a grant to fund Supported Accommodation and Floating Support Services for homeless clients, in preparation for a new service starting 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 for an initial trial period of 18 months.**
- (2) Agreed that authority be delegated to the Director of Finance and Legal Services, the Director of Community Services and the Cabinet Members for Neighbourhood Action, Housing, Leisure and Culture and Strategic Finance and Resources to negotiate and complete a grant agreement with the H2H Consortium for a term from 1st October 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014, with an option to extend.**
- (3) Agreed to maintain funding at the current existing budget provision of £1,396, 583 per annum (pro rata first year and excluding any negotiated change). This was equivalent to a total cost of £2,094,875 over the term of the grant up to March 2014.**
- (4) Agreed to require a full evaluation of the service be undertaken by 1<sup>st</sup> October 2013 to establish that the benefits outlined in the report were being achieved before any decision to extend was made.**

**103. Planning Committee Procedures on Public Speaking**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development, which provided an update on the impact of the changes to public speaking at Planning Committee and the extended delegated powers given to Officers for determining planning applications. The changes came into place in January 2011 on a temporary trial period of 12 months. It was considered that the changes had achieved the objectives they intended to, therefore, the report sought approval that these changes be confirmed on a permanent basis.

The Constitution had been amended on a trial period of 12 months by Full Council on 7 December 2010. The principal change limited the numbers of speakers (other than a Member) at Planning Committee to 2 in support and 2 against each planning application. The Chair of Planning Committee had discretion to allow more speakers on Major applications. Members speaking at Committee were limited to 5 minutes (with a further 2 minutes summarising at the end of any speaking). Greater flexibility was given for anyone wishing to register to speak for or against an item in that it could be done up to 48 hours before the time of the Committee meeting. Other minor procedural matters with public speaking and presenting of information were clarified. The changes to the Constitution occurred at the same time as Planning Committee approving extended delegated powers for dealing with applications and enforcement matters.

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

Coupled with the changes to public speaking, the delegated agreement had also been changed and had resulted in fewer planning applications and enforcement matters being reported to Planning Committee since January 2011.

The Constitution Working Group had considered the matter on 7 December 2011 and had recommended that Council confirmed the changes.

**RESOLVED that the City Council agree that the changes to the Planning Committee Procedure Rules on Public Speaking which had been in place since January 2011 on a trial basis, now be approved on a permanent basis.**

Note: In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with paragraph 4.1.69 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 Mrs Abbott	Councillor Andrews	
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Bailey	
Councillor Bains	Councillor Blundell	
Councillor Mrs Bigham	Councillor Crookes	
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Mrs Dixon	
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Field	
Councillor Mrs Fletcher	Councillor Foster	
Councillor Gannon	Councillor Gazey	
Councillor Harvard	Councillor Hammon	
Councillor Mrs Hetheron	Councillor Mrs Johnson	
Councillor Howells	Councillor Lapsa	
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin	
Councillor Kershaw	Councillor Nellist	

Councillor A. Khan	Councillor Noonan
Councillor T. Khan	Councillor Sawdon
Councillor Lakha	Councillor Skinner
Councillor Mrs Lucas	Councillor Taylor
Councillor McNicholas	Councillor Williams
Councillor Maton	
Councillor Mrs Miks	
Councillor J. Mutton	
Councillor Mrs M. Mutton	
Councillor O'Boyle	
Councillor Ruane	
Councillor Sandy	
Councillor B. Singh	
Councillor Singh Sehmi	
Councillor Skipper	
Councillor Mrs Sweet	
Councillor Walsh	
Councillor Welsh	
Lord Mayor	

Result: 32 for  
18 against  
0 abstentions

(Note: Councillor Ridley was not present when this vote was taken)

#### **104. Amendments to Development Forums/Procedure Rule**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development which proposed changes to Development Forum procedures.

Development Forums were held to enable the engagement of both Councillors and Members of the public in pre-application discussions with developers in a structured manner, ensuring that communities and Councillors are involved at the earliest opportunity. These meetings are normally held at 5.00 p.m. in the Council Chamber and they are chaired by the Cabinet Member (City Development) or their nominee. The developer had the opportunity to present their scheme and then respond to questions on factual matters. There was no debate with the developer on the proposals as the focus is to clarify aspects of the proposal and the Development Forum was not an arena for negotiation. Immediately following the Forum, Council officers and Members meet separately to discuss the scheme. Officers will provide a report back to the developer on issues they may wish to consider further.

As Development Forums had been in place for some time, it was felt that it would be appropriate to review the processes and procedures to assist in clarifying the roles of all stakeholders, in particular for officers and Members. The Planning Advisory Service promoted Development Forums nationally as good practice, and the Council's current arrangements were similar to other authorities.

