



Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee

Time and Date

10.00 am on Wednesday, 10th May, 2017

Place

Committee Room 3 - Council House, Coventry, CV1 5RR

Public Business

1. **Apologies and Substitutions**
2. **Declarations of Interest**
3. **Minutes** (Pages 5 - 12)
 - (a) To agree the minutes of the previous meeting held on 12 April, 2017
 - (b) Matters Arising
4. **Annual Report of the Work of Outside Bodies - West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA)** (Pages 13 - 18)

Report of the Leader, G Councillor Duggins

The following will report at the meeting:

Martin Reeves, Chief Executive of WMCA
Councillor G Duggins, WMCA Board
Councillor J Mutton, Overview and Scrutiny Committee
Councillor S Bains, Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee
5. **Feedback on the Local Plan and City Centre Area Action Plan - Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 15 2017- April 28 2017)** (Pages 19 - 46)

Briefing Note of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place)

Councillors Bigham and Thomas, Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member for Community Development have been invited to the meeting for the consideration of this item

6. **Ignite Programme - Progress and Early Lessons** (Pages 47 - 56)

Briefing Note of the Executive Director of People

Councillors Bigham and Thomas, Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member for Community Development and Councillors Ruane and Seaman, Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member for Children and Young People have been invited to the meeting for the consideration of this item

7. **Prevent in the Community** (Pages 57 - 60)

Briefing Note of the Deputy Chief Executive (People)

Councillors A Khan and P Akhtar, Cabinet Member and Deputy Cabinet Member for Policing and Equalities have been invited to the meeting for the consideration of this item

8. **Outstanding Issues** (Pages 61 - 66)

Report of the Scrutiny Co-ordinator

9. **Review of 2016- 2017 Scrutiny Activity** (Pages 67 - 76)

Report of the Scrutiny Co-ordinator

10. **Any Other Items of Public Business**

Any other items of public business which the Chair decides to take as a matter of urgency because of the special circumstances involved.

Private Business

Nil

Martin Yardley, Executive Director, Place, Council House Coventry

Tuesday, 2 May 2017

- Notes:1) The person to contact about the agenda and documents for this meeting is Liz Knight, Democratic Services, Council House, Coventry, telephone 7683 3073, alternatively E-mail: liz.knight@coventry.gov.uk
- 2) Council Members who are not able to attend the meeting should notify Liz Knight no later than 9.00 a.m. on the day of the meeting, giving their reasons for absence and the name of the Council Member (if any) who will be attending the meeting as their substitute.
- 3) Scrutiny Board Members who have an interest in any report referred to this meeting, but who are not Members of this Committee, have been invited to notify the Chair by 12 noon on the day before the meeting that they wish to speak on a particular item. The Member must indicate to the Chair their reason for wishing to speak and the issue(s) they wish to raise.

Membership: Councillors N Akhtar, J Blundell, G Crookes, D Gannon, L Kelly, R Lancaster (Chair), J McNicholas, M Mutton and R Singh (Deputy Chair)

By invitation Councillors P Akhtar, S Bains, L Bigham, G Duggins, A Khan, J Mutton, E Ruane, P Seaman, C Thomas

Please note: a hearing loop is available in the committee rooms

If you require a British Sign Language interpreter for this meeting
OR if you would like this information in another format or
language please contact us.

**Suzanne Bennett/Liz Knight, Governance Services - Telephone: 024
7683 3072/3073**

E-mail:

suzanne.bennett@coventry.gov.uk/liz.knight@coventry.gov.uk

This page is intentionally left blank

Coventry City Council
Minutes of the Meeting of Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee held at 10.00 am on
Wednesday, 12 April 2017

Present:

Councillor J Blundell
Councillor D Gannon
Councillor L Kelly
Councillor J McNicholas
Councillor M Mutton
Councillor R Singh (Chair)
Councillor D Skinner

Other Members: Councillors J Mutton and P Seaman

Other representatives: Mary Dunleavy, Department for Work and Pensions (DWP)
Janet Gurney, Coventry Law Centre
Claire Hindson, DWP
Ed Hodson, Citizens Advice Bureau
Alan Markey, Coventry Independent Advice Services
Iona Old, DWP
Glen Smailes, Job Shop

Employees (by Directorate):

V Castree, Place Directorate
L Knight, Place Directorate
A West, Place Directorate

Apologies: Councillor N Akhtar, L Bigham (Cabinet Member) G Crookes,
R Lancaster and C Thomas (Deputy Cabinet Member)

Public Business

70. Declarations of Interest

There were no declarations of interest.

71. Minutes

The minutes of the meeting held on 3rd March, 2017 were signed as a true record.

With reference to Minute 63 headed 'Creation of a City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order', the Committee were informed that their recommendations had been considered by Cabinet on 7th March. Cabinet felt that the issues raised in recommendations i – iv were already being pursued, they accepted an amended version of recommendation v to 'support the consideration of a city centre skatepark' and accepted an amended version of recommendation vi which supported the 'further consideration of a clear cycle plan for the city centre'. In addition, the Committee noted that in respect of Minute 64 headed 'Connecting

Communities Phase 2', their recommendations had been accepted by Cabinet on 7th March without alteration.

72. **Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) - Priorities for 2017/18**

The Committee received a presentation from Mary Dunleavy, Claire Hindson and Iona Old, Department for Work and Pensions (DWP) which outlined their priorities, challenges and opportunities for 2017/18 and informed how partnership work was supporting their aims. Janet Gurney, Coventry Law Centre, Ed Hodson, Citizens Advice, Alan Markey, Independent Advice Service and Glen Smailes, Coventry Job Shop also attended the meeting for the consideration of this item. A paper from Janet Gurney and Alan Markey setting out potential partnership issues for consideration was tabled at the meeting.

The presentation highlighted that the unemployment rate had fallen to 4.7% which was the lowest since 2005. Coventry had 4,430 claiming work intensive benefits, 855 being 18-24 which was a significant positive change since 2010.

Information was provided on the Jobcentre Plus Offer. Support for claimants included a universal job match; a named Jobcentre Plus contact with experience of recruitment in the local area; attraction campaigns and opportunities to get involved in local events; opportunities to recruit via a sector specific route-way; and offers of work experience or work trials. Examples of recent individual cases where claimants had been supported were highlighted.

The Committee were provided with an understanding of universal credit and given details on the benefit cap. The full roll out for Universal Credit in Coventry was due to take place in April, 2018.

The presentation referred to the new Disability Confident scheme, which involved working with employers to increase their understanding of disability; challenging attitudes towards disability; removing barriers for disabled people; and ensuring disabled people had the opportunities to fulfil their potential.

The Committee were informed about the support provided by Jobcentre Plus which included disability employment advisers, work choice and Access to Work, a national programme which helped to overcome barriers that disabled people come across when moving onto or retaining employment. Detailed information was provided on the benefits of Access to Work, the eligibility criteria and the types of help available. Information was also provided on the Mental Health Support Service and the help available from the Access to Work programme. Examples of several success stories were provided where individuals had been assisted with Access to Work grants.

The presentation set out current partnership working which included support for schools and troubled families. The presentation concluded with a summary of departmental objectives.

Members questioned the representatives on a number of issues arising from the presentation and responses were provided, matters raised included:

- Information on sanctions placed on claimants and how long the appeals process took
- The support provided by DWP for troubled families including attendance at children centre partnership board meetings
- The involvement of the DWP with the new family hub models
- The relationship between DWP and the local Law Centre and Citizens Advice Bureau
- The opening hours for Job Centre Plus and the position of the Tile Hill office
- Clarification about the working age population and the classification of university students
- Further details about the budgeting support available for claimants
- Clarification that there was not a duplication of services amongst the partner organisations
- A suggestion that a representative from DWP be asked to sit on the Health and Wellbeing Board
- A request for a briefing session for all Members of the Council on Universal Credit
- Further information on how the work of Job Shop compliments the work of DWP
- Details about the 18-24 year olds entitled to benefits but not claiming and the reasons for this
- The financial support that would be available to help people manage when they are moved on to Universal Credit.

Representatives from the DWP agreed to provide the Committee with additional information about the Disability Confident scheme and a definition of the working age population.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The presentation be noted.

(2) Councillor Caan, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, be asked to consider the appointment of a representative from the Department of Work and Pensions as a member of the Board.

(3) Arrangements be put in place for a Members Briefing to understand how Scrutiny can support effective engagement in the run up to the introduction of universal credit.

(4) Information be circulated to Members to enable them to signpost residents with issues to the appropriate agency and also inform them about the various options for support.

(5) A copy of the letter sent by an MP to his local schools informing about the support offered by Job Centre Plus to help potential NEETS students be circulated to members.

73. Annual Report of the Work of Outside Bodies - Whitefriars Housing Association

The Committee considered a report of Councillor Patricia Seaman, one of the Council's four representatives on the Whitefriars Housing Board, which detailed the work of Whitefriars Housing over the preceding twelve months; set out the benefits to the Council of the Council's appointments; and provided information on the attendance records and remuneration for the appointments. Councillor Seaman attended the meeting for the consideration of this item.

RESOLVED that the current arrangements for the governance of the Whitefriars Housing Board continue to be made and the Council continues to appoint four individuals to the organisation to:

- **Ensure compliance with the values and purpose of Whitefriars Housing**
- **Play a leading role in setting the direction for the organisation**
- **Establishment of policies and plans**
- **Ensure residents are central to plans and decisions**
- **Oversee a framework of delegation and control**
- **Take decisions on significant matters**
- **Approve annual accounts, budgets and business plans for agreement at West Mercia Group Board**
- **Monitor performance in relation to plan budgets and key performance indicators.**

74. Public Transport Select Committee - Outcomes and Learning

The Committee considered a briefing note of the Deputy Chief Executive (Place) which had previously been considered by the Business, Economy and Enterprise Scrutiny Board (3) at their meeting on 22nd March, 2017 (their minute 48/17 refers) which detailed the outcomes of the Scrutiny Board's Public Transport Select Committee held on 15th February, 2017.

The report indicated that in preparation for the Select Committee:

- Members of the Board visited the House of Commons on 19th July 2016 sat in on the Parliamentary Select Committee on Transport to observe Members questioning witnesses, they also met with Clive Betts MP the Chair of Communities and Local Government and questioned him on the process of a Select Committee in the Houses of Parliament.
- An Advisory Panel of the Board, comprising Councillors Brown, Lancaster, Mayer, and McNicholas (chair), was established to clarify and finalise key lines of enquiry and scope for the meeting.
- Members attended a number of briefings and were provided with background documentation on: Effective Questioning for Scrutiny; Connecting Coventry – Strategic Transport Investment Programme; Coventry Station Masterplan; and Coventry Rail Story.
- Members agreed the key lines of enquiry and the witnesses to be invited to provide evidence and also invited representatives from Coventry Older

Voices and Transport Focus (the independent transport user watchdog) to participate in the meeting. Twitter and Facebook would also to be used to encourage public participation.

The Select Committee was set out in 3 sessions at which Members received presentations and information from witnesses and raised questions in response:

- Session 1 - How can train connectivity support economic development and business growth in the city?
- Session 2 - How can we improve the bus service in the city?
- Session 3 - What are the key accessibility issues for public transport in the city, and how can they be addressed?

The Committee were informed that Scrutiny Board (3) had agreed the lessons learned and ways to improve the process as follows:

- i. Specific briefings for Cabinet Members by Select Committee Chair and Officers should be held, especially if the themes of the committee span more than one portfolio.
- ii. Members on the select committee attend briefing sessions, avoid substitutions and fully familiarise themselves with background briefing papers.
- iii. Presentations from witnesses should be to introduce their role only and not provide additional or new information.
- iv. The number of witnesses should be kept to a maximum of three per session.
- v. Questions to witnesses should be given one at a time to allow multiple witnesses to respond, and should be limited to 60-90 seconds.
- vi. Questions to witnesses should be prepared prior to the meeting by members of the committee, based on background briefing information and themed or grouped together.
- vii. Careful consideration of payment to expert witness should be made where there are gaps in knowledge by Council officers.
- viii. Council officers who attend as witnesses should be senior officers with responsibility for implementing and managing policy decisions.
- ix. The select committee should be consist of a half-day to question witnesses with additional time for a plenary session, so recommendations can be identified on the day.
- x. Social media and other traditional communications are used well in advance of the meeting to enable questions from the public to be considered as part of the process.

A briefing note of the Scrutiny Co-ordinator informed the Committee that at their meeting on 22nd March, Scrutiny Board 3 had also agreed that Cabinet Members be required to attend all future Scrutiny Select Committees and that advanced publicity for Select Committees be maximised to encourage public participation.

The Committee discussed a number of issues arising from the briefing notes including:

- For any future Scrutiny Select Committees, the importance of members being fully involved in the complete process
- Clarification about the attendance of witnesses on the day

- A suggestion that, in relation to the recommendation to the Cabinet Member for Jobs and Regeneration that he commissions a bus user and non-user survey just for Coventry, that Transport for West Midlands be involved in the survey
- The benefits of having the option to choose either a Scrutiny Select Committee or a Task and Finish Group to investigate an issue
- The models for Scrutiny work used by other local authorities
- The selection of members to serve on the Select Committee

Members placed on record their appreciation for all the work undertaken by the Scrutiny Team to ensure the success of the Select Committee meeting.

RESOLVED that:

(1) The benefits of using a Select Committee approach for Scrutiny be noted.

(2) The lessons learned on the process, as detailed in paragraph 14 of the report, for future Select Committee arrangements be noted.

