

**Coventry City Council**

**Minutes of the Meeting of Council held at 2.00 pm on Tuesday, 12 January 2016**

Present:

Members: Councillor M Hammon (Lord Mayor)

Councillor N Akhtar	Councillor A Khan
Councillor P Akhtar	Councillor R Lakha
Councillor M Ali	Councillor R Lancaster
Councillor A Andrews	Councillor M Lapsa
Councillor M Auluck	Councillor J Lepoidevin
Councillor R Auluck	Councillor A Lucas
Councillor R Bailey	Councillor P Male
Councillor S Bains	Councillor K Maton
Councillor L Bigham	Councillor J McNicholas
Councillor J Birdi	Councillor C Miks
Councillor J Blundell	Councillor J Mutton
Councillor R Brown	Councillor M Mutton
Councillor K Caan	Councillor H Noonan
Councillor D Chater	Councillor J O'Boyle
Councillor J Clifford	Councillor E Ruane
Councillor G Crookes	Councillor T Sawdon
Councillor G Duggins	Councillor B Singh
Councillor D Galliers	Councillor D Skinner
Councillor D Gannon	Councillor H Sweet
Councillor L Harvard	Councillor R Thay
Councillor J Innes	Councillor S Walsh
Councillor D Kershaw	Councillor D Welsh
Councillor T Khan	

Honorary Alderman J. Gazey

Apologies: Councillor F Abbott, A Gingell, P Seaman, T Skipper and S Thomas, Mrs. J. Wright (Honorary Alderman)

**Public Business**

**98. Minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2015**

The minutes of the meeting held on 1 December 2015 were signed as a true record.

**99. Exclusion of the Press and Public**

**RESOLVED** that the press and public be excluded under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972 relating to the private report headed "Freehold purchase of Hornchurch Close Industrial Estate, Quinton Road, Coventry" on the grounds that the report involved the likely disclosure of information defined in Paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act, as it contained information relating to the financial and business affairs of a particular person (including the authority holding that information) and that

**in all circumstances of the case, the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing the information.**

100. **Coventry Good Citizen Award**

On behalf of the City Council, the Lord Mayor presented Amanda Atkins and Kris Townshend with the Good Citizen Award. Their citation read:

*“Amanda and Kris are carers who have gone far beyond their normal duties to offer an extremely high standard of support to an end of life patient.*

*They showed great respect and dignity to him and would call in to see him even on their days off. His comfort and well-being were their primary concern. They worked diligently and professionally and showed great compassion; they excelled in the care they gave to their patient at his time of greatest need.*

*Their support also extended to the close family of their patient who were treated with respect and kindness. Their unselfish approach to such a delicate situation illustrates the reason that Kris and Amanda are worthy Good Citizen Award winners.”*

101. **New Year’s Honours**

The Lord Mayor congratulated the following Coventry citizens who had been included in the recent New Year's Honours List.

- **BEM** to Pete Chambers, for his voluntary services to music in the city.
- **BEM** to Dennis Davison, a D-Day veteran for services to World War II commemoration and memorialisation and setting up the charity, Normandy Day UK
- **BEM** to Keelie Jayne Hill, a teaching assistant at Sherbourne Fields School for her services to youngsters with special educational needs and disabilities.
- **OBE** to Sean Moore a Coventry Firefighter for his services to national and international search and rescue.

The Lord Mayor had written on behalf of the City Council to all the recipients sending congratulations.

102. **Councillor Alison Gingell and Councillor Tony Skipper**

On behalf of the City Council, the Lord Mayor extended best wishes to Councillor Alison Gingell and Councillor Tony Skipper in respect of their recent illnesses.

Regarding Councillor Alison Gingell, in accordance with the Constitution, it was moved by the Leader, Councillor Lucas and seconded by Councillor Blundell that her ongoing illness was a good and sufficient reason for her non-attendance at meetings.

**RESOLVED that, for the reason given above, the City Council approve the continuing absence of Councillor Alison Gingell.**

**103. Petitions**

**RESOLVED that the following petitions be referred to the appropriate City Council bodies:**

**(a) Request that the Council take appropriate measures regarding parking issues in Stoke Row – 20 signatures, presented by Councillor Bains.**

**(b) Request for parking controls on Cannon Park Road – 42 signatures, presented by Councillor Blundell.**

**104. Declarations of Interest**

Councillor Noonan declared an interest in the matter the subject of Minute 111 (New Coventry Local Plan – Publication Draft (2011-2031) and the Updated Local Development Scheme (2016).