Following this review, it is proposed that where sites were located in a specific ward within the City, the Development Forums should be held in the appropriate Ward.. These meetings would be held in an appropriate venue within the Ward and would be chaired by the chair of the Ward Forum, unless s/he was a member of the Planning Committee. In such instances, one of the other Ward Councillors would be requested to Chair the Development Forum. If an appropriate venue could not be located, the Development Forum meeting would be convened at the Council House.

Where a proposal relates to a significant and strategically important site, sites within the city centre, contentious sites, or in situations where the development would impact on more than one ward, the Development Forum would be held at the Council House and would commence at 7.00 p.m.

In addition, there was currently a meeting held immediately after the Development Forum with Council officers and Members. Whilst there will be meetings following the development forum, these would be part of the normal discussions at pre-application stage, and may involve the developer with Members and Officers.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the proposed changes to the Development Forum Procedures and amend the Council's Constitution accordingly.**

#### **105. Authority for Attendance at Conference**

The City Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development which sought approval to the attendance by a number of Coventry City Council officers at the MIPIM Conference 2012.

At the meeting of the Cabinet Member (City Development) held on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2012, the Cabinet Member considered an Attendance at Conference Form which sought approval for delegates to attend the Marche International Des Professionals De L'Immobilier – MIPIM 2012 Conference to be held in France between 6<sup>th</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> March 2012.

After due consideration of the report and the matters raised at the meeting, the Cabinet Member had given approval for four officers to attend the conference. Details were given in the report.

The decision had been called-in by Councillors Blundell, Mrs Dixon and Noonan on 11th January 2012, the reasons for the call in were:

*'To understand the rationale as to the number of Council paid attendees at the conference and to further enquire as to the nature of the sponsorship as verbally disclosed at the Cabinet meeting and whether or not this is intended to mitigate any costs incurred.'*

This item had been referred to the Council as a late urgent item to be considered at this meeting. This was because, if the Council wished to secure attendance and representation at the conference, the necessary booking and associated arrangements

would need to be made before the usual call in arrangements through the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee could be carried out.

In accordance with 4.1.35.4 of the Constitution, Councillor Foster moved a motion without notice, which was seconded by Councillor Blundell to refer the item to the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2012. The motion was lost.

Note: In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with paragraph 4.1.69 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 Abbot	
Councillor Bailey	Councillor Auluck	
Councillor Blundell	Councillor Bains	
Councillor Crookes	Councillor Mrs Bigham	
Councillor Mrs Dixon	Councillor Clifford	
Councillor Field	Councillor Duggins	
Councillor Foster	Councillor Mrs Fletcher	
Councillor Gazey	Councillor Gannon	
Councillor Hammon	Councillor Harvard	
Councillor Mrs Johnson	Councillor Mrs Hetherton	
Councillor Lapsa	Councillor Howells	
Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin	Councillor Kelly	
Councillor Nellist	Councillor Kershaw	
Councillor Noonan	Councillor A. Khan	
Councillor Ridley	Councillor T. Khan	
Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Lakha	
Councillor Skinner	Councillor Mrs Lucas	
Councillor Taylor	Councillor McNicholas	
Councillor Williams	Councillor Maton	
	Councillor Mrs Miks	
	Councillor J Mutton	
	Councillor Mrs M Mutton	
	Councillor O'Boyle	
	Councillor Ruane	
	Councillor Sawdon	
	Councillor B Singh	
	Councillor Singh Sehmi	
	Councillor Skipper	
	Councillor Mrs Sweet	
	Councillor Walsh	
	Councillor Welsh	
	Lord Mayor	

Result: 19 for  
32 against  
0 abstentions

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve attendance of the officers, referred to in Paragraph 1.2 of the report, at the MPIM 2012 Conference.**

(Note: This item of business was considered as a late urgent item. This was because, if the Council wished to secure attendance and representation at the conference, the necessary booking and associated arrangements would need to be made before the usual call in arrangements through the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee could be carried out).

#### **106. 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 Mrs Bigham	Councillor Mrs Lucas	Timescale of Scrutiny Co-ordination considerations from call-in through to decision.
2.	Councillor Mrs Dixon	Councillor Mrs Abbot	Wyken Cross Children's Centre
3.	Councillor Bailey	Councillor Singh	Consideration of closing of childrens centre at Whoberley Ward Forum.
4.	Councillor Foster	Councillor Noonan	Discussion on closure of childrens centre at next Cheylesmore Ward Forum
5.	Councillor Mrs Sweet	Councillor Maton	Former Cheylesmore Pub site
6.	Councillor Sehmi	Councillor Harvard	Road repairs across the City
7.	Councillor Maton	Councillor Skipper	Response to major incident at Caradoc Hall
8.	Councillor Sawdon	Councillor Harvard	Traffic Lights at Radford Road/Ring Road.
9.	Councillor Harvard	Councillor J Mutton	Leaflet distribution in South Coventry which referred to members allowances.
10.	Councillor Howells	Councillor J Mutton	Ricoh shares



