

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF COVENTRY

20th March 2012

PRESENT

Lord Mayor (Councillor Mulhall)

Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Sawdon)

| | |
|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| Councillor Mrs 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 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 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 Skinner

Public Business

121. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 21st February 2012, were signed as a true record.

122. Coventry Good Citizen Award

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor and his Honour Judge Griffith-Jones, the Honorary Recorder, presented Arthur Johnson with the Coventry Good Citizen Award. The citation read:

"Arthur Johnson has worked tirelessly for his local community for a number of years giving his time, and his considerable energy, freely.

He was asked to take on the position of treasurer for the Canley Community Centre on a temporary basis in April 1951 – he will complete his 61st year in the role at the end of the month!

A decorator by trade, he was also a useful table tennis player in his youth and represented his country at international level – he has since brought his skills and enthusiasm to the benefit of his local community.

For his commitment and dedication, Arthur Johnson deserves to be called a Good Citizen of Coventry."

123. Death of Mr David Kidner

The Lord Mayor referred to the recent death of Mr David Kidner OBE, former Clerk to the City Justices for Coventry from 1973 until his retirement in 1995.

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

Members stood for one minute's silence in memory of Mr Kidner.

124. Petitions

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

- (a) Protect the recent temporary arrangements, transporting St. Thomas's Day Centre Pensioners to Earlsdon – 80 signatures – presented by Councillor Duggins.**
- (b) Call for provision of safe crossing point on Harnall Lane East at junction of Wright Street and Aylesford Street – 62 signatures – presented by Councillor O'Boyle.**
- (c) Objection to planning application FUL/2012/0296 – Ritz Cinema – 289 signatures – presented by Councillor Duggins.**
- (d) Concerns regarding surface water and drainage serving Seashell Close – 8 signatures – presented by Councillor Gazey.**
- (e) Against a bus route in Dudley Street – 68 signatures – presented by Councillor Duggins.**
- (f) Objection to the removal of the 27 and 34 bus service – 168 signatures – presented by Councillor Mrs Dixon.**

- (g) Request for action to prevent dangerous and illegal parking around entrances to Manor Park Primary School – 277 signatures – presented by Councillor Noonan.
- (h) Objection to 16/16A bus service being routed down Skipworth Road – 60 signatures – presented by Councillor Mrs Dixon.
- (i) Objection to proposed conversion of 47 Headington Avenue from business use to residential use – 304 signatures – presented by Councillor Lancaster.
- (j) Concerns by residents of Buchanan Close in respect of Planning applications 52000 (RM1) and (RM8) which were approved under delegated authority – 254 signatures – presented by Councillor Mrs Johnson.
- (k) Objection to no longer having a bus route sufficiently covering Henley Green, Manor Farm, Walsgrave and surrounding areas – 228 signatures – presented by Councillor Ruane.
- (l) Save the 34 bus route from Tile Hill and Eastern Green to University Hospital – 1,283 signature – presented by Councillor Hetherston.
- (m) Request for accessible pavements and routes in the Charterhouse area – 77 signatures – presented by Councillor Nellist.

125. Declarations of Interest

The following Members declared interests as follows:

(a) Interests in Items for Consideration by the City Council

Personal Interests

Minute 132 (Settlement of Equal Pay Claims)

Councillor Nellist – a member of UNITE.

(b) Interests in Debate – West Midlands Police and West Midlands Police Authority

Prejudicial Interests

Councillor Lepoidevin.

(b) Interests in Debate – Ring and Ride

Personal Interests

Councillor Lepoidevin – mother uses service.

126. Options for a New Housing Target for Coventry 2011-2028

Further to Minute 129/11 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development, which sought approval of a proposed consultation with residents and stakeholders on options for new housing targets for Coventry, the results of which would inform the final Core Strategy.

Independent consultants had been working on a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) that estimated the housing need for Coventry up to 2028. This would inform the Core Strategy and was a crucial evidence document. The consultants had provided the Council with a draft interim report, which included a number of different scenarios for the future development of Coventry and provided estimates of the numbers of new homes needed for each scenario.