(3) Consideration of suitable subjects for potential Select Committees be discussed by the individual Scrutiny Boards when discussing their work programmes for the new municipal year.

(4) The following two additional Scrutiny Board (3) recommendations from the meeting on 22nd March be noted:

(i) Relevant Cabinet Members be required to attend all future Select Committees

(ii) Advanced publicity for future Select Committees be maximised to encourage public participation.

(5) With reference to recommendation 3) from the Scrutiny Board (3) meeting, the Cabinet Member for Jobs and Regeneration be recommended to involve Transport for West Midlands in any bus user and non-user survey undertaken in Coventry.

75. Outstanding Issues

The Committee noted a report of the Scrutiny Co-ordinator which outlined the approach to be taken on progress, outcomes and responses to recommendations and actions made by the Committee.

76. Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee Work Programme 2016/2017

The Committee noted their work programme for the current municipal year.

77. Any Other Items of Public Business - West Midlands Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee

The Committee noted an update from Councillor J Mutton, the Council's representative on the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) Overview and Scrutiny Committee, regarding his attendance at the recent Committee meeting held on 21st March, 2017. The Committee had discussed the key principles to

underpin the relationship between the CA and local authority scrutiny by individual authorities on the work of the CA. The Committee had agreed that all partners would work together to exchange views, to minimise bureaucracy and ensure the best use of resources. The Committee agreed that their focus would be on regional issues and there was an acknowledgement that, for some issues, consideration at a local scrutiny level would be preferable. Local Scrutiny Committees would have the opportunity to make recommendations to the CA.

The Committee noted that they were due to discuss progress of the work of the WMCA at their meeting on 10th May, 2017.

(Meeting closed at 12.20 pm)

This page is intentionally left blank



Coventry City Council

Public report

Report to
Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee

10 May 2017

Report of
Councillor George Duggins - Leader of the Council

Title
Annual Report on the Work of Outside Bodies – West Midlands Combined Authority

1 Purpose of the Report

- 1.1 This report sets out details of the work of the elected members appointed to Committees of the West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) over the preceding twelve months and details of attendance by the City Council's representatives.
- 1.2 The WMCA is a statutory body that facilitates the collaboration and joint working between local authorities to drive economic prosperity for the area. It was established on 17 June 2016 with Coventry being one of the seven constituent members. This gives the City Council full voting rights at its board and influence in how the WMCA achieves its ambition for the West Midlands to help rebalance the UK economy, closing the £16bn output gap, and lead the Midlands Engine for the benefit of the region and the citizens of Coventry.
- 1.3 The WMCA operates within the framework of legislative and constitutional parameters and its governance arrangements require appointments to its board and sub committees from the seven constituent authorities. From May 2017 the WMCA will be operating as a Mayoral Combined Authority.
- 1.4 Council has made the following appointments to the WMCA board and its committees:-
 - WMCA Board:
 - Councillor George Duggins (substitute member Councillor Jim O'Boyle)
 - Councillor Abdul Khan (substitute member Councillor Kevin Maton)
 - WMCA Overview and Scrutiny Committee:
 - Councillor John Mutton (substitute member Councillor R Singh)
 - WMCA Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee:
 - Councillor Sucha Bains (substitute member Councillor N Akhtar)

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 Appointments to the WMCA Board and Committees should continue to be made to the organisation in line with legislative requirements.

3 Information on the WMCA

- 3.1 The Board co-ordinates the work of the WMCA to achieve its identified priorities across the region. The Leader of the City Council as member of the WMCA board provides a statement of the work of the WMCA at each meeting of the City Council.
- 3.2 The Leaders of the constituent authorities, as part of their WMCA duties, have distinct responsibilities for programmes, initiatives or projects and work in partnership with each of the three Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs). Councillor Duggins is portfolio lead member for skills and productivity – skills and productivity commission (including employability), learning for the future and Further Education (FE) area reviews.
- 3.3 In March, Cllr Duggins was appointed as the City Council's representative on the Board of Directors for the newly created West Midlands Growth Company, created and owned by the WMCA, to attract investment, jobs, visitors and businesses to the West Midlands and raise the profile of the region in national and global markets.
- 3.4 The WMCA has set out its priorities as follows:-

Economic Priority:

The West Midlands Combined Authority is based on an extensive Functional Economic Market Area assessment, which tested whether the geographic area covered by the three LEPs would be more beneficial financially than the LEPs continuing to work separately. As a result of this, the emerging WMCA plans on using the geography to jointly create an economy which is the strongest outside London and contributes fully to the Government's vision of a wider "Midlands Engine for Growth".

The West Midlands region is renowned for its innovation – its businesses account for almost 10% of UK research and development expenditure, much of which is delivered in partnership with local universities. It has some of the best performing educational institutions in the country and it has particular strengths in digital technology and computer science, healthcare, business administration, engineering and technology, and education. The region also has a range of internationally recognised research institutions. This is why the West Midlands Combined Authority has ambitious plans to build on these strong foundations.

If the region grows at the same rate as the London economy then the West Midlands will be £26.4 million better off by 2030.

Skills Priority:

The West Midlands suffers from a significant shortage of skills both at the lower and higher ends of the skills spectrum. The skills deficit is reflected in the high levels of unemployment (9.3%) across the seven Metropolitan Authorities. This is why skills is one of the West Midlands Combined Authority's key priorities.

3.5 **Transport Priority:**

We need a fully integrated rail and rapid transit network that connects our main centres with quick and frequent services, and that increases the number of people who can readily access HS2 stations and main centres. By delivering this, we will reduce transport's impact on our environment, improving air quality, reducing carbon emissions and improving road safety. The resulting network will enable the efficient movement of goods to help businesses to connect to supply chains, key markets and strategic gateways.

Housing Priority:

The West Midlands has a large and ever-increasing population, which needs to be accommodated for in the future. This is why housing is one of the West Midlands Combined Authority's key priorities. The WMCA will therefore establish a Land Commission to help identify the land which can be used or regenerated to create homes for the future.

- 3.4 The WMCA has established three commissions to create a blueprint that can deliver economic, social and public sector reform for the West Midlands and also a blueprint for change that may be used elsewhere in the country. The Commissions are addressing:
- Mental Health
 - Productivity and Skills
 - Land
- 3.5 In April 2017 the WMCA published its Review and Annual Plan 2017/18 which highlights progress to date and sets out the objectives that will develop and grow the Combined Authority agenda during 2017/18. The plan is available at:
<https://www.wmca.org.uk/what-we-do/>
- 3.6 The Plan includes a summary of the significant projects supported by the WMCA aimed at addressing the region's primary regeneration and economic growth goals. For Coventry, this includes:
- Resources of £150m identified in the Devolution Deal to support the Council with the development of both its City Centre South and Friargate schemes - earlier this year the WMCA Board approved a grant of up to £98.8m to support the development of the City Centre South scheme.
 - The Connecting Coventry programme totalling £620m, of which £284m will be provided by the WMCA, to deliver a step change in transport connectivity to remove barriers to growth including improving connectivity to HS2 and UK Central.

4. Overview and Scrutiny Committee

- 4.1 The Overview and Scrutiny committee met four times over the course of the last year and has been consolidating its terms of reference and formulating its work programme. In November it held a workshop with Leaders and Chief Executives to support the development of the work programme.
- 4.2 In considering the formulation of its work programme the Committee was minded to concentrate on the outcomes from the three Commissions established by the Combined Authority addressing Mental Health, Productivity and Skills and Land. The Committee will address these issues, together with a fourth focusing on budget scrutiny, through the establishment of task and finish groups and these will start work in the new municipal year.

- 4.3 In January, the Combined Authorities (Overview and Scrutiny Committees Access to Information and Audit Committees) Order 2017 was ratified. This comes into force on 8 May 2017 and sets out arrangements for working including for membership, chairing, work programming and scrutiny relations with the Mayor and the combined authority and these will be reflected in the future working of the Committee. Work is also being undertaken to develop protocols for effective working between combined authority and local authority scrutiny.
- 4.4 The WMCA Board received a report on the Overview and Scrutiny Committee at its meeting of 7 April 2017 and this can be found at pages 19-49 of the report pack at: <https://www.wmca.org.uk/media/1817/adocpackpublicversion0001.pdf>

5. Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee

- 5.1 The Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee met three time during the year. It considered a number of reports and polices of the WMCA that have been produced during the first year including the strategic risk strategy and risk report, report on the overview of governance and assurance arrangements, report of the internal auditor and counter fraud review and finance and budget update.
- 5.2 The Chair of the Committee has worked closely with the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee to ensure that the two bodies work in a complementary and effective way and attended the November workshop.
- 5.3 The WMCA Board received a report on the Audit, Risk and Assurance Committee at its meeting of 7 April 2017 and this can be found at pages 51-54 of the report pack at: <https://www.wmca.org.uk/media/1817/adocpackpublicversion0001.pdf>

4 Benefits to the City Council of the Appointments

- 4.1 The appointments to the WMCA Board and Committees ensure the voice of Coventry residents is heard, the benefits of devolution for the City continues and that the City Council retains its influential role within the WMCA.

5 What Financial Contribution Does the Council Make to this Organisation

- 5.1 The financial contribution for 2016/17 was £213,000, although the budget put aside for the WMCA was £500,000.

6 Attendance Record and Remuneration for the Appointment

- 6.1 The West Midlands Combine Authority Board met 13 times during the year. Councillor Duggins attended all 13 meetings and Councillor A Khan attended 9.
- 6.2 West Midlands Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee have held 4 meetings, Cllr Mutton has attended two meetings and submitted apologies for two meetings, sending a substitute to one. Cllr Mutton also attended the workshop in November.
- 6.3 West Midlands Combined Authority Audit Committee – Cllr Bains has attended all 3 meetings of the Committee.

List of background papers

Proper officer:

Author:

Councillor George Duggins - Lead Member
(Any enquiries should be directed to the above)

Telephone: 024 7683 1003

Other contributors:

Councillor Sucha Bains

Councillor John Mutton

Julie Newman, Legal Services Manager (People)

Adrian West, Members and Elections Team Manager

Papers open to Public Inspection

<https://westmidlandscombinedauthority.org.uk/committees/>

Description of paper

Schedule of City Council Appointments to Outside Bodies

Location:

Council House, Room 59

This page is intentionally left blank



Coventry City Council

Briefing note

To: The Scrutiny Coordination Committee

Date 10th May 2017

Subject: Feedback on the Local Plan and City Centre Area Action Plan - Proposed Modifications Consultation (March 15th 2017 – April 28th 2017)

1 Purpose of the Note

1.1 The purpose of this note is to provide the members of the Scrutiny Coordination Committee with a summary of the feedback and consultation responses received to the statutory period of public consultation between March 15th and April 28th 2017, in so far as they relate to the proposed modifications to the Draft City Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) and the Draft Local Plan.

1.2 This paper responds to recommendation 3 of the Local Plan and City Centre AAP proposed modifications report endorsed by Cabinet and Council at their respective meetings on the 7th and 14th March 2017. For the avoidance of doubt, the recommendation read as follows:

“Delegates authority to the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Community Development, the Chair of Scrutiny Coordination Board and the Chair of Planning Committee, to take full account of the responses received to the statutory period of public consultation, propose any further minor amendments to both Plans (where this is necessary to correct any errors and aid clarity) and submit the Plans back to the Secretary of State’s nominated Inspector for her final consideration”.

This report has now been presented and supported by the Executive Director of Place (now referenced as Deputy Chief Executive – Place).

Further briefing sessions are to be held with the Cabinet Member for Community Development (Cllr Bigham) and the Chair of Planning Committee (Cllr Brown) in advance of the committee meeting on the 10th May 2017.

It is presented to the Chair of the Scrutiny Coordination Committee as part of this meeting.

2 Recommendations

2.1 The Scrutiny Coordination Board are recommended to:

- 1) Consider the content of the briefing note and its Appendices; and

- 2) Endorse the submission of all representations and summary notes of public drop in sessions and the schedule of proposed minor changes to the Secretary of States nominated Inspector for her consideration as part of the on-going Public Examination of the city's draft Local Plan and City Centre Area Action Plan.

3 Information/Background

- 3.1 The period of public engagement began on Wednesday 15th March and finished on Friday 28th April 2017. The Plans did however become public on the 28th February in advance of them being considered by Cabinet and Council on the 7th and 14th March respectively. Throughout the period of engagement the Council's Planning and Housing Policy team have worked jointly with the Communications team to ensure that a comprehensive communications strategy has been delivered. This has been carried out in full accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement and with a degree of consistency with the consultation programme utilised in early 2016.
- 3.2 The section below summarises the public engagement processes and the feedback received as of 3pm on Friday 28th April. A further summary of responses received after that point on the final day of the consultation will be provided in the form of an addendum note. This additional note will be made available to members of Scrutiny Coordination Committee as soon as possible in advance of the meeting on the 10th May. This note principally groups the engagement process into 1 of 4 categories:
 - Public drop-in sessions;
 - Other engagement activity;
 - Community responses to the proposed changes to both Plans; and
 - Other responses to the proposed changes to both Plans (including those from developers, neighbouring councils and other stakeholders).