## 107. Statement by the Leader of the Council

### Distribution of Tickets for the Olympic Opening and Closing Ceremony

The Leader, Councillor John Mutton, made a statement in respect of the tickets which had been allocated to the City Council for the Opening and Closing Ceremonies for this year's Olympic Games. Councillor Mutton reported that he believed these tickets should be awarded to deserving people of Coventry and therefore proposed that a draw be made for the 7 available tickets (4 for the Opening Ceremony and 3 for the Closing Ceremony).

The City Council, in conjunction with the Coventry Telegraph, would establish a criteria to qualify for the draw and it was proposed that this be based on individuals who had devoted time or had demonstrated commitment to sport-related community activities.

The Leader of the Opposition Group, Councillor Foster, responded in support of the Statement.

## 108. Debate – Health and Social Care Bill

The following amended motion was moved by Councillor Welsh, seconded by Councillor Clifford, and carried:

“The Government is planning the biggest re-organisation of the NHS since it began in 1948.

This Council believes the Health and Social Care Bill is unnecessary, unwanted, wasteful and damaging - and threatens to end the NHS as we know it. Thousands of people have called on the Government to drop the Bill, but they are ploughing on, ignoring public and professional opinion.

This Council calls on the Government to drop the Health and Social Care Bill.”

**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 4.1.69 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 Mrs Abbott	Councillor Andrews	
Councillor Auluck	Councillor Blundell	
Councillor Bains	Councillor Crookes	
Councillor Mrs Bigham	Councillor Mrs Dixon	
Councillor Clifford	Councillor Field	
Councillor Duggins	Councillor Foster	
Councillor Mrs Fletcher	Councillor Gazey	
Councillor Gannon	Councillor Mrs Johnson	

Councillor Harvard	Councillor Lapsa
Councillor Mrs Hetherton	Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin
Councillor Howells	Councillor Noonan
Councillor Kelly	Councillor Ridley
Councillor Kershaw	Councillor Skinner
Councillor A. Khan	Councillor Taylor
Councillor T. Khan	Councillor Williams
Councillor Lakha	
Councillor Mrs Lucas	
Councillor McNicholas	
Councillor Maton	
Councillor Mrs Miks	
Councillor J. Mutton	
Councillor Mrs M. Mutton	
Councillor Nellist	
Councillor O'Boyle	
Councillor Ruane	
Councillor Sandy	
Councillor Singh Sehmi	
Councillor Skipper	
Councillor Mrs Sweet	
Councillor Walsh	
Councillor Welsh	
Lord Mayor	

Result: 32 for  
15 against  
0 abstentions

(Note: Councillors Blundell, Hammon, Sawdon, B. Singh were not present when this vote was taken)

## **Private Business**

### **109. Commissioning Proposal for Supported Accommodation and Floating Support Services for Homeless Clients**

Further to Minute 100 above, the Cabinet considered a report of the Director of Community Services and the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which detailed financially confidential information in relation to proposals for the future delivery of a Homeless Service for homeless clients in Coventry.

The Cabinet approved proposed amendments to the recommendations contained in the report made by the Leader, Councillor Mutton, in relation to the delegation of authority to officers and appropriate Cabinet Members to negotiate and complete a grant agreement with the H2H Consortium and in relation to a requirement to carry out an evaluation of the service by September 2013.

In moving the recommendations, in accordance with Paragraph 4.1.45, Councillor Skipper, Cabinet Member (Neighbourhood Action, Housing, Leisure and Culture), moved that the contract now commence from 1<sup>st</sup> October 2011.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- (1) Provide a grant to fund Supported Accommodation and Floating Support Services for homeless clients, in preparation for a new service starting 1<sup>st</sup> October 2012 for an initial trial period of 18 months.**
- (2) Delegate authority to the Director of Finance and Legal Services, the Director of Community Services and the Cabinet Members for Neighbourhood Action, Housing, Leisure and Culture and Strategic Finance and Resources to negotiate and complete a grant agreement with the H2H Consortium for a term from 1st October 2012 to 31<sup>st</sup> March 2014, with an option to extend.**
- (3) Maintain funding at the current existing budget provision of £1,396,583 per annum (pro rata first year and excluding any negotiated change). This is equivalent to a total cost of £2,094,875 over the term of the grant up to March 2014.**
- (4) Require that a full evaluation of the service be undertaken by 1<sup>st</sup> October 2013 to establish that the benefits outlined in the report were being achieved before any decision to extend was made.**

(Meeting closed: 8.05 p.m.)