

**SCRUTINY CO-ORDINATION COMMITTEE**

**5th July, 2006**

Members Present:- Councillor Asif  
Councillor Clifford (Substitute for Councillor Mutton)  
Councillor Duggins  
Councillor Lee  
Councillor Patton  
Councillor Ridge  
Councillor Sawdon  
Councillor Williams

Other Scrutiny Board  
Members Present:- Councillor Batten  
Councillor Mrs. Dixon  
Councillor M. Noonan  
Councillor Mrs. Waters

Cabinet Members  
Present:- Councillor Arrowsmith (Cabinet Member (Urban Regeneration  
and Regional Planning))  
Councillor Blundell (Cabinet Member (Children, Learning and  
Young People))

Employees Present:- R. Hughes (Head of Corporate Policy)  
C. Pullin (Children Services Directorate)  
N. Richards (City Development Directorate)  
P. Robinson (City Development Directorate)  
H. Simpson (Children Services Directorate)  
C. Steele (Chief Executive's Directorate)  
C. Swann (Legal and Democratic Services Directorate)  
A. Townsend (Legal and Democratic Services Directorate)

By Invitation:- Mr. Tayton (Petition Spokesperson)

Apologies:- Councillor Mutton

**8. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Clifford declared an interest in the matter the subject of Minute 6/06 below, headed "Proposed Capital Projects in the Non-Schools Programme". As this interest arose from his being a Council-appointed Governor of Limbrick Wood School, in accordance with Paragraph 5.1.3.3.2(c) of the City Council's Constitution, the interest was not regarded as being prejudicial.

**9. Proposed Capital Projects in the Non-Schools Programme**

Further to Minute 2/06, the Committee considered a joint report which had previously been considered by the Cabinet Member (Children, Learning and Young

People) (their Minute 4/06 refers and had been called in by Councillors Batten, Clifford and Mutton.

The report sought approval to the remodelling of the former infant building at Limbrick Wood Primary School to allow the relocation of the Minority Group Support Services and the Parent Partnership SEN Support Service from the former Sir Henry Parkes School site which was scheduled for demolition as part of the Canley Regeneration Programme.

The Members calling in the report and the Committee questioned the Cabinet Member and Officers on aspects of the report, in particular the reasons why Canley Regeneration Funding was being used to pay for these works which were outside of the regeneration area. The officers explained that the £150,000 being used for the works were as a result of a virement from the previous year which had added the same amount to the Canley Regeneration Budget at the end of the 2005/2006 financial year to fund The Canley Youth Project at the Midlands Sports Centre. This transfer had been documented in the statement of accounts which had been approved at Council the previous week. With regard to the costing for the scheme at Limbrick Wood, the officers confirmed that the works had been fully tendered and costed, the tender returns were within the £150,000 limit.

**RESOLVED that further consideration of this issue be deferred to the meeting on 12th July, 2006, and that the Officers be requested to draft a further report providing details of the 2005/06 virement, how it has been used and also a breakdown of the costs for the Limbrick Wood works.**

#### 10. **Proposed Bus Boarders in Belgrave Road**

Further to Minute 3/06, the Committee considered a report of the Director of City Development that had previously been considered by the Cabinet Member (Urban Regeneration and Regional Planning) (their Minute 3/06 refers) and had been called in by Councillors M. Noonan, Mrs. Dixon and Mrs. Waters.

The report set out the responses to a petition which had been submitted to the Cabinet Member opposing the introduction of a bus boarder at a bus stop on Belgrave Road and detailed the results of a site visit by the Cabinet Member.

The Committee received a representation from Mr. Tayton, who was the original petition spokesperson and also went on to question the Cabinet Member and Officer on aspects of the report, in particular the proposed traffic calming measures and their impact on emergency services vehicles, the dimensions of the street, and the accident record for the site. The Cabinet Member indicated that the bus boarder and traffic calming scheme went hand in hand, the traffic calming scheme was still to be consulted on and unless agreement could be reached on this the bus boarder would not go ahead.

**RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee concur with the decision of the Cabinet Member, noting that the bus boarder works were dependant on suitable traffic calming measures being agreed with local residents and that the road would be surveyed during the detailed design process for the scheme.**

11. **Call-Ins Stage 1**

The Director of Legal and Democratic Services reported on the following call-ins that had been received:-

(1) **Local Enterprise Growth Initiative (LEGI)**

The report had been called in by Councillors Lakha, Mutton and Batten.

The reason for the call-in was, "to understand in detail who are the members of the LEGI Partnership Board".

(2) **Arena Construction Completion Report**

The report had been called in by Councillors Townshend, Patton and Maton.

The reason for the call-in was, "to understand why since the Conservatives gained control of the Council in 2004 they have allowed the Ricoh Arena Project to slip into a £2.9m overspend".

The Committee noted that the deadline for call-ins from Cabinet and Cabinet Member decisions made during the week commencing 26th June, 2006, was 9.00 a.m. on Friday 7th July, 2006. Any further call-ins received after this meeting and before that deadline would be considered for validity by the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee in consultation with the Director of Legal and Democratic Services (Paragraph 4.5.25.4 of the City Council's Constitution refers).

**RESOLVED:-**

(1) **That the call-in detailed at (1) above be considered in detail by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee at their meeting on 19th July, 2006 and that the Cabinet Member (Urban Regeneration and Regional Planning) be requested to attend.**

(2) **That a decision on the validity of the call-in detailed at (2) above be deferred to the meeting on 12th July, 2006 to which all signatories to the call-in would be invited.**

12. **Report Back on Conference – Leading Delegation from SEWA International (Coventry), 4th to 18th February, 2006**

The Committee considered and noted a report of the former Lord Mayor, Councillor Lakha, which detailed the above civic visit and the outcomes of that visit.

13. **Report Back on Conference – 800th Anniversary of the City of Dresden, 30th March to 2nd April, 2006**

The Committee considered and noted a report of the former Lord Mayor, Councillor Lakha, which detailed the above civic visit and the outcomes of that visit.

14. **Scrutiny Boards Work Programmes 2006/2007**

The Committee considered and noted the work programmes for Scrutiny Board (1), (Culture, Leisure and Libraries, Finance, Procurement and Value for Money, Human Resources, Corporate and Customer Services and Audit Issues), Scrutiny Board (2) (Children, Learning and Young People) and Scrutiny Board (3) (Urban Regeneration and Regional Planning and City Services).

**RESOLVED that the work programme for Scrutiny Board (4) be submitted to the meeting on 12th July, 2006 to allow the Chair of the Board the opportunity to attend for this item.**

15. **Outstanding Issues**

The Committee considered and noted a report of the Director of Legal and Democratic Services that identified those issues on which further reports had been requested in order that Members monitor progress.

16. **2006/2007 Work Programme**

The Committee considered and noted the work programme for the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee for 2006/2007.

**RESOLVED:-**

- (1) That the Cabinet Member Plan be considered informally on 19th July in order to plan questions with formal consideration taking place at the meeting on 26th July, 2006.**
- (2) That with reference to the decision of Council on 27th June, 2006, that capital and revenue monitoring reports continue to be considered by Scrutiny Board (1) but if that they have any concerns regarding the progress of the programme they be referred to this Committee.**