Scenario 1 was based on the historic trends of average net residential completions over the last 20 years, taken from the Council's annual monitoring reports. This would require 9,690 net dwellings between 2011 and 2028, which would equate to 570 dwellings per annum.

Scenario 2 was developed through the SHMA process and assumed that the number of jobs in Coventry would grow at a rate of 5.2% over the plan period. This figure was based on the 2010 IPM sub-regional baseline forecasts for Coventry and was also reflective of the annual average rate of delivery seen in the City in the last 10 years, which was also evidenced from the Council's annual monitoring reports. This scenario would require 11,373 net dwellings between 2011 and 2028, which equated to 669 dwellings per annum.

Scenario 3 was based on the 2010 population projection published by the Office for National Statistics (ONS). The number of households differed slightly to the ONS figures due to some rebasing to 2011 and adjustments to headship rate assumptions. In addition it included an allowance of 2.5% for vacant properties. This was based on standard national assumptions when formulating housing requirements from household growth projections. This scenario would require 20,655 net dwellings between 2011 and 2028, which equated to 1,215 dwellings per annum.

The consultation document was available at the meeting and included details of the types of land required, estimated employment land delivery, benefits and opportunities and risks and impacts for each of the 3 scenarios.

The Council noted that scenario 3 was the official Government projection for the City and that if this was not included within the consultation, it was likely that an independent inspector would instruct the Council to consult on this figure at a later date.

It was proposed that a period of consultation be undertaken from 26th March 2012 to 10th May 2012, in accordance with the Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement.

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

That the following additional recommendation be inserted:

"3) This Council agrees that its preferred option, to support the protection of the Green Belt, is Option 2 as outlined in the consultation paper."

RESOLVED that the Council approve the "Options for a New Housing Target for Coventry for 2011-2008" document for a six week period of consultation beginning on Monday 26th March 2012 and ending on Thursday 10th March 2012.

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

| <u>For</u> | <u>Against</u> | <u>Abstain</u> |
|---------------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| Councillor Andrews | Councillor Mrs Abbott | Councillor Gazey |
| Councillor Bailey | Councillor Auluck | |
| Councillor Blundell | Councillor Bains | |
| Councillor Crookes | Councillor Mrs Bigham | |
| Councillor Mrs Dixon | Councillor Chater | |
| Councillor Field | Councillor Clifford | |
| Councillor Foster | Councillor Duggins | |
| Councillor Hammon | Councillor Fletcher | |
| Councillor Mrs Johnson | Councillor Gannon | |
| Councillor Lapsa | Councillor Harvard | |
| Councillor Mrs Lepoidevin | Councillor Hetherton | |
| Councillor Noonan | Councillor Howells | |
| Councillor Sawdon | Councillor Kelly | |
| Councillor Taylor | Councillor Kershaw | |
| Councillor Williams | Councillor A Khan | |
| | Councillor T Khan | |
| | Councillor Lakha | |
| | Councillor Ms Lancaster | |
| | Councillor Mrs Lucas | |
| | Councillor McNicholas | |
| | Councillor Maton | |
| | Councillor Mrs Miks | |
| | Councillor J Mutton | |
| | Councillor M Mutton | |
| | Councillor Nellist | |
| | Councillor O'Boyle | |
| | Councillor Ruane | |
| | Councillor Sandy | |
| | Councillor B Singh | |
| | Councillor Sehmi | |
| | Councillor Skipper | |
| | Councillor Mrs Sweet | |

For

Against

Abstain

Councillor Townshend
Councillor Walsh
Councillor Welsh
Lord Mayor

Result: 15 for
36 against
1 abstention

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

127. Draft Climate Change Strategy for Coventry

Further to Minute 130/11 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Director of City Service and Development, which outlined the progress in producing a Climate Change Strategy for Coventry and requested endorsement of the final draft.