4 Public drop-in sessions

- 4.1 In order to support the consultation process a selection of drop-in sessions were arranged and advertised. Five of these sessions were again targeted in areas that were most effected by the Local Plans proposals to remove land from the Green Belt, with a sixth session held at the city centre library. A total of 6 sessions were therefore held across the city. The city centre drop-in session was held on a Saturday covering the morning and lunch time period. The remaining five sessions were held across the late afternoon and early evening. This was intended to facilitate attendance after school and work times.
- 4.2 The drop-in sessions were advertised in local media and by way of post card delivery to in excess of 1,000 homes within the immediate vicinity of each location. We have been advised that not all homes within the immediate vicinity received these cards informing them of the public meetings and have managed two specific complaints to this regard, both relating to the Keresley area of the city. As part of reviewing those complaints it was apparent that not all local roads were covered by the original post card distribution around Keresley. This was rectified by a further post card delivery run in the two days preceding the Keresley drop in session. The initial non-delivery of post cards to some local roads around Keresley was a result of an assumption based on the positive experience of last year's post card delivery work. The previous post card delivery run (in January 2016) had yielded significant interest in the Keresley area, with the main point of concern being the venue for the

public meetings, which was subsequently changed. In addition to the two formal complaints received in relation to the Keresley area some concern was raised at the drop in sessions themselves at both Eastern Green and Whitley. This was with regard to the extent of post card distribution as opposed to failure to receive such post cards. On a more positive side, a number of local residents attended sessions specifically in response to the post cards being delivered to their home. Based on officers' experience of the drop-in sessions, we are therefore as confident as we can be that local communities were sufficiently aware of the proposed changes to both Plans and that if some homes were missed as part of the initial delivery process, this has not appeared to have hampered the local communities ability to respond to the Plans or attend drop-in sessions.

- 4.3 The table below clarifies the dates and venues for the drop-in sessions as well as approximate attendance levels and key points of feedback. Unfortunately due to the nature of the events it did not prove possible to record full notes and records of the questions asked. Appendix 1 does however contain a full summary of the areas discussed. In general these picked up on localised concerns and were broadly consistent with the concerns raised at the previous consultation events in 2016.
- 4.4 To support the drop-in session's officers provided copies of the Local Plan maps and Frequently Asked Questions. These were provided in paper form and as part of laminated display posters. Officers also utilised other evidence documents that have supported the Plans development to explain different proposals to local residents. In addition to paper documents officers were also able to utilise new Council IT including lap tops and mobile internet to explain site specific maps and to provide additional relevant detail when required.

Date of Public Meeting	Venue	Approximate Attendance	Key areas of discussion
Friday 24 th March 2017	Xcel Centre, Canley	50-100	Objection to Green Belt development, especially within the Cromwell Lane, Kings Hill and Westwood Heath areas (the latter two being within Warwick District). Questions were also asked around infrastructure delivery, most notably around highway pressures and congestion. This also included issues of parking pressures at Tile Hill Station and matters of highway safety. A number of questions were raised in relation to Brexit, population projections, student numbers and the overall need for green belt release and housing development.
Saturday 25 th March 2017	Central Library, City Centre	0-50	Discussions at the city centre session were diverse and picked up a range of discussions that mirrored those at the area specific meetings. This included issues relevant to Keresley, Eastern Green, Westwood and Baginton Fields. In addition

			there was targeted city centre discussion around homelessness and rough sleeping, city centre regeneration and general support the proposed schemes such as City Centre South. Concerns were raised however about the perceived university focus within the city centre.
Monday 27 th March 2017	Eastern Green Social Club	200-250	Objection to Green Belt development, especially within the Eastern Green area. Questions were asked around infrastructure delivery, most notably around highway pressures, site access and links to the surrounding road network. Questions were also raised about the relationship of new homes to existing residential communities, new school provision and new health care facilities. A number of questions were raised in relation to Brexit, population projections, student numbers, the Housing White Paper and the overall need for Green Belt release and housing development. Objections focused predominantly on housing delivery but also related to the employment and retail elements of the proposed scheme.
Wednesday 29 th March 2017	President Kennedy School, Keresley	100-150	Objection to Green Belt development, especially within the Keresley area. Questions were asked around infrastructure delivery, most notably around highway pressures, site access and links to the surrounding road network. This also picked up discussion around the proposed link road and Jubilee woodland. Questions were also asked around infrastructure delivery and the relationship of new homes to existing residential communities, new school provision and new health care facilities. A number of questions were raised in relation to Brexit, population projections, student numbers and the overall need for Green Belt release and housing development.
Thursday 6 th April 2017	Grangehurst Primary School,	0-50	Discussion focused more around the Keresley proposals and the cross boundary impacts with areas such

	Longford		as Ash Green. Localised discussion focused on support for retaining Green Belt around Lentons Lane. Whilst requests were made to improve bus provisions in communities north of the M6.
Tuesday 11 th April 2017	Whitley Academy School	50-100	Objection to Green Belt development in general, but most notably around the Baginton Fields site and proposals to expand Whitley Business Park. Concerns focused primarily around the possible impact on ecology and biodiversity in the local area and loss of local nature trails and wildlife. There were also concerns about how new employment development would relate to existing residential communities and how the site would be accessed. Questions were also asked about infrastructure delivery – most notably around highway improvements and air quality. Discussion also criticised the level of consultation and how responses had been taken into account in developing the Plan.

4.5 In addition to the drop-in sessions opportunities to attend other public meetings were explored. Unfortunately due to timing issues only one ward forum was held during the consultation process – at Westwood ward. Although officers were unable to attend the ward forum itself a briefing note was provided to the ward councillors for distribution at the forum meeting. A further briefing note was provided to support on-going consideration of the Plans within Wainbody ward. This was also provided at the request of the ward councillors. Further information was also provided in advance of the Finham Parish Council meeting on the 24th April 2017.

4.6 In terms of feedback, the strongest objections to the Local Plan were again raised in the areas around Cromwell Lane, Eastern Green, Whitley and Keresley, with objections to the principle of developing on Green Belt land and specific issues relating to proposed development sites.

4.7 In addition the other key areas of debate in relation to the Local Plan included:

- Infrastructure - both existing capacity and new provision – most notably around highways, drainage/flood risk, health care and education.
- The relationship of existing homes to the new proposed developments and how these would be integrated and screened. This was a particular issue at Eastern Green, Keresley, Westwood and Whitley.
- Ecology and Biodiversity – the loss of Green Belt land was identified as impacting negatively on ecology and biodiversity as well as access to green spaces. This was a particularly sensitive issue in Whitley in relation to possible impacts on Stonebridge Meadows and Baginton Fields.

- Although the length of the consultation period was debated less this time, matters of consultation and notification continued to be an issue for local residents. The availability of detailed information was felt to be inadequate in a number of cases and in Keresley in particular complaints were made about the poor distribution of post cards to advertise the consultation programme.
- The suitability and appropriateness of background data and information, especially around population projections and the impact of the city's student population. A number of objections continued to feel that the growth projections for the city were too high and were skewed by the city's student population. This matter formed a key part of discussions on local radio. Matters relating to Brexit were also mentioned and whether or not this could impact on the city's growth.
- A desire to see greater focus of development on brownfield land and continuation of urban regeneration. This was often linked to questions around the need to build on Green Belt land in the first place and the potential for phasing the release of land.

4.8 With regards the City Centre Area Action Plan, discussions were limited and the plan appears to have gained genuine support. The greatest discussions were had at the City Centre, Longford and Whitley drop in events, although it was also discussed briefly at Eastern Green. The most notable areas of discussion included:

- City centre car parking – it was felt by some that the quality of car parking in the city centre needed to be improved and that ideally the costs of it would reduce to make it more competitive with out of town shopping parks and other towns and cities.
- Student orientation – It was felt that the city centre had become focused solely on students and the University. There were concerns that any development taking place in the city centre was solely University focused and that it was driving the city's wider population out to other locations such as Solihull and Leamington.
- Importance of new leisure and retail opportunities – this was linked to general support for the proposed regeneration programmes at City Centre South etc. there was a recognition that the city centre needed to regenerate itself to attract new investment and increase foot fall.

4.9 One overarching theme of the drop in sessions was a support in principle for the need to grow and support the city's economy, creating more jobs for local people. It was also discussed that new homes should follow jobs growth and be located in close proximity in order to support sustainable development. This was also seen by many as an opportunity to link infrastructure and promote sustainable transport. This was an overarching theme of both Plans, although there were local concerns about employment based development at Eastern Green and further expansion of the Whitley business park. Opportunities to provide more affordable homes and combat problems of homelessness and rough sleeping were also supported. These matters were discussed specifically at the city centre drop in session.

5 Other Engagement Activity

5.1 A range of additional activity has taken place over the course of the consultation process. This has included:

- A range of information made available in local libraries and council buildings;

- As referenced above, a number of post cards delivered to local communities to advertise and promote the drop-in sessions;
- Radio interview with BBC Coventry and Warwickshire;
- Letter and email notifications to Council consultation databases;
- Update of the new Local Plan website with a specific section on proposed modifications;
- Other correspondence in local newspapers, Citivision, radio and social media; and
- Site and area specific meetings (where they have been requested) to discuss Plan proposals and aid clarity.

5.2 Much of this activity has generated emails, phone calls and letters to the Council's Planning and Housing Policy team commenting on the Local Plan and City Centre AAP in more generic terms. Much of this engagement has however focused on a number of key themes, including the need for development of Green Belt land, site/area specific issues and detailed enquiries around the population projections and housing numbers. The most common area of engagement in terms of emails and phone calls has resulted from residents in the Keresley, Eastern Green and Cromwell Lane areas of the city expressing particular concern around the potential development of Green Belt land in these particular areas.

6 Community responses to Both Plans

6.1 There has continued to be a sizeable interest in the Plans and attendance at all drop in sessions was at least on par with previous events in early 2016, with increased attendance in many cases. Officers are of the view that this is reflective, in part at least, of the increased distribution of emails and letters to interested parties following the collation of contact details at the last stage of consultation. Despite high levels of engagement and interest in both plans though the total number of responses (received at the time of writing) has declined compared to the previous consultation stage. At the time of writing 169 responses had been received to the Local Plan and 5 to the City Centre AAP. This compared to more than 700 responses in the previous round of consultation.

6.2 As part of the consultation process responses were requested either via written letter or email. This responded to the technical difficulties experienced with standardised response forms used previously and the apparent preference for submitting own comments in a more informal and personal way. In addition, and due to the targeted nature of the consultation – focusing on the proposed changes to both Plans as opposed to the Plan in general a Survey Monkey process was not applied to this consultation as there were no specific questions to seek responses to.

6.3 At the time of writing no new petitions had been lodged or received by the Council relating to the Proposed Modifications for the Local Plan or City centre AAP.

6.4 Of the 174 consultation responses currently received, 151 were from local residents or community groups with all but 1 relating to the draft Local Plan. In addition 2 responses were received from Coventry ward councillors.

6.5 In general local communities and residents responded in objection to the Local Plan proposals. They were generally focused on 1 key area – namely the loss of Green

Belt land to development and the related implications and reasons behind it. These concerns tended to manifest themselves in relation to specific locations, most notably Cromwell Lane, Eastern Green, Whitley and Keresley. This included references to encroachment on the Meriden Gap and concerns over the possible merging of Coventry with neighbouring towns and cities. It also raised concerns about nature conservation, ecology and biodiversity. In raising objections residents and communities did raise a range of comments relating to site specific issues and concerns. These included:

- Highway capacity and safety and the need for improvements and investment;
- Lack of existing capacity in local school places;
- Lack of existing health care capacity;
- The importance of infrastructure provisions in general;
- Drainage and flood risk issues, both on sites proposed for development and subsequent impacts on existing built up areas;
- The importance of any new development being well integrated into the existing urban area;
- The importance of any new development being high quality design;
- That if development does happen that it is well landscaped and includes an appropriate buffer/screening to existing homes;
- Greater clarity as to what such a buffer could look like and how big it would be;
- The ability of utilities to cope with planned growth;
- The impacts of development on local ecology and biodiversity, including ancient woodlands, trees, hedgerows, nature reserves, nature trails and community green spaces; and
- The lack of a dedicated phasing policy and failure to exhaust all brownfield opportunities before releasing Green Belt land.

As such, the responses received to the consultation process on the Local Plan have mirrored the feedback received at the drop-in sessions as well as the responses received at last year's consultation stage.

- 6.6 One notable addition was a number of references made to the Housing White Paper. Although there was some consistency with the issues raised by some parts of the development industry, the concerns raised by local communities were wider and focused predominantly on the importance of estate regeneration, brownfield development and protecting the Green Belt and natural environments.
- 6.7 With regards the City Centre AAP, a total of 5 responses were received at the time of writing. Thus far responses have been focused around singular issues and have not necessarily reflected the discussions had at the drop in sessions. The issues raised can be summarised as follows:
- The importance of regenerating the city centre – including around Hertford Street;
 - The importance of promoting a unique selling point for the city centre; and
 - The importance of promoting and managing dedicated leisure provisions within the city centre.

7 Other Responses to both Plans

- 7.1 At the time of writing, 16 responses have been received to the Local Plan from other companies and organisations. Thus far only 1 has been received from neighbouring councils (including parish and town councils). Of these 17 responses

10 are from the development industry or large employers/companies in the local area. This included national and local house builders, planning consultancies and land agents/promoters.