The Council first published a Climate Change Strategy with the Coventry Partnership in March 2008. Since that date, the Energy Act 2008 and the Climate Change Act 2008 had introduced major changes to encourage energy efficiency, promote investment in the low carbon sector and to set legally binding carbon reduction targets on the UK. Local authorities were expected to be closely involved in delivering these commitments and were expected to demonstrate local leadership through working with partners to reduce the carbon footprint of their areas and from their own operations.

The purpose of the Climate Change Strategy was to provide a framework to co-ordinate the many different people and organisations involved in the drive to tackle climate change. It also identified the many single strategies that contributed to the overall carbon reduction target of a 34% reduction by 2020 and an 80% reduction by 2050.

The report indicated that households which needed to spend more than 10 per cent of their income on fuel to maintain a satisfactory heating regime, as well as meeting their other fuel needs (lighting, appliances, cooking and water heating), were classed as being fuel poor. In Coventry the number of homes in fuel poverty was increasing, with 25.9 per cent of homes classed as fuel poor in 2009, against 21.9 per cent in 2008. The average for England was 18.4 per cent (15.6 per cent in 2008). However, it was noted that these averaged figures tended to mask more significant concerns such as that over a quarter of the Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs) in the City had more than 30 per cent of homes in fuel poverty and that in 4 LSOAs more than 40 per cent of homes were fuel poor when in 2008 there were none.

The challenges presented by climate change and the need to reduce carbon dioxide emissions would affect every household, workplace, school and community group in the City. Rising energy costs, phasing out of certain kinds of light bulbs,

changes to electrical equipment, different scales of car tax, extreme weather events, carbon taxes and the availability of home insulation were just some examples of the changes seen within in the last few years.

The actions within the Strategy, which was appended to the report, fell into four main categories; those already in progress, those that were planned, some that were aspirational and some that required approval. It was anticipated that those requiring approval would form the basis of future reports to Cabinet Member or Cabinet as appropriate. Aspirational actions required further investigation into their feasibility and means of delivery and may require formal approval in the same way. It was noted that the Council would also have an important promotional and leadership role in encouraging others to act and change how they live and work.

RESOLVED that the Council approve the final draft Climate Change Strategy.

128. Response to Consultation – Devolving Local Major Transport Schemes

Further to Minute 131/11 of the Cabinet, the Council considered a report of the Director of City Services and Development, which detailed a proposed response to a Government consultation issued by the Department for Transport on proposals to devolve transport major scheme funding from a national to local level.

Currently, local authorities were required to submit detailed major scheme business cases to the Government to obtain funds for major transport schemes over £5m. The future proposal was for the Government to distribute funds to new Local Transport Bodies (LTBs) based on the geographical boundaries of Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). It would be for the LTBs to prioritise a programme of major schemes, demonstrate value for money and determine the appropriate delivery bodies.

The consultation document set out how the devolution process could work, the governance necessary and the assurances required to ensure that investment returns were maximised. A number of options were also set out for the role of the LEP in any decision making process. The consultation paper, and subsequent clarification, made it clear that local authorities were seen as having the primary role in the LTB, and while LEPs should not have a lead role, they should have real influence over the process.

The proposed response to the consultation was broadly supportive of the proposals, whilst indicating that the opportunity to work collaboratively with surrounding LTB's and LTP's should be welcomed and agreed to be of key importance moving forward, on the basis that there were likely to be a number of priority schemes which would require cross-boundary working and working with neighbouring areas to deliver the infrastructure needed to support economic growth in the West Midlands and beyond.

RESOLVED that, the Council:-

- (1) Approve the proposed response to the Department for Transport's consultation titled Devolving Local Major Transport Schemes as set out in Appendix 2 to this report noting in particular:**
 - (a) A preference for receiving the full devolved major scheme funding allocation direct to a new democratically accountable and led Local Transport Body without top slicing by Government or other organisations.**
 - (b) That the ability to deliver individual schemes with other Local Transport Bodies is welcomed, either as a consortia or joint partners. However, decisions regarding how the funding allocation received is discharged should be solely directed by a Local Transport Body based on the Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership geography.**
- (2) Endorse the opening of discussions with Warwickshire County Council, Centro and the Coventry & Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership regarding the future formation of a Local Transport Body.**

129. Appointment of Proper Officer and Counting Officer for Referendums

The Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services, which sought approval of the appointment of the Chief Executive as Proper Officer and Counting Officer for the purposes of the referendum on 3rd May 2012.

The Council would be holding a referendum on 3rd May 2012 on whether to continue with the present system of Leader and Cabinet or to change to an elected mayor and cabinet executive. Under the Local Government (Conduct of Referendums) (England) Regulations 2012, notice of the referendum must be given and other duties in connection with the referendum must be carried out by the 'proper officer' of the Council. Certain other duties were to be carried out by the counting officer. Part 3 of the Council's Constitution delegated certain functions to employees. However, there was no express provision appointing the Chief Executive as proper officer for the purposes of the referendum.

It was therefore proposed that part 3.7 of the Constitution be amended to include the following paragraph immediately after the paragraph ending "Local Returning Officer for European Parliamentary Elections":

To exercise functions relating to referendums under the Local Government Act 2000 and under any subsequent legislation, and in particular, to act as Proper Officer and Counting Officer for referendums. Deputy Counting Officers may be appointed

RESOLVED that, the Council approve changes to Part 3.7 of the Constitution to appoint the Chief Executive as the Proper Officer and Counting Officer for the purpose of referendums.

130. Appointment of Independent Persons under the Localism Act 2011

The Council considered a report of the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which sought approval to advertise for the appointment of independent persons under the Localism Act 2011.

Section 28 of the Localism Act 2011 required the Council to appoint at least one independent person whose views will be sought when making decisions about allegations that Councillors have breached the code of conduct. The member against whom a complaint was made may also seek the views of the independent person. Whilst the independent person must be consulted, he/she had no vote or binding authority in any determination process with regard to a complaint.

Vacancies must be advertised and independent person(s) needed to be in place by July 2012, when the new standards regime was expected to take effect.

In accordance with Paragraphy 4.1.45 of the City Council's Constitution, in moving the Recommendations, Councillor Townshend amended the date in Recommendation (2) in relation to when a report would be submitted on the outcome of the advertisement process to "a future meeting".

RESOLVED that the Council:

- (1) Authorises the Assistant Director (Legal Services) to advertise for up to three independent persons under section 28 of the Localism Act 2012 and, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to agree the final number of persons to be appointed and the amount of any allowances and expenses to be paid to them.**
- (2) Request that a report be brought to a future meeting of the Council on the outcome of the advertisement for independent persons so that the Council can appoint suitable candidates.**

131. Pay Policy Statement 2012/13

The Council considered a report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services, which sought approval of the 2012/13 Pay Policy Statement.

The Localism Act 2011 required all local authorities to produce an annual Pay Policy Settlement setting out the Council's policies regarding the pay and grading of the workforce. The report indicated that the first Statement must be approved by the Council and in place by 1st April 2012. In particular, the Statement was required to highlight the relationship between the pay and remuneration of most senior staff (Chief Officers) and the general workforce.

In addition, guidance on the development of Pay Policy Statements stated that authorities should explain their policy in respect of Chief Officers who had been

made redundant and later re-employed or engaged under a contract of service, and their approach to any shared arrangements. The Council noted that no existing chief officers had been made redundant and subsequently re-employed or re-engaged and it was not anticipated that this would occur in the future. In addition, no chief officers were engaged on a shared basis.

RESOLVED that, the Council approve 2012/13 Pay Policy Statement, attached as Appendix 1 of the report.

132. Settlement of Equal Pay Claims

Further to Minute 91/10, the Council considered a joint report of the Director of Customer and Workforce Services and the Director of Finance and Legal Services, which outlined the background to the settlement of equal pay claims and sought approval of changes to the strategy to resolve equal pay claims against the Council.