- 7.2 Responses from this grouping tended to focus on 1 of 2 viewpoints. The first of these viewpoints was from those promoting sites allocated within the Plan and was broadly positive and supportive of the approach the Local Plan was taking. This included continued recognition that the city could not accommodate its full housing needs within its own boundaries, but that the Plan had taken an appropriate and well evidenced approach to growth and development. There was also support for site proposals and broad support for the key infrastructure and design principles associated with them. This included broad support for the new Masterplan Principles policy and the updated Infrastructure Delivery Plan, albeit with a small number of suggested adjustments to detailed wording. The other view point highlighted concerns about how the proposed modifications to the Local Plan responded to the Housing White Paper, with a particular focus on the point about when Local Plans should be reviewed. Concerns were also raised in relation to the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan and its identified shortfall against the Coventry and Warwickshire Housing Requirements Memorandum of Understanding. There was also some suggestion that housing needs within the city and across the sub region as a whole were higher and should be appropriately reflected in Plan.
- 7.3 There were also other areas of continued challenge and objection, which largely reflected previous areas of objection that had not been successfully, addressed during the examination hearings. Of particular focus was the changes made to the Environmental Management policies and the continued exclusion of certain sites such as those around Duggins Lane.
- 7.4 In addition to the developer led organisations and businesses, a number of responses were received from local groups and specialist organisations (some of which have responsibilities around the Duty to cooperate) to the Local Plan. In total six responses have been received thus far and were more specialist in nature reflecting their specific areas of interest. Generally comments were positive but did seek some areas of clarification, concern and suggested amendments. These can be summarised as follows:
- Warwickshire Wildlife Trust – general support but with suggested small adjustments to wording for policy DS4 in particular..
 - Natural England – no further comments to make
 - Woodland Trust – general support but with suggested small adjustments to wording for policies GE1 and GE3.
 - Historic England – highlight the Statement of Common Ground and positive work undertaken to overcome previous concerns. Subsequent correspondence has highlighted the work undertaken in partnership for the Local Plan and AAP to be exemplar with regards the historic environment.
 - Highways England - wish to ensure on-going discussions around development proposals, especially where they may have an impact on the strategic highway network. This is particularly related to funding and securing developer contributions to facilitate key aspects of infrastructure.
 - The Coal Authority – support in principle for the proposed changes to reflect mining legacy issues, but wish to see this go further, especially in Policy EM2. Also query the relevance of new policy EM10.

- 7.5 In relation to the Area Action Plan, a total of 4 responses were received from developers and organisations. The Coal Authority, Historic England and Natural England had no further comment to make on the AAP, whilst representatives from the Coventry Techno Park expressed a desire to see a greater unique selling point for the city centre with greater focus on leisure developments to help attract new business and footfall.
- 7.7 The Duty to Cooperate is of particular importance to both Plans. Although engagement relative to both Plans is technically intended to end at the point the Plans are submitted, we have continued to work closely with neighbouring councils and other relevant stakeholders to ensure the Plans remain sound, legally compliant and deliverable. We have also worked closely with other Councils to support the preparation and development of their own respective Plans, especially in regard to the Housing and Employment MOU's for Coventry and Warwickshire. In deed this has seen an Employment Land MOU approved by all 6 Coventry and Warwickshire authorities after the city Councils plans were submitted and further engagement with Warwick District Council on cross boundary matters relating to both Plans at their respective examination stages. As such, information was shared with all respective Duty to Cooperate bodies and groups including: Historic England, The Coventry and Warwickshire LEP, NHS England, Transport for West Midlands, Warwickshire County Council, the Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Duty to Cooperate group, and the West Midlands Metropolitan Duty to Cooperate group. In this context the Council has continued to maintain channels of communication and cooperation by way of good practice and partnership working.
- 7.8 At this time, we have had 1 response from Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council expressing their continued support for the Plan. With this exception no further responses have been received from neighbouring authorities, utility providers (including Severn Trent), emergency service providers or NHS England.

8 Proposed Changes to both Plans

- 8.1 Following the consultation process there are a small number of minor changes that are proposed for both Plans. These changes are small and predominantly aid clarification and certainty of the Plans. All proposed changes are included in a schedule at Appendix 2 alongside reasons for them being made. It is intended that these additional amendments will be provided to the Inspector as part of an invitation to include them if she feels it appropriate. Due to their nature it is not envisaged that further consultation would be required in relation to these amendments.
- 8.2 It is important to stress though that the final consideration of these changes alongside those which have been subject to this consultation rests with the appointed Planning Inspector.

List of Appendices:

1. Summary notes of drop-in sessions
2. Schedule of possible further amendments to the Local Plan.

Mark Andrews

**Planning and Housing Policy Manager
Place Directorate
02476 834295**

This page is intentionally left blank

Appendix 1 – Summary points for Local Plan and City Centre AAP drop-in Sessions

Proposed Modifications consultation

March – April 2017

Summary of Feedback from Xcel Leisure Centre Consultation Session

Friday 24th March 2017 – 16:00 – 19:30

Held at Xcel Leisure Centre, Mitchell Avenue.

Approximate Attendance: 50-100 people.

Areas of discussion:

- City Centre;
- Kings Hill – proposed development site;
- Westwood Heath – proposed development site;
- Cromwell Lane – proposed development site; and
- Solihull development proposals.

Key Points:

- What stage of the Local Plan process is this and why are you consulting further at this stage?
- What happens to the Local Plan next?
- Hasn't the Inspector already approved the Plan?
- What modifications are you consulting on?
- Has the Cromwell Lane site being removed or is still being promoted?
- What is happening in Warwick District at Westwood Heath and Kings Hill?
- What is happening with the new link road? Where does it go and what will it serve?
- Can such sites and proposals be shown on your proposals map?
- General objection was raised to the principle of the proposed allocation at Cromwell Lane.
- Why do we have to build on the Green Belt?
- What happens if Brexit results in significant population reduction?
- Where are the people coming from that need these homes?
- The city's population growth is all students.
- Over what timeframe will this development be built?
- When will development works start?
- Will the review mechanism really allow the Plan to respond to changes of population growth?
- Could land be returned to Green Belt if it's not developed?
- A specific request was made to consider a fallback position in the event that the Inspector rejects the proposed changes to GB for site H2:8 (Cromwell Lane). Should the allocation be rejected then the Green Belt boundary should still be moved but just to the rear of the existing properties/plots on Cromwell Lane.
- A specific request for all comments submitted as part of the consultation to be published online in full for transparency.
- A specific issue raised about local GP practice provision. This included disappointment at one of the Duggins Lane sites not being included as part of the proposed modifications. The site had been promoted to include a new GP surgery.
- A specific query about access to the proposed allocation from Cromwell Lane, with a request to consider using an existing bungalow (different to that currently proposed) as a point of access.

- A number of concerns were raised about existing traffic pressures and parking problems along Cromwell Lane.
- A number of safety concerns were raised about pedestrian safety and the ability to cross roads etc.
- Junction pressures were highlighted at a number of junctions especially at peak times.
- Questions were asked about any further expansion of the Tile Hill Park and Ride car park. It was suggested that it was currently too small to meet demand and that was impacting on parking pressures in surrounding streets and industrial estates.
- It was requested that opportunities to charge for the car park should be considered to help fund its expansion.

Summary of Feedback from City Centre Consultation Session

Saturday 25th March 2017 – 10:00 – 12:30

Held at Coventry City Centre Library

Approximate Attendance: 0-50 people.

Areas of discussion:

- City Centre
- Eastern Green – proposed development site;
- Keresley – proposed development site;
- Whitley – JLR expansion – proposed development site;
- Kings Hill – proposed development site;
- Westwood Heath – proposed development site;
- Cromwell Lane – proposed development site;
- Woodlands School;
- Solihull development proposals

Key Points:

- Principles of Green Belt development – what it means and why it's being considered?
- Prefer to see brownfield sites used first – desire to understand where brownfield sites are and why they can't be brought forward first.
- What regeneration schemes are already underway?
- Are any regeneration proposals being considered for Spon End?
- What happens if Brexit results in significant population reduction?
- Where are the people coming from that need these homes?
- The city's population growth is all students.
- Why do we need 25% affordable housing?
- Will we build more affordable housing and if so what percentage of overall development which will be affordable?
- How is affordable housing calculated and determined – why is Warwick 40% and Coventry 25% for example?
- What can the Plan do about homelessness and rough sleeping in the city centre?
- What policies are proposed to support a positive relationship between new homes and existing properties – how does the Plan deal with design, setting and buffering?
- If these schemes are approved what is the timetable for the plan and future planning applications.
- Negative response to student growth and university expansion – city centre should be about more than just students.
- HiMO's are out of control and need to be reduced and reused for family homes.
- Sewage capacity and water supply are issues – are you working with Severn Trent Water?
- Flood risk and drainage issues – especially at Keresley and Eastern Green.
- All this development will have huge impacts on ecology and biodiversity. The site at Baginton Fields is a prime example. How will the new Masterplan principles policy protect this area?
- General support for city centre south proposals and city centre improvements.
- What's happening to the Council house?
- What joint working has taken place with neighbouring authorities and how has this influenced the duty to cooperate?

- Why can't we build on the eastern side of Coventry towards Rugby as the gap between Rugby and the city is far greater and less sensitive?
- The concept of the Master planning principles policy and in particular its link to further community involvement were generally supported.
- Eastern Green Master planning needs to involve the local community.
- What is the timeframe for development coming forward in a range of areas including Eastern Green and Keresley in particular?
- What are the Solihull development proposals on the city's western boundary
- Concerns were raised about the impacts of urban sprawl and loss of Meriden Gap.
- Cars should not be allowed to access onto Upper Eastern Green Lane
- Junction improvement works needed at Allard Way/Langbank Avenue and St Martins road / A45.
- Need to consider the impact of Kings Hill development on Coventry roads – especially the Green Lane area. Can alternative access be created directly onto Kenilworth Road?
- Impacts of development on highways network – both strategic network and local roads – how will they cope with the traffic generated by new homes?
- Can you do anything to compensate people for loss of property value?

Summary of Feedback from Eastern Green Consultation Session

Monday 27th March 2017 – 16:00 – 19:30

Held at Eastern Green Social Club, Church Lane.

Approximate Attendance: 200-250 people.

Areas of discussion:

- City Centre;
- Eastern Green – proposed development site;
- Keresley – proposed development site;
- Whitley – JLR expansion – proposed development site;
- Kings Hill – proposed development site;
- Westwood Heath – proposed development site;
- Cromwell Lane – proposed development site;
- Woodlands School;
- Solihull development proposals;
- Rugby development proposals; and
- Walsgrave Hill Farm – proposed development site.

Key Points:

- Masterplan principles policy should include a requirement to identify an illustrative development phasing proposal with suggested timescales for development so surrounding residents know when development will take place and where.
- Masterplan principles policy should clearly specify the minimum distance of green infrastructure areas for screening of existing residential properties from new developments and for the green corridor proposals along Pickford Green Lane.
- Support for further detailed engagement on design guidance and with developers over site master plan.
- If the development does take place can one of the streets be named after a former farmer and councillor – Thomas Knowle?
- If this happens the scheme needs to be high quality and high value.
- Over what timeframe will this development be built?
- When will development works start?
- Why can't we build more to the east towards Rugby?
- Where else are you planning to build?
- What Brownfield sites are being used?
- Have alternative development proposals not been considered to the north of the A45? If so – why not there instead?
- Why do we have to build on the Green Belt at all?
- How have the proposed modifications addressed the proposals within the Housing White Paper?
- What happens if Brexit results in significant population reduction?
- Where are the people coming from that need these homes?
- The city's population growth is all students.
- Why do we need 25% affordable housing?

- Why do all properties have to be family housing? If the scheme has to be built it should be a bigger mix of property types including bungalows.
- How will the new West Midlands combined authority proposals impact this development?
- How will the WMCA road proposals link into this?
- Wish to see greater detail and visuals of the grade separated junction to understand the sort of impact it could have visually.
- Can the grade separate junction not be provided away from Brick Hill Lane and the existing residential properties?
- When will the junction be constructed and how long will it take.
- How will people still be able to access Pickford Green Lane and Brick Hill Lane?
- Significant concerns about risk of rat running into Pickford Green Lane and south into Hockley lane and beyond – consider blocking the road network from any development parcels along this road.
- Highway access of any kind onto upper eastern green lane would be a disaster – road too narrow and existing lane not appropriate to support public transport etc.
- How will highways ensure construction traffic isn't directed up inappropriate road networks such as Pickford Green Lane?
- Have already requested traffic calming measures along Upper Eastern Green Lane but been refused – council has no concern for persons safety by the schools.
- Don't want any further highway connectivity into Park Hill Drive and surrounding network.
- How will the 2 properties off the A45 be accessed as part of a redevelopment or comprehensive proposal?
- Want to see public transport integrated into the new scheme.
- If you introduce public transport only links these will inevitably become full highway routes like at Park Hill Drive.
- How has your transport modelling work taken into account surrounding developments?
- Why has HS2 not been factored into the modelling work.
- Why are you proposing new employment land and retail as well?
- There is no requirement for a new supermarket.
- If there are going to be shops they need to be in 1 location, not split across 2 sites and certainly not towards Upper Eastern Green Lane as existing properties already have access to such services.
- Any new development needs to be supported by new schools and supporting infrastructure.
- how will you ensure the school and surgery are built – they haven't been at Banner brook.
- What happens if the site is built (like Bannerbrook) and the school and health centre etc are left as waste land?
- Why not use the Woodlands academy site for a new school or if not for new homes instead?
- Consultation is inappropriate and won't be taken into account – it wasn't last time - this is a done deal.
- Residents at Juniper Drive have been letter dropped about changes to public rights of way in the area – why has this not been wider around upper eastern green lane etc?
- Will you protect the existing trees and hedge rows?