Equal pay legislation required that men and women should receive equal pay for equal work. To comply with this legislation, all council's were required by national agreement to review their terms and conditions for 'officers' and 'manual workers' and bring about a single set of terms and conditions which removed any inequality. This was known as Single Status and there was a requirement for all council's to do this by April 2007.

Following a breakdown in negotiations, the Council introduced its Single Status package in June 2005 to bring about equal pay across the Council's workforce. The system was based on a job evaluation scheme, which scored jobs and fitted them into a new grading system. Approximately 10,500 employees were affected by the introduction of Single Status, either as losers (1,637), gainers (3,528) or those who were assimilated into the new arrangements (5,375).

To mitigate any losses to employees upon implementation, a five year protection scheme had been previously negotiated with the Trade Unions and agreed by ballot to protect, in cash terms for 5 years, losses in pay suffered as a result of the introduction of Single Status.

In February 2006, the Birmingham Employment Tribunal began to receive equal pay claims from Council employees, most of whom were 'gainers', who felt that they had a claim for equal pay because they had been in receipt of lower pay levels than an equivalent comparator prior to 2005. Claimants also claimed that because 'losers' received up to 5 years protection, they should also receive such protection payments going forward from single status implementation to 2005, to bring their pay into line with comparators.

In July 2010, as a result of the Council's new administration's commitment, negotiations began with the trade unions in an attempt to settle the equal pay claims lodged against the Council in the Birmingham Employment Tribunal.

By February 2012, a total of 1,165 employment tribunal claims had been received by the Council, of which 117 were subsequently withdrawn or struck out by the Tribunal. As a result of legal discussions and developments, the number who had not received settlement offers stood at 85. Of the 963 offers made to claimants,

791 had now accepted the Council's offer (and an increase from the 766 referred to in the report). Of the total of 963 offers made, this left 172 outstanding claims (a decrease from 197 referred to in the report).

The Council noted that this represented a significant step forward in dealing with the equal pay claims and whilst some claims were still to be resolved, the risks to the Council had been significantly reduced and it was hoped that the need for further costly litigation could be minimised or ended completely.

It was proposed that any outstanding equal pay claims that the Council consider to be valid be settled, with offers being made on a reduced liability basis, taking into account the benefit of secured and accelerated receipt by claimants and the removal of litigation risk to the claimants. The proposed offers would include no payment in relation to any liability for Pay Protection going forward from June 2005 and it was noted that employees would be expected to pay tax and national insurance. However, advice from the West Midlands Pension Fund indicated that these payments were not pensionable.

RESOLVED that the Council:

- (1) Approve retrospectively the changes to the strategy to resolve equal pay claims against the Council set out in Sections 1 and 2 of the report, including the offers made to a wider number of claimants within the approved provision of £7.5m.**
- (2) Delegate authority to the Director of Customer and Workforce Services and the Director of Finance and Legal Services in liaison with the Leader of the Council to determine any outstanding litigation or claims whether by settlement, if possible, defending at Employment Tribunal or otherwise.**

133. Albany Theatre Trust.

In accordance with Paragraph 4.1.35.13 of the City Council's Constitution, a Motion without Notice was moved by Councillor McNicholas and seconded by Councillor Mutton, that Councillor Kershaw be appointed as the City Council's representative to the Albany Theatre Trust.

RESOLVED that Councillor Kershaw be appointed as the City Council's representative on the Albany Theatre Trust.

134. Question Time

The appropriate Members provided a written response to all the questions set out in the Questions Booklet, together with an oral response to supplementary questions put to them at the meeting.

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

| No | Question Asked By | Question Put To | Subject Matter |
|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|---|
| 1 | Councillor Nellist | Councillor Skipper | To provide him with a copy of the notes he used to respond to the questions at the meeting. |
| 2 | Councillor Bailey | Councillor Harvard | Information in relation to the opening of St Mary's Guildhall to the public. |
| 3 | Councillor Noonan | Councillor Harvard | Information in relation to stolen drain covers |
| 4 | Councillor Hammon | Councillor Bigham | Information on any developments in relation to Drapers Hall, as and when there were any developments. |
| 5 | Councillor Auluck | Councillor Mutton | Acknowledgement of the perceived state of the political parties nationally. |

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

There was no statement

136. **Debate – West Midlands Police and West Midlands Police Authority**

Councillor Bains moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Townshend:-

"This Council expresses its total opposition to the current partial privatisation proposals being taken forward by West Midlands Police and West Midlands Police Authority.