- How will you manage flooding and drainage, especially towards Upper Eastern Green Lane as water flows down the hill towards the existing homes which already suffer with flood risk.
- How will the small fields off of Pickford Green Lane to the north of Blyth Cottage and Ainsley Grange be protected now the SUE boundary has changed.
- Are the existing ponds and brook corridors going to be retained?
- How will you protect the buzzard nests and great crested newt ponds?
- Support shown for provision of new sports pitches.
- Support for Pickford brook corridor being utilised for pedestrian activity – walking and cycling etc.
- Can you do anything to compensate people for loss of property value?

Summary of Feedback from Keresley Consultation Session

Wednesday 29th March 2017 – 16:00 – 19:30

Held at President Kennedy School.

Approximate Attendance: 100-150 people.

Areas of discussion:

- Keresley – proposed development site;
- Cromwell Lane – proposed development site;
- Browns Lane – proposed development sites

Key Points:

- Objection to the principle of development at Keresley, Cromwell Lane and Browns Lane.
- Existing infrastructure will not support so many homes. What does the Plan do for new schools, health care and roads?
- Concern was expressed about development impact at the Coundon Wedge.
- Why do we have to build on the Green Belt?
- Development at Keresley will have significant impact on local wildlife and ecology value.
- What happens if Brexit results in significant population reduction?
- Where are the people coming from that need these homes?
- The city's population growth is all students.
- Over what timeframe will this development be built?
- When will development works start?
- Where else are you planning to build?
- What Brownfield sites are being used?
- Why do all properties have to be family housing? If the scheme has to be built it should be a bigger mix of property types including bungalows.
- If this happens the scheme needs to be high quality and high value.
- Some support was expressed in recognition of the need for new homes and that the city needs to grow.
- Any support for growth was caveated by the need for high quality development to be planned in an appropriate way with the necessary infrastructure to support it.
- Consultation is inappropriate and won't be taken into account – it wasn't last time - this is a done deal.
- Post card deliveries have been inappropriate and missed out a lot of properties that are in the most affected areas.
- Why have these proposals not been more widely advertised or promoted?
- What happens with the Plan after this stage of consultation?

Summary of Feedback from Longford Consultation Session

Thursday 6th April 2017 – 16:00 – 19:30

Held at Grangehurst Primary School.

Approximate Attendance: 0-50 people.

Areas of discussion:

- Keresley – proposed development site;
- City Centre;
- Lentons Lane area in general; and
- Ash Green possible development proposals by Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council.

Key Points:

- Objection to the principle of development at Keresley.
- Development at Keresley will have significant impact on local wildlife and ecology value.
- What happens if Brexit results in significant population reduction?
- Where are the people coming from that need these homes?
- The city's population growth is all students.
- Existing infrastructure at Keresley and Ash Green areas will not support so many homes. What does the Plan do for new schools, health care and roads?
- If the development at Keresley proceeds, we need a new school to support the needs of the people.
- Can you confirm if the Jubilee Wood will be affected by the development proposals?
- How will the new link road proposal alleviate traffic congestion/
- What is the exact route of the new link road?
- Residents in the Lentons Lane area expressed support for not developing along Lentons Lane.
- Specific requests were made to try and improve bus services north of the M6.
- How will the Plans support improved connectivity into the city centre
- How will the AAP bring about new retail and leisure facilities to make the city centre more attractive – at the moment everyone goes to out of town centres.

Summary of Feedback from Whitley Consultation Session

Tuesday 6th April 2017 – 16:00 – 19:30

Held at Whitley Abbey School.

Approximate Attendance: 50-100 people.

Areas of discussion:

- Whitley Business Park expansion
- Baginton fields – proposed employment development site;
- Eastern Green – proposed development site;
- Keresley – proposed development sites;
- London Road / Allard Way – proposed development site; and
- City centre

Key Points:

- Objection to the principle of development at Baginton Fields, Keresley and Eastern Green.
- The Masterplan Principles policy does not go far enough to ensure protection for the Local Wildlife sites and nature trails at Baginton Fields.
- The Masterplan Principles policy is not clear as to the extent of buffering and screening – this would need to be meaningful – not just a hedgerow. This was of relevance to the Keresley, Eastern Green and Baginton Fields discussions.
- The importance of green spaces within the local community should not be underestimated – it is a vital local resource.
- The concept of improving connectivity between the nature trails and the Sowe Valley as part of the Baginton Fields site was broadly supported.
- It is important to retain existing wildlife and ecology within the Baginton Fields area and not force it further afield.
- Would like to see sections of the Baginton Fields area designated as Local Green Space as part of GB1.
- Air quality is a big issue in the local area at Baginton fields in particular. Support the identification of new air quality monitoring infrastructure in the IDP, but need to make sure it's delivered.
- Parking provisions at new employment sites should be adequate to meet need and not place pressure on local streets.
- Access to the new Baginton Fields employment site should not be from local streets.
- There was general support for the refurbishment and regeneration of the locally listed pumping station and lodge buildings at London Road.
- The importance of maintaining public rights of way was highlighted.
- Existing infrastructure will not support so many homes. What does the Plan do for new schools, health care and roads?
- Why do we have to build on the Green Belt?
- What happens if Brexit results in significant population reduction?
- Where are the people coming from that need these homes?
- Over what timeframe will this development be built?
- When will development works start?
- Why can't new employment land go on brownfield sites?
- Some support was expressed in recognition of the need for new homes and that the city needs to grow.

- Any support for growth was caveated by the need for high quality development to be planned in an appropriate way with the necessary infrastructure to support it.
- Post card deliveries in Keresley have been inappropriate and missed out a lot of properties that are in the most affected areas.
- Why have these proposals not been more widely advertised or promoted?
- Previous consultation responses were poorly received and there is a feeling that proposals are a done deal.
- There is a feeling the Baginton Fields site will inevitably be for JLR and that it should just be confirmed and managed in a more transparent way.
- More should be done to advertise different consultations – making more use of local information boards etc.
- What happens with the Plan after this stage of consultation?

Appendix 2 – Potential Further Minor Amendments to the Local Plan

The following tables include a list and explanation of potential further adjustments to the Local Plan. The possible changes have been identified as a result of the recent consultation on the Proposed Modifications and only relate to improving clarity and certainty of the Plan.

None of these changes would affect the aim or intention of the policies or the Plan as a whole and are therefore considered ‘minor’ in nature.

All changes would be subject to the approval of the appointed Planning Inspector.

No further changes to the City Centre Area Action Plan are proposed.

Table 1 – Local Plan Potential Additional Changes

Page number/Policy reference*	Proposed amendment	Justification and reasoning
Policy DS1 and supporting text on page 16 (and others where relevant)	Add reference to housing requirements being “net” figures.	We addressed this as part of Action Point 16.6 in so far as it relates to the Monitoring Framework. As such, the Monitoring Framework defines the figures as net and in our view this is naturally assumed as part of the figures within the Plan anyway. To aid clarity though we would not object to the words “net” being added to policy DS1 and other text references where appropriate throughout the Plan itself.
Policy DS4 (Part B vi)	Correct reference to “Baginton Fields Local Wildlife Site” instead of “Nature Reserve”.	To ensure correct reference is made to the Baginton Fields LWS.
Policy DS4 (Part B vii)	At the end of the point add “and Sebastian Close”.	To ensure appropriate listing of relevant street names.
Policy DS4 (Part D vii)	Amend the reference to “Westridge Avenue” to “Woodridge Avenue”.	This would respond to consultation responses from local residents and correct a

		typographical error.
Page 44 supporting text (Para 2)	Add reference to “Baginton Fields Local Wildlife Site” alongside existing references to Sowe Valley river corridor and Stonebridge Meadows LNR.	This will ensure the reference in this part of the supporting text is consistent with the proposals in Policy DS4 (Part B).
Page 57 (below table 4.1)	Amend 55% to 52% for the proportion of remaining supply that is brownfield land. This would reflect the figure included in Figure 2 of document Mod6.	This was a typographical oversight and would ensure the monitoring platform is consistent at the point of possible plan adoption.
Policies Map	We have updated the Policies map in relation to the LWS designations (as already adopted) to ensure these are now presented in a clearer way.	We have appreciated that with so many layers on the Map it can be perceived as cluttered and confusing. The Map will be professionally produced following adoption of the Plan which should remove any ambiguity.
Policies Map	We have updated the Policies map in relation to the Mineral Safeguarding Area. We would be happy to retain this as an inset map as opposed to over complicating a single Policies Map.	We have appreciated that with so many layers on the Map it can be perceived as cluttered and confusing. The Map will be professionally produced following adoption of the Plan which should remove any ambiguity.
Infrastructure Delivery Plan Page 9 (Warwick District)	Add reference to the end of the paragraph regarding the station and Park and Ride facility at Kings Hill. This will add to and amend the final few words of the paragraph and extend it as follows: “within the Kings Hill area where viable and appropriate”.	This will respond to the most up to date position within the WDC Infrastructure Plan, reflect our on-going discussions on infrastructure delivery and reflect the comments made through consultation responses by the site promoter.
Infrastructure Delivery Plan page 36	Add additional infrastructure requirement as follows: “Installation of new, international standard synthetic pitch at Butts Park Arena and	Responds to planning and sports related discussions around future plans to enhance and upgrade the Butts Park Arena. This change would therefore keep the IDP up to

	supportive enhancements to the stadium and associated community facilities". To be classified as a category 2 provisions with a cost of approximately £700k and to be delivered in phases between 2018 and 2022 through a mix of private and (sports related) grant funded sources.	date.
Infrastructure Delivery Plan page 36	Correct heading to say "Health" instead of "Heath".	Correct typographical error.

* Page numbers and references relate to documents Mod1 (the Local Plan including Tracked Changes), Mod 4 (The Local Plan Appendices including tracked Changes) and Mod 9 (the Infrastructure Delivery Plan extract from Mod 4)

This page is intentionally left blank



Coventry City Council

Briefing note

To: Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee

Date: 10th May 2017

Subject: Ignite Programme – Progress and Early Lessons

1 Purpose of the Note

- 1.1 Ignite is a five year programme funded by the Early Action Neighbourhood Fund, with additional funding from Coventry City Council, and aimed at transforming public services. It is being delivered by Central England Law Centre and Grapevine Coventry and Warwickshire. The Fund was set up by a group of grant makers who want to show national and local government how acting early on problems can save public money now and later on. Its goal is to drive change in how mainstream public services are planned, funded and delivered, away from crisis and towards earlier and more effective 'root cause tackling' action.
- 1.2 This note introduces initial progress and learning from the programme, which is included in the update report at Appendix 1, produced by Central England Law Centre and Grapevine Coventry and Warwickshire.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee is recommended to:
 - 1) Note the update report at Appendix 1, progress to date and early lessons
 - 2) Make any appropriate recommendations to the Cabinet Member Community Development and Cabinet Member Children's services

3 Funding and responsibilities

- 3.1 Central England Law Centre and Grapevine Coventry and Warwickshire secured the funding and are responsible for implementing the programme. Partnership working arrangements were established at the outset the bid development and have been maintained throughout implementation of the programme, through membership of the Ignite Programme Board and events or briefings on progress, including to the Early Action Partnership Board and the Connecting Communities Board.
- 3.2 The grant awarded by the Early Action Neighbourhood Fund for £1,500,000 for a five year period, which, as a result of restrictions in the overall funding nationally, meant the local bid had to be scaled down by £400,000, meaning that crucial elements of the programme would of been removed over the course of five years.
- 3.3 In recognition that the Ignite Programme has great potential to aid public services to shift services away from crisis level interventions through tackling root causes early on, an additional one-off resource of £320,000 via Public Health Grant was provided in March 2015 to help meet the shortfall and to fund activities that are central to delivery, which include:
 - Expansion of the Ignite programme - additional funding to increase the reach and impact of Ignite so that there are sufficient Ignite workers to involve services in the programme that can aid early action, for example, drugs and alcohol

services, mental health services, police, educational psychology and youth offending services.

- Development of an Early Action and Resilience Centre – to develop city-wide capability to embed an asset-based acting early approach in local services.

3.4 The Public Health resource is monitored through reports submitted to the Ignite Programme Board, membership of which includes senior officers from Public Health and Children's Services.

4 Scope of the Ignite Programme

- 4.1 Ignite aims to build capability and resilience in those who are most vulnerable and to tap into their strengths and the strengths within their communities and networks - to help them move forward, build aspiration and be ready to take opportunities. The approach is based on a belief that the human relationship between the service provider and service user is key to transformation, and that communities can play a key role in tackling complex human problems.
- 4.2 Ignite is working in Willenhall inside two public service 'pathfinders' for change. These are Children's Services and Whitefriars Housing Management Service. The work is focusing on people facing multiple and complex disadvantage, but the learning from the work of the programme should be applicable to all people-based services.
- 4.3 Ignite has been 'active' for 15 months but the work inside the pathfinders began in earnest in September 2016. It is too early to report significant learning but Ignite has established a website <http://www.cnccoventry.org.uk/> where it will share its learning, and it is working to encourage others with similar new approaches and ideas to share them via the website and via formal and informal events. Ignite hope that this will promote good practice and inspire curiosity in others to find more effective ways of running people-based services that put community at their heart and that are empowering.

5 Progress and Early lessons

5.1 *Early findings from the Ignite Programme at year 1*

- Increasing money in the system is critical- if people are living in poverty without the right advice and support their lives are getting progressively worse. It is wrong to assume that the DWP have done the right thing that the person is just stuck with their lot
- Uncovering root causes improves the ability of people to achieve outcomes and saves service time- where we are working on the wrong problem at the wrong time we won't affect a change that secures the outcome we need.
- Need to create a culture of support not suspicion – help people to understand what they need to do
- Build confidence to work with households when we are worried, rather than reporting or referring them on- build a relationship that focuses on what could happen in a positive way rather than monitor the negatives
- When we see something that causes us concern be genuinely inquisitive about why someone might have found themselves in serious difficulty and what help we might be able to offer.
- The earlier the help can be offered the more positive the relationship

5.2 *Communities doing more for themselves*

- 5.3 Ignite is starting to learn and show how we might move away from public services being the only resource and solution during difficult times. Operating in a locality means we can spot and understand problems as they emerge, as well as who could help, right at the start. It allows us to mobilise non-service solutions in response to a problem including from within the individual themselves, the family network and neighbourhood.
- 5.4 Currently services are provided in response to crisis. Professionals rally to resolve the immediate issue in a way which masks both the root cause and any skills or assets the individual might have in understanding their own problem and working on it. The role of the individual is to comply with what the service requires of them in fixing the problem. Professionals with little time to form the right relationship and who don't know anything about a local area struggle to unmask the real problem and mobilise long lasting solutions. But Ignites pathfinder activity within Whitefriars and Children's Services, within Willenhall is showing us how this can happen.
- 5.5 Case Study CA (see Appendix 1) highlights how building relationships before crises supports everyone in understanding the real problem and what can best support people in overcoming difficulties. It exemplifies how working together to uncover strengths can really improve the outcomes everyone wants to achieve.
- 5.6 We need more time and space to understand how the Willenhall community can contribute to thriving given its adverse social and economic climate. Poverty cannot be ignored. Addressing the detrimental material circumstances of households means individuals and families are more stable and resilient against future setbacks. But the effects of living in poverty and deprivation are not a focus for most services.
- 5.7 Case study AC (see Appendix 2) demonstrates the importance of improving local connectedness to build resilience and move people beyond their difficulties. It also reiterates the need to work on the right problem and to be honest about what is possible
- 5.8 The multiple and complex needs and the interconnectedness of problems experienced in Willenhall gives rise to a feeling from some professionals that often people are beyond help. In fact Ignite clients are making slow but steady progress. In our experience you have to be in a close relationship of trust to foster (and witness) this kind of progress. We have been able to demonstrate to professionals that it is possible and to suggest ways in which they might reshape their working practice as a result.
- 5.9 Successfully building connections to people and places is the only way to transforms lives - services do not and cannot sustain people long-term in the way that communities and people can. Ignite is beginning to demonstrate how community can be part of the solution.
- 5.10 Causes Not Consequences has been set up as an online home of Ignite and as a focus for events that help spread the practice of acting early on root causes throughout the local workforce and amplify the reach of Ignite's learning. A secondary aim is to build and foster community of people who want to change how services are delivered and need met.

NAME Emma Bates
 JOB TITLE Ignite Programme Manager
 ORGANISATION Coventry Law Centre
 CONTACT DETAILS emma.bates@centralenglandlc.org.uk

NAME Helen Shankster
 JOB TITLE Insight Manager (Engagement)
 DIRECTORATE People
 CONTACT DETAILS Helen.shankster@coventry.gov.uk

Appendix 1 Case Study Template CA

Name and household circumstances (include any baseline data on capability or networks)

CA. Whitefriars flat for a few years in great condition and nicely decorated. CA is very house proud and having it nice is important to her. She has a number of manageable debts with payment plans that she keeps to. Living with two of her three sons (one aged 3 and one about 4 months old). Damages to property- almost all doors have holes punched in them- she is paying for these again as a debt added to her rent at a cost of about £100 per door. CA has a partner and they have a volatile relationship. Currently CIN since Dec 2016 following DV incident, continued concerns about violent relationship. No concerns re parenting.

Reason for involvement: State that what service workers reasons were. State what ignites reasons were

Neighbourhood Officer wanted us involved because: they wanted extra support around managing the mould and how it was being looked at by Whitefriars this was resolved quickly. We continued to be involved because CA showed signs of vulnerability which later escalated to Social Care involvement and continues to be unstable (threatening to go up and down the CAF-CIN-CP ladder) and we felt our methodology and relationship gave us a chance to see if our involvement could manage this better.

What did we do

CA had already contacted an independent Solicitor when we became involved. However after discussions with the Neighbourhood officer regarding how the mould was affecting the health of the family we contacted Whitefriars Repair Team and consequently WF did the repair earlier than first quoted (something like June/ July as opposed to October). No further problem with the mould but we noticed some problems the Damage to doors related to DV incidents which indicated vulnerability.

Supporting with managing feelings and negotiating through getting upset before it escalates into argument- police called, etc

Introducing CA to breastfeeding Lead in Coventry.

We completed some charitable grant applications and she was awarded a new washing machine- she is now doing the cooker one herself (with us there if she needs us).

Uncovered more about the way CA interprets what happens to her and manages her emotions and the knock on effect it has on her life.

We learned early on that relationships, distrust, bravado, fear, etc. that might be causing her problems. We worked on this. It is a work in progress as CA has been thinking like this for a long time.

We worked collaboratively with the whole family and managed to involve R CA' s partner in some of the sessions we ran with CA, this meant that he was able to use some of the skills discussed himself and commented at the end of session that he could understand CA's perspective a little better as a result

We also were able to inform R about some local opportunities offered by Waites a construction company this would enable R to gain qualifications for a CSCS card, the card would allow him to work on building sites, at the moment this was a major barrier for him in pursuing employment in construction.

We offered a balance of support, listening and trying to understand along with challenging her when this is useful to her (ie, helping her see that she has a responsibility or that she is only looking at a situation from one point of view, etc.). We were also in a position to form a relationship not just based on crisis intervention, this meant that we had a more holistic and real picture of the family.

Results

People are commenting that CA is calmer in CIN meetings, she reports feeling happier.

CA is finding new ways to manage her problems, feelings, emotions and actions. With this and the great care she takes of her boys it means she is probably less likely to need support from a social worker in the future once this case closes.

CA also becoming aware of the impact of her relationship with R on the children, we discussed how although the volatile incidents were not witnessed by the children she was beginning to acknowledge that if this continued this could affect her children.

SW said at the last meeting this can again be considered if progress continues and meetings are so positive.

SW acknowledged that CA was able to make decisions around what type of sessions or workshops worked for her as an individual. At the last CIN meeting S/W agreed to explore whether a more bespoke service around relationship issues and self-esteem could be offered to CA .

CA has developed a better working relationship with social worker and housing officer and is able to see that people are working to ensure positive outcomes for her children

CA is the poster girl for breastfeeding now and was also doing peer volunteering training to support other young mums.

Were we able to fulfil our role as change agents via this case? If so how?

SW has involved us and valued our input. When CA was reticent about redoing the relationship work with a social worker we offered to do some work with her. In doing this we were able to get CA to see the value what the SW wanted also and this is what has happened.

While initiating the work we fed back to SW via email how it was going and she too met with CA and was pleased with what CA appeared to be getting from it. We also fed back, with CA leading at the next CIN meeting so we could review what difference it had made; all commented that CA appeared calmer and less aggressive in the meeting and her friend said she had seen a change in the couple with them sending her 'less angry texts'.

We suggested in that meeting that CA consider doing the work with social care saying it would complement what we were doing.

SW sought our view when considering stepping up to CP in response to another DV report at the house. It was decided to remain CIN. She values our attendance at meetings and has cancelled to ensure we are there.

With WFH after Ignite training had been delivered to various departments it was reported by the Neighbourhood officer that a change to her approach in her interactions with CA resulted in relations between the two improving and being less adversarial.

What are we learning?

Relational working is key- CA said she wasn't really sure about us the first couple of months (when dealing with the mould, presenting issue) but it developed to something more than she expected.

CA has a better understanding of how the system works and how to better work with the system to get to the goal that everyone wants. This has not been a direct route and there have been incidents where the police have been called; most recently as a way to make the boyfriend leave and without violence. This has enabled CA to see how this triggers concerns and changed her involvement with social care and she is now considering new ways she can manage her problem, along with her partner. SW and health professionals have no concerns about the children directly, just the adults relationship (which of course in turn will impact- again CA is recognising this more and more).

The connecting role was feeling difficult as she had dropped out of the two connections made due to being constantly tired as heavily pregnant but she wanted to stay connected to us as it was helping her work through other issues.

Time spent building a relationship and not focussed on a crisis pays off when a problem did occurs as people know we see more than their mistakes and so are more likely to tell us the real story for an issue making it much easier to work with them.

Locality focus and close contact with SW meant when a crisis did occur meant the SW didn't have to build a picture dominant by the crisis. Work was easier to identify and outcomes quicker to be achieved.

Was there competence transfer and capability building within services through this case?

We were not fearful of challenging the status quo because of existing knowledge and relationship so we offered a way of working differently that respected CA and the SW's need to manage risk and safety. The work we are doing is being seen by the social worker in the feedback from CA along with her observations of how she is different. SW has had all of the worksheets that we gave to CA and Partner and understands the approach and what we are trying to do.

Our offering to do the 1-2-1 work was not us being an 'extra pair of hands'. It was offered for CA as we felt that we could show a different way of working on agreed problem that better met CA's needs. The SW was involved in this when we fed back at future CIN meetings. SW saw the value of it saying at the time to CA *'These guys have seen you when you're doing real well so they know you better'*.

The more individualised approach was required here we wanted to illustrate working with a couple as well as individually has huge value; each can agree a change but if the partner is not involved it easily falls in to old patterns and cycles of behaviour. The SW current offer was both do an individual (victim or perpetrator) training separately. In this case both are victim and perpetrator.

Was there competency transfer and capability building within the client or household?

Yes CA is now looking at sources of support for household items she needs, she is emotional self-managing more and became a breast feeding peer mentor. We are still working this case.

Did we see risks to our change agent role and how did we manage them?

There were some risks in us taking on a larger role but it allowed us to reiterate the importance of relational working, an individualised approach and how critical getting to root causes is. The social worker was involved in decisions taken and has seen for herself the impact on CA. There is always a balance with maintaining both important relationships- with family/ person and the professional involved.

Appendix 2

Case Study AC

Name and household circumstances

Name: AC

Household details: Bedsit, living alone but with large dog. Un-carpetted and decorated with furniture and bed worn and beaten by the dog. Two children, aged 11 visiting at weekends and staying over. Good family network- sister was there on our first visit and we spoke to AC's Dad on the phone quite often initially. Family supported with money at times and they saw each other at times. No friends in the area even though he had lived there for over a year. Reported 'not being very good on the phone' and appearing to be unconfident with dealing with the phone, bills, online stuff, etc.

Reason for involvement: State that what service workers reasons were. State what Ignites reasons were

Introduction with Neighbourhood Officer. Complaints about noise (dog barking when AC was out). A number of complaints received and he had letters from Noise Abatement that stated there will be court action if one more complaint received; would mean Whitefriars would instigate eviction proceedings. Whitefriars were concerned this was highly likely and he was at risk of eviction.

Housing: The immediate concern was avoiding eviction. We wanted AC to fully understand the importance of what was happening and the process in which it might happen, along with exploring what he could do to manage and avoid eviction.

Money: AC is on a low income, with just basic benefits and some debt repayments in place.

Isolation & mood: AC had no local friends or family and spent a lot of time in his flat alone. His mood was often low and he would present as agitated and annoyed at his neighbours. He sometimes appeared paranoid about the things they were doing and the lengths they went to, to spy on him.

What did we do?:

Avoiding eviction:

Initially planned to try to help him to train the dog to get used to being alone- AC a bit resistant saying he had tried all those things. Attempts were scuppered by bad weather and low motivation from AC to try it.

We talked to AC about his options, openly and frankly; including rehoming his dog. He was more open to this than expected and ultimately that is what happened. We worked with RSPCA to rehome him how to get online there.

AC then started bidding on Homefinder independently and going to the library fairly regularly after us introducing him to staff there.

We visited Noise Abatement/ Kilo 2 and met with the manager, not to discuss case directly but in general terms and to understand process and how likely eviction might be.

Managing and maximising money:

We helped with food bank vouchers- going with AC to see what the best things were for him (things he would use)

We spent considerable time looking at maximising benefits but ultimately AC did not want to make a claim for his two children (he reports they have ADHA & autism) citing upsetting his relationship with his ex as the reason. We could then be upfront about what he could expect and the fact that a change in benefits would be unlikely with the circumstances he presents- we did say we can try still.

We supported AC to claim via SSAFA (Armed Forces charity). He was successfully awarded new carpets, cooker, washing machine, bed and new sofa. We supported AC to get quotes and

strongly encouraged him to do more for himself as initially he appeared to sit back and relied on us to do things for him.

Isolation & Mood:

We paid deliberate attention to AC 's hobbies (painting, making models) and encouraged his interest in this thing that made him happy and had previously led him to socialise (in life and online) with other hobbyists. We deliberately spent time hearing what he had to say and showing interest as we know this is a great way to build rapport and also build confidence in people. We wanted him to feel of value and praised the art he had done (which was brilliant) and asked questions about it (neither of us have any natural interest in the area but we deliberately focussed on to help relationship building).

As we got AC to do more for himself we started to meet him outside at the Hagard community cafe. We introduced him to everyone we knew if they were about so he knew more faces and names in the area. We would arrange to meet him there for a cup of tea and aim to sit with other people at the communal tables. We instigated conversations, pointed out common interests or shared experiences (AC grew up in the area so we often got him chatting to others about what Willenhall was like in the 80's, what they did, etc.)