The structure of the process (as evidenced by the absence of any logic for the teaming up with Surrey Police) seems to be driven by the Home Office looking for a model that could be applied nationwide rather than what is in the interests of the West Midlands local community.

This Council calls upon West Midlands Police Services and Authority and the incoming Commissioner (who will be expected to sign any contracts) to reconsider this process and explore other options such as collaboration with other forces or local councils."

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

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

Delete first paragraph after "total opposition to the" and insert "privatisation of front line Policing."

Insert after first paragraph 2 new paragraphs as follows:

"In doing so Council recognises that whilst a number of changes have been made under successive governments to the remit of work undertaken by Police Officers, including matters such as Crown Court Security and investigation of fraud in connection with mail order companies, the public expect the front line policing service to remain directly accountable.

Council believes that the recent OJEU notice issued by Surrey and West Midlands Police Forces has raised legitimate concerns amongst the public, and serving officers, about what services might be contracted out to the private sector given its wide breadth. Whilst support services have been delivered in partnership with the private sector, the core policing service fulfils a unique role in society."

Delete original second paragraph of the motion.

Amend third paragraph by inserting "therefore" after "Council" in 1st line. Then delete "." after "councils" in 4th line and insert "and confirm that they would use their powers to block the privatisation of front line policing".

The amended debate now to read:-

"This Council expresses its total opposition to the privatisation of front line Policing.

In doing so Council recognises that whilst a number of changes have been made under successive government to the remit of work undertaken by Police Officers, including matters such as Crown Court Security and investigation of fraud in connection with mail order companies, the public expect the front line policing service to remain directly accountable.

Council believes that the recent OJEU notice issued by Surrey and West Midlands Police Forces has raised legitimate concerns amongst the public, and serving officers, about what services might be contracted out to the private sector given its wide breadth. Whilst support services have been delivered in partnership with the private sector, the core policing service fulfils a unique role in society.

The Council therefore calls upon West Midlands Police Service and Authority and the incoming Commissioner (who will expected to sign any contracts) to reconsider this process, explore other options such as collaboration with other forces or local councils and confirm that they would use their powers to block the privatisation of front line policing."

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

137. Debate – Ring and Ride

Councillor Lepoidevin moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Noonan:

"This Council recognises the current concern amongst service users about the consultation being undertaken by Centro on the introduction of a membership scheme for Ring and Ride, in particular the proposed criteria.

This Council believes that the proposals being consulted upon do not represent the best way forward for the service and commits to respond to the consultation supporting the concerns being expressed by service users."

The following amendment was moved by Councillor McNicholas, seconded by Councillor Kershaw, and carried:-

After the words "This Council" delete the remainder of the debate and insert the following:

"Notes the concerns by some Coventry users about the proposed changes for Ring and Ride and agrees to write to Centro urging them to address these concerns when considering the way forward. We encourage Coventry users to respond to the consultation process which ends 30th March 2012."

So this will now read:

"This Council notes the concerns by some Coventry users about the proposed changes for Ring and Ride and agrees to write to Centro urging them to address these concerns when considering the way forward. We encourage Coventry users to respond to the consultation process which ends 30th March 2012."

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

(Note: Agenda item 8.3, relating to the Co-opted Member Appointment to the Children, Young People, Learning and Culture Scrutiny Board (Scrutiny Board 2) if Education Matters are to be considered, was withdrawn at the meeting as the proposed nominee had resigned from a Board of Governors and was therefore no longer eligible to be considered for this position.)

Meeting closed at 7.30 p.m.