We attended the Men's Shed social group together and AC continues to do this on his own now.

He was using the Ignite tablet to bid weekly on Homefinder and we took him in to the library to meet Carinna and Geoff who signed him up and showed how to do it. He started bidding independently.

Another frank chat about likelihood of successfully moving to another area into a flat as for a while AC desperate to leave the flat (angry with neighbours and Whitefriars for 'making him get rid of his dog')

Acceptance that he is not likely to get a move any time soon. This was a key moment because on accepting he was here to stay he decided to invest in the flat

We successfully focussed and re-focussed AC on solutions and away from problems often; so steering his focus away from the neighbours to what he had been doing for example. We were able to challenge his thinking about the flat as a place he didn't want to be to thinking of it a home by being honest about the likelihood of being moved and focussing on the positives of staying or at least 'I'm here so I may as well make the most of it' which is what he now feels.

Results

Stabilised tenancy- eviction no longer a threat.

Lessened his isolation and increased social contact and quality. AC has gone from being alone in his flat almost constantly to being a part of his community. When we met him he knew nobody locally. Now he volunteers at the local community centre, setting up tables and chairs for groups, helping in the café washing up, etc. and is also now running the men's group that we took him along to and has lots of ideas of how to make it a success.

His flat is now a home- he hated being there when we first met and was desperate to move. Now it is carpeted and furnished with new or nearly new furniture. He has also started painting and is retiling his hallway with tiles from Poundland. He appears very proud of his flat now.

Capabilities are increased or at least put into practice now as he has more confidence. AC is out and about doing things for himself. He tells us his money is okay and everything is paid by direct debit. He uses the computers at the library if he needs to sort a problem out. He has not asked us for support with something for weeks- whereas before we would regularly have requests to chase things up or something.

I think he seems more confident and more fun. Neighbourhood Officer saw him and commented to him how he looked really well and much healthier. He seems happier and tells us he's 'doing great'.

We consciously asked him to do more (talking on the phone, bidding, etc) as we felt his feeling that he couldn't do those things wasn't really accurate and actually he was fine once he did it; now he is now doing more on his own independently of us or our meetings with him.

I wonder if his expectations of services are more realistic now - he presented often with an irritation that some service hadn't done something and we see this much less now.

What are we learning?

People can do more for themselves- if we believe they can they may start to believe it too.

Being honest (even if it's not great news) is best. Once someone can accept this they can make a decision about how they'll manage things within the system we have. False hopes just stall any other action-- believing I'll get a move means I don't need to think about where I am now.

Shifting focus from negative thinking to solutions can really help- we need to acknowledge the negative stuff of course but not collude in a 'I know it's terrible isn't it' way.

Making friends and contacts increases mood and quality of life having a locality focus maximises the effectiveness of this.

Were we able to fulfil our role as change agents via this case? If so how? Was there competence transfer and capability building within services through this case?

We met jointly with Whitefriars initially then moved to a position of updating verbally or by email. We know this was a missed opportunity and would like, now to revisit with Neighbourhood Officer and see how together we could have worked more effectively with AC so we garner some learning for the system change aspects.

Was there competency transfer and capability building within the client or household?

There was capability building with AC. He is taking more responsibility for things and is happier and more confident.

Did we see risks to our change agent role and how did we manage them?

The greatest risk to our change role here was ensuring people were close enough to our approach to be able to understand it. We could have done more to connect people to our methodology- we have to avoid doing this retrospectively as it not as effective.

This page is intentionally left blank



Coventry City Council

Briefing note

To: Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee

Date: 10th May 2017

Subject: Prevent in the Community

1 Purpose of the Note

- 1.1 To brief members of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee on the Prevent programme in the community.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 The Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee are requested to consider the issues raised in the report and forward any recommendations to the appropriate Cabinet Member

2.2 Information/Background

- 2.3 As indicated in the briefing note prepared for the 8th February Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee, the Prevent Duty was established in July 2015 as part of the Counter Terrorism and Security Act and in particular Section 26 which came into force on 1 July 2015. It outlines the duty for public bodies to have “due regard to the need to prevent people from being drawn into terrorism”. The earlier report outlined these requirements and the implications of the Prevent Duty, along with the key actions which have been taken to support implementation.

- 2.4 Essentially the Prevent Duty is based on the principle that recognising that children, young people and adults can be vulnerable to exploitation and radicalised to support and engage in violent extremism is one part of the safeguarding duties of the local authority – and is therefore part of the overall duty of care.

- 2.5 The key duties of the Duty for the Council are to:

- Promote local partnerships
- Identify local risks
- Develop actions to mitigate those risks
- Undertake training staff in the organisation to understand the risks and the support that is available
- Ensure the safe and effective use of resources eg ICT use

2.6 Supporting Community Response to the Duty

- 2.7 A large part of the response to the Duty has been to provide training and awareness not just within the Council, but also with representatives of the local voluntary and community sector. As emphasised in the previous report the training and guidance provided locally confirms that Prevent is concerned with all forms of extremism that

might lead to terrorism, including domestic extremism, such as extreme right wing activity. Over the last year the Council has worked with Voluntary Action Coventry to support two community focussed workshops at which local community group representatives could engage in a review of how Prevent is working and the implications for their work with local people, in addition to a presentation at the annual general meeting to outline the scope and priorities of the Prevent Duty. Most recently a further community event was held on April 27 organised through VAC at which attendees from across a variety of voluntary and community groups had the opportunity to discuss and implications of delivering Prevent in Coventry.

- 2.8 To support these wider engagement events, the Council is working with specific community organisations to engage them with the Prevent Duty. This has included providing training and also more informal engagement, including groups such as
- Grapevine
 - Valley House
 - Coventry and Warwickshire Mind
 - St Basils
 - Whitefriars Housing Association
 - Coventry Refugee and Migrant Centre
 - Supported Housing organisations
- 2.9 A current priority is to do more to engage local sports and recreation groups around Prevent. To initiate this work a workshop is being held in May with a range of local sports group representatives to deliver the WRAP course and to look both to train volunteers to deliver this programme as well as identify further groups and networks that need to be prioritised.
- 2.10 In addition to the work around training and awareness, there are three community based projects funded and evaluated centrally by the Home Office. These projects support the Prevent Duty and we provide local co-ordination and direction. The projects are Upstanding Neighbourhoods, Kikit and Women Building Resilience.
- 2.11 The Upstanding Neighbourhoods initiative started work during 2016/17. This is a community based organisation which is supported by the Home Office to engage local people in promoting alternative narratives to extremist dialogue. To date this has involved giving training to directly to local people as well as working with a variety of local groups. The project will continue for the next 12 months providing further community training events, and developing local campaigns which bring communities together and challenge extremism from all quarters.
- 2.12 The Kikit organisation have also started work in Coventry. This community group works with local people to provide advice and support around substance misuse. In addition they have developed a local vulnerability assessment which highlights potential vulnerability to radicalisation and enables volunteers to mentor and guide local people to receive support.
- 2.13 The Home Office project “Women Building Resilience” has also been delivered across over three separate events with over 60 participants. This project was aimed specifically at local women and provided a range of safeguarding advice and support to local people. This included issues around the risks of radicalisation, how to recognise possible signs and what to do if there were concerns. This training evaluation indicated

that attendees felt better informed about the issues and aware of the support that was available.

2.14 A significant local community development that has taken place during 2016/17 has been the Our Families Our Future (OFOF) initiative. This programme is centred on Coventry schools and while it features the risks of radicalisation, does so in the context of wider safeguarding issues. In November 2016, the first of these events took place in Sidney Stringer School, at which over 200 of the female pupils and their mothers and/or sisters attended a very well received programme with a range of safeguarding inputs, including a presentation from a mentor who had personally worked with vulnerable girls at risk of radicalisation. A further event is scheduled for Sidney Stringer in May at which male pupils and their family members can attend a diverse programme with inputs around safeguarding matters. Key to the OFOF initiative is that there is a combined community and agency steering group, chaired by a community representative; the programme for each school is shaped by pupil representatives from that school; while it is centred on schools it explicitly looks to engage family and friends to draw a wider community impact. There is strong interest in taking up OFOF at schools across the City and further events are planned for May and July while a programme is also being reviewed for the next academic year. It is too early to evaluate the impact of this project, but this will be a priority for the steering group as it delivers through 2017/18.

2.15 The Prevent Duty has also been presented to and discussed with a variety of local community networks including the Coventry Inter-faith forum, Muslim Community forum and Community Safety forum.

2.16 **Other useful background papers:**

2.17 The Prevent duty - (June 2015)

Geoff Thomas – Prevent Co-ordinator
People Directorate
02476 831437
geoff.thomas@coventry.gov.uk



Coventry City Council

Briefing note

To: Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee

Date: 10th May 2017

Subject: Outstanding Issues Report

1 Purpose of the Note

- 1.1 To inform Members of the approach to be taken on progress, outcomes and responses to recommendations and substantial actions made by the Scrutiny Board.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 Members are recommended to:
- 1) Note the attached outstanding issues at Appendix 1

3 Information/Background

- 3.1 When recommendations and actions are made following a scrutiny meeting, they are circulated to the relevant Cabinet Member and officer, and recorded on a recommendations tracker.
- 3.2 The purpose of this report is to bring to the Committee's attention the responses received from Cabinet Members and officers in regard to recommendations and actions from previous meetings.
- 3.3 Once a response has been received or an action dealt with, it will be removed from this report and kept in the full recommendations tracker. The complete tracker can be viewed by contacting the Scrutiny Team on the details below.
- 3.4 At the start of this year, the opportunity was introduced for members of the public to suggest topics that members of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee could consider adding to the work programme. The guidance explains that while there are no hard and fast rules about what makes a good topic for Scrutiny to investigate, only issues that Coventry residents are concerned about will be considered, and particularly if the issue affects the whole city. It explains that local issues may be better discussed with ward councillors and that other processes are in place to deal with complaints about services.
- 3.5 There have been no suggestions from the public since the previous meeting.

Victoria Castree
Scrutiny Co-ordinator
gennie.holmes@coventry.gov.uk
024 7683 1122

Appendix 1 - Outstanding Issues

Meeting Date	Agenda Item	Cabinet Member/ Responsible Officer	Rec', Action or Info	Recommendations/ Actions	Officer contact	Response/ Status
13th July 16	Police, Crime and Community Safety	Chair of Police, Crime and Community Safety Partnership (Cllr A Khan)	R	(1) The scope of the planned review of the Coventry Police Crime and Community Safety Partnership Board be acknowledged and supported and the Committee's concerns relating to ensuring that there is clarity about the future role of members and a clear accountability of organisations receiving funding be taken into account during the review. (2) The performance data detailed in Appendix 9 be noted and for future performance reports information be included on the impact of Police and Crime Commissioner spend and outcomes on priority areas.	Craig Hickin Gennie Holmes	Briefing note sent to Cllr A Khan 10/8/16 Following response from officers 27/2/17: (1) The review of the PCB is ongoing. The funding for initiatives is subject to scrutiny by the PCB. (2) This is now included in the performance report.
13th July 16	Police, Crime and Community Safety	Cabinet Member Policing and Equalities	R	The Cabinet Member for Policing and Equalities be recommended to receive a report on performance in relation to hidden crimes and convictions at a future Cabinet Member meeting	Gennie Homes	Briefing note sent to Cllr A Khan 10/8/16 Following response from officers 27/1/17: (3) Hidden crimes. The information is due to be presented to the Cabinet Member
3rd March 17	Creation of a City Centre Public Spaces Protection Order	Craig Hickin/ Liam Nagel	I	Ask the police which powers they can use to tackle the anti-social behaviour connected to prostitution and report back to members	Craig Hickin	Awaiting a response

12th April 17	Department for Work and Pensions – Priorities for 2017/18	Cllr Caan, as Chair of Health and Wellbeing Board	R	Councillor Caan, Chair of the Health and Wellbeing Board, be asked to consider the appointment of a representative from the Department of Work and Pensions as a member of the Board.	Liz Gaulton	Recommendation sent to Cabinet Member 24.04.17
12th April 17	Department for Work and Pensions – Priorities for 2017/18		A	Arrangements be put in place for a Members Briefing to understand how Scrutiny can support effective engagement with constituents in the run up to the introduction of universal credit	Vicky Castree	To be arranged for October/November, 6 months before full rollout of Universal Credit
12th April 17	Department for Work and Pensions – Priorities for 2017/18		A	Information to be circulated to Members to enable them to signpost residents with issues to the appropriate agency and also inform them about the various options for support	Vicky Castree Liz Knight Claire Hindson Iona Old Janet Gurney Ed Hodson Alan Markey Glen Smailes	Information requested 12.04.17
12th April 17	Department for Work and Pensions – Priorities for 2017/18		A	A copy of the letter sent by an MP to his local schools informing about the support offered by Job Centre Plus to help potential NEETS students be circulated to members.	Claire Hindson Vicky Castree Liz Knight	Information requested 12.04.17
12th April 17	Public Transport Select Committee – Outcomes and Learning		A	Consideration of suitable subjects for potential Select Committees be discussed by the individual Scrutiny Boards when discussing the work programmes for the new municipal year	Vicky Castree Gennie Holmes Governance Services officers	To be picked up with work programming 2017/18
12th April 17	Public Transport Select Committee – Outcomes and Learning	Cabinet - as part of the Select Committee Cabinet report	R	With reference to recommendation 3) from Scrutiny Board (3), the Cabinet Member for Jobs and Regeneration be recommended to involve Transport for West Midlands in any bus user and non-user survey undertaken for Coventry	Gennie Holmes	To be picked up by SB3 next municipal year

26th April 2017	Female Genital Mutilation	Cabinet Member for Public Health and Sport	R	<p>The Cabinet Member for Public Health and Sport is recommended to:</p> <p>1) Work with partners to ensure that there is sufficient funding to ensure that the work of the community champions can continue</p> <p>2) Monitor and provide statistical data on the impact that the withdrawal of funding has on the work in this regard, including the impact on accessing services and service provision, and submit a report on this matter to the Committee at an appropriate time.</p> <p>3) Request that the police consider mirroring Operation Limelight in other European cities where those cities have international airports that act as a hub for flights to and from the UK (i.e. Amsterdam)</p> <p>4) Work with partners to influence airlines into providing training for cabin crew on FGM and other safeguarding issues</p>	Liz Gaulton	Draft with Chair
26th April 2017	Female Genital Mutilation	Cllr K Caan	A	A copy of the intelligence form used by West Midlands Police and partners to be circulated to the Committee	Gennie Holmes	

26th April 2017	Progress Update on the Domestic Violence and Abuse Services (DVA) Commissioned Services for Coventry	Cllr A Khan	R	The Cabinet Member is recommended to: 1) Highlight the success of the partnership working on this issue with the Local Government Association, with a view to replicating this practise across the country 2) Consider the Committee's offer of Scrutiny providing support when setting the key performance indicators when the contract is reviewed and renewed. 3) Refer the report regarding the awarding of the new Domestic Violence and Abuse Services contract to Scrutiny before final approval by Cabinet	Robert Mackenzie-Wilson	Draft with Chair
26th April 2017	Progress Update on the Domestic Violence and Abuse Services (DVA) Commissioned Services for Coventry		I	Officers to provide the Committee with a synopsis Briefing Note on the performance data available and how the contract is monitored	Robert Mackenzie-Wilson	
26th April 2017	Progress Update on the Domestic Violence and Abuse Services (DVA) Commissioned Services for Coventry		A	Requested officers to work with partner agencies to support the lack of provision for those victims with no recourse for public funds	Robert Mackenzie-Wilson	
26th April 2017	Progress Update on the Domestic Violence and Abuse Services (DVA) Commissioned Services for Coventry		A	Requested that officers, working with partner agencies, raise the issue of introducing legislation that makes the attendance on perpetrator courses mandatory	Robert Mackenzie-Wilson	

26th April 2017	Progress Update on the Domestic Violence and Abuse Services (DVA) Commissioned Services for Coventry		A	Requested that officers provide information regarding Domestic Violence, including statistical information, and how to report incidents, to be placed on the Council's website	Robert Mackenzie-Wilson	
26th April 2017	Business Rates Consultations and the West Midlands 100% Business Rates		A	Requested that officers ensure that in any current or future consultation response regarding this matter, reference is made to ensuring that Coventry gets a fair deal and that inequalities in the funding system are addressed.	Paul Jennings	
26th April 2017	Business Rates Consultations and the West Midlands 100% Business Rates		A	Requested that the Committee continues to receive updates on developments in Business Rates as and when they become available	Paul Jennings/ Gennie Holmes	



Coventry City Council

Briefing note

To: Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee

Date: 10th May 2017

Subject: Review of 2016/17 Scrutiny Activity

1 Purpose of the Note

- 1.1 To review the work of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee carried out during the course of the 2016/17 municipal year and identify any priorities or issues for consideration when planning next year's scrutiny work programme.

2 Recommendations

- 2.1 The Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee is asked to review the activities and issues covered by the Board during the year and make any comments or recommendations for consideration as part of work programming and planning for the 2017/18 municipal year.

3 Information/Background

- 3.1 During the year, the Committee has met 12 times and considered the items set out in the work programme, included in Appendix 1.
- 3.2 To help with the review, it is suggested that the Committee include consideration of the following questions:
- 3.2.1 Recognising that the Committee cannot cover everything, the work programme was used to prioritise issues for consideration. There are some issues on the work programme that were not covered during the year and some areas of Cabinet Member portfolios that were not addressed. The national and local policy landscape is also constantly changing.
Are there any issues that should be given priority for next year?
- 3.2.2 During the year, Scrutiny Boards have carried out their business through a range of activities including traditional board meetings, task and finish groups and visits. Boards have gathered evidence from and engaged with Cabinet Members, council officers, partner organisations from the public, private and third sectors and members of the public.
What has worked most effectively and what should be taken into account when planning arrangements for next year?

Adrian West
Members and Elections Team Leader
024 7683 2286

This page is intentionally left blank

Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee

Scrutiny Work Programme 2016/17

13 th July 16
Crime and Community Safety performance Council Plan progress Outside Bodies Report
7 th Sept 16
West Midlands Combined Authority Business Rates Consultation
22 nd September 2016
Business Rates Retention Consultation
12 th October 16
Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and Health and Well-being Strategy Drugs and Alcohol Service re-commissioning
9 th November 16
Connecting Communities
11 th January 17
Welfare Reform Local Plan Half Year Council performance
18 th January 17
Changes to the Education Service
8 th February 17
Prevent Strategy Electoral Registration and Voter Engagement Overseas Conference Reports
3 rd March
Connecting Communities Public Space Protection Orders Connecting Communities Phase 1 – Implementation Report
12 th April 17
Department for Work and Pensions priorities for 2017/18 Public Transport Select Committee Annual Report of the Work of Outside Bodies – Whitefriars Housing Association
26 th April 17
Female Genital Mutilation Progress on commissioned DVA services Business Rates
10 th May 17
Local Plan Annual Report of the Work of Outside Bodies - West Midlands Combined Authority Prevent Strategy in the Community Ignite Project Review of the Year
Municipal year 2017-18
Drug and Alcohol Services – 2017/18 West Midlands Combined Authority

Business Rates retention
Selective Licensing for the Private Rented Sector – consultation outcomes
Friargate
Public Space Protection Order – 12 months review
Connecting Communities Phase 1 – implementation report
Connecting Communities Phase 2 progress and Phase 3

Date	Title	Detail	Cabinet Member/ Lead Officer
13th July 16	Crime and Community Safety performance	To review: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work of the Police, Crime and Community Safety Board; • Information on funding that is distributed to which services. • Membership and representation • Sub-group and remit and Chairs • Involvement of the third sector • Scope of the planned review of the Board • End of year performance • PCP questionnaire on his plan priorities 	Cllr A Khan
	Council Plan progress	An opportunity for members of the Board to look at Council performance across all areas and identify any areas that may need further scrutiny. Including equalities action.	Si Chun Lam Cllr Duggins
	Outside Bodies Report	Scruco can decide which outside bodies they receive reports on at their meetings. This report provides opportunities to identify the criteria for which reports are submitted throughout the year.	Gennie Holmes
7th Sept 16	West Midlands Combined Authority	To consider information available on the devolution deal and how information on the work of the Combined Authority can be cascaded to Coventry citizens.	Martin Reeves/Julie Newman Cllr Duggins
	Business Rates Consultation	Members of the Board to consider the response to the Business Rates consultation taking place over the summer which proposed 100% retention by Councils.	Paul Jennings Cllr J Mutton
22nd September 2016	Business Rates Retention Consultation	A more in depth look at the consultation questions and responses on the Government consultation on Business Rates Retention. To look at potential pooling of rates across the Combined Authority area and also the Council's strategy to maximise business rates income	Paul Jennings Cllr J Mutton Cllr O'Boyle
12th October 16	Joint Strategic Needs Assessment and	The Health and Well-being Strategy and Joint Strategic Needs Assessment review of the current and future health and care	Jane Moore Cllr Kamran Caan

Date	Title	Detail	Cabinet Member/ Lead Officer
	Health and Well-being Strategy	needs of the local community. This report will be going to Cabinet on 1 st November	
	Drugs and Alcohol Service re-commissioning	Public Health is currently re-commissioning drug and alcohol services in the city and have developed a new service model. The model is currently out for consultation and will be going to Cabinet for a decision on 1 November	Georgia Flaherty Jane Moore Cllr Kamran Caan
9th November 16	Connecting Communities	An opportunity for Members to discuss emerging themes from the consultation and contribute to the consultation themselves. To include the findings from the Phase 1 consultation.	Michelle McGinty Cllr Maton/Ruane
11th January 17	Welfare Reform	Further review of impacts of changes to welfare provision and the services provided by partners in the city. Including most recent changes announced.	Glenda Cowley/ Welfare Reform Working Together Group Alan Markey – Coventry Independent Advice Service Richard Sharp - The DWP Coventry and Warwickshire Operational Leader Cllr Bigham
	Local Plan	An update following the hearings on the plan and the outcome of the Inspector's report.	Mark Andrews
	Half Year Council performance	An opportunity for members of the Board to look at Council performance for the half year across all areas and identify any areas that may need further scrutiny. Including equalities action.	Si Chum Lam Cllr Duggins
18th January 17	Changes to the Education Service	To consider proposed changes to the education service.	Kirston Nelson Cllr Maton
8th February 17	Prevent Strategy	Following from a suggestion by a member of the public that Scrutiny should look at the rise of the far-right in the city and what is being done to address this	Chief Superintendent Danny Long Geoff Thomas
	Electoral Registration and Voter Engagement	To consider the Council's engagement plan and to follow up on actions from the previous Board meeting.	Liz Read

Date	Title	Detail	Cabinet Member/ Lead Officer
	Overseas Conference Reports	Report back from conferences from China and Sweden	Cllr O'Boyle
3rd March	Connecting Communities	To consider the final recommendations based on the outcome of the consultation	Michelle McGinty Cllr Maton/Cllr Ruane
	Public Space Protection Orders	Members of the public have requested that the recommendations following the public consultation are considered by Scrutiny before they go to Cabinet.	Craig Hickin Cllr A Khan
	Connecting Communities Phase 1 – Implementation Report	A progress report on phase 1 of the programme	Michelle McGinty
12th April 17	Department for Work and Pensions priorities for 2017/18	Following the consideration of changes to the welfare system the DWP have offered to present their plans and priorities for 2017/18	Clare Hindson (DWP) Glenda Cowley Cllr Bigham
	Public Transport Select Committee	Recommendations and learning from SB3's select committee on public transport	Cllr McNicholas Gennie Holmes
	Annual Report of the Work of Outside Bodies – Whitefriars Housing Association		Cllr Seaman
26th April 17	Female Genital Mutilation	Progress report on implementation of the action plan	Georgia Faherty Cllr Caan
	Progress on commissioned DVA services	Following their meeting on 14 th October 2015, Board Members agreed to receive annual progress updates, including October 2016. To include contributions from the Police and Whitefriar's Housing and any information on a regional perpetrators programme.	Cllr A Khan
	Business Rates	An update on changes to the business rates system included the pilot.	Paul Jennings Cllr J Mutton
10th May 17	Local Plan	To receive feedback on the outcome of the Consultation on the revisions to the Local Plan.	Cllr Bigham/ Mark Andrews

Date	Title	Detail	Cabinet Member/ Lead Officer
	Annual Report of the Work of Outside Bodies - West Midlands Combined Authority	To hear on progress from the three elected member reps on the WMCA, Audit Committee and Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Also the Chair of the Overview and Scrutiny Committee, Cllr Peter Hughes from Sandwell has been invited.	Cllr Duggins Cllr J Mutton Cllr Bains Martin Reeves
	Prevent Strategy in the Community	Following the briefing note that came on the 8 th February, Members requested additional information on how the Prevent strategy is delivered in the community.	Cllr A Khan Geoff Thomas
	Ignite Project	Referred from SB4 – to look at progress on a project to join up working between Whitefriar’s and Willenhall Children’s Centre	Cllr Ruane/Bigham Helen Shankster
	Review of the Year	A chance to look back and also look forward to next year	Adrian West
Municipal year 2017-18	Drug and Alcohol Services – 2017/18	A report summarising services up to 2017 was requested following the Boards consideration of the Reshaping of Drug and Alcohol Services in Coventry at their meeting on 12 th October 16	Jane Moore Cllr Caan
	West Midlands Combined Authority	To discuss the role of scrutiny at the WMCA. To invite Cllr Peter Hughes.	Cllr Duggins Martin Reeves
	Business Rates retention	Following the meeting on 22 nd September Members requested regular updates when information becomes available.	Paul Jennings Cllr J Mutton
	Selective Licensing for the Private Rented Sector – consultation outcomes	To consider the outcomes of the consultation and recommendations to the Cabinet Member following a scrutiny task and finish group recommending implementation in St. Michael’s Ward.	Davina Blackburn Tracy Miller Cllr O’Boyle
	Friargate	An update to cover both the SB1 and SB3 elements of the project, in terms of the Council’s move to the building and the progress on developments on the whole site.	David Cockroft, Lisa Commane Cllr O Boyle, Cllr J Mutton
	Public Space Protection Order – 12 months review	Following their consideration of the original report, members requested a progress report on 12 months	

Date	Title	Detail	Cabinet Member/ Lead Officer
	Connecting Communities Phase 1 – implementation report	Members requested progress report from partners involved in delivery of services	Michelle McGinty
	Connecting Communities Phase 2 progress and Phase 3	To keep Members informed of progress on the Connecting Communities programme	Michelle McGinty

This page is intentionally left blank