The Lord Mayor, Councillor Hammon, declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the matter the subject of Minute 112 (Coventry City Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) – Publication Draft.

As the debates on the items above were combined with the agenda items the subject of Minutes 109 and 110 below, Councillors Noonan and Hammon withdrew from the meeting during consideration of and voting on all of the items in Minutes 109 to 112.

When the Lord Mayor withdrew from the meeting, the Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Harvard, took the Chair.

**105. The 2016/17 Council Tax Base Report**

Further to Minute 87 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Executive Director of Resources, which established the 2016/17 Council Tax base for tax setting purposes.

The Council Tax base, being the measure of the taxable capacity of an area, for the purpose of calculating an authority's Council Tax, represented the estimated number of Band D equivalent chargeable dwellings for the year. It also took into account the authority's estimated Council Tax collection rate.

The necessary calculations were made in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax base) Regulations 2012 to establish the Council Tax base for the City Council and its parishes. These regulations applied to financial years beginning 1 April 2013 onwards, and included the impact of the change from awarding Council Tax benefit to the introduction of a Council Tax Support Scheme (also known as the Council Tax Reduction Scheme).

On 23 June 2015 the City Council agreed a reorganisation order to establish a parish and parish council for the Finham area of the City with effect from 1st April 2016. The reorganisation order included details of the proposed budget requirement for the first year of the new parish. As a result, this report included, for the first time, the details of the tax base for the new Finham parish, together with the grant to be paid to Finham Parish Council to compensate it for the reductions made as part of the Council Tax Support Scheme.

Under the Support Scheme, the Council Tax base was reduced according to the amount of reductions awarded under the scheme, as the authority would be foregoing the relevant Council Tax income and instead would receive grant income outside of the Council Tax arrangements. These reductions were reflected in the calculation of the Council Tax base, in order to calculate the correct amount of band D Council Tax for the billing authority (Coventry City Council), the major precepting authorities (West Midlands Police and Crime Commissioner and the West Midlands Fire and Rescue Authority), and the local precepting authorities (Allesley Parish Council, Finham Parish Council and Keresley Parish Council)

Proposals would not set the actual level of Council Tax in Coventry and that would be set by Council on the 23<sup>rd</sup> February 2016. The determination of the tax base is one part of the process and must occur before 31st January each year.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve:**

1. That the Council Tax collection rate for 2016/17 be set at 98.3%.
2. That, in accordance with the Local Authorities (Calculation of Council Tax Base) Regulations 2012, the amounts calculated by the City Council for 2016/17 shall be:

a net tax base of 77,525.1 for the whole of the City Council area made up as follows:

Allesley Parish	318.3
Finham Parish	1,467.8
Keresley Parish	226.2
All Other Coventry City Council Wards	<u>75,512.8</u>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>77,525.1</b>

3. That the following grant payments should be made to parish councils to reflect the impact in 2016/17 of Council Tax reductions on their tax bases.

Allesley Parish	£621
Finham Parish	£3821
Keresley Parish	£354

---

**TOTAL**

**£4,796**

**106. Revision of the Local Council Tax Support Scheme**

Further to Minute 90 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Executive Director of Resources, which set out the outcome of consultation on proposals for a new Council Tax Support Scheme and made recommendations for the introduction of a new scheme.

Council Tax Support (CTS) was a means tested discount to help low income households with the cost of Council Tax payments. The existing CTS scheme in Coventry broadly mirrored the Council Tax Benefit (CTB) scheme, previously administered under the framework from the Department for Work and Pensions (DWP).

Since the Government announced that CTB was to be localised from April 2013 every council has had the responsibility for designing its own scheme of support. In localising support, the Department for Communities and Local Government had also cut funding by 10 per cent in 2013/14. Notwithstanding this reduction in funding, the Council initially made the decision to implement a new Council Tax Support scheme which effectively mirrored the previous CTB scheme, meaning no change in the level of financial assistance received by recipients. Due to the 10 per cent reduction in funding from central government, this meant that the Council had to find approximately £3 million of additional resources to maintain the equivalent level of support under the CTS scheme.

The report indicated that the Council faced significant funding pressures for 2016/17 and beyond. Although the Pre-Budget Report previously approved by Cabinet contained proposals that would move the Council towards a balanced Budget in 2016/17, large shortfalls existed in the budget for later years. Given these medium term funding pressures, the 2015/16 Budget Report included a £3 million saving target for CTS from 2016/17. This formed part of the Council's 2015/16 budget consultation process.

It was acknowledged that reducing the CTS scheme was only one of a number of difficult and challenging decisions that the Council would need to take as it reduced and redesigned services to ensure that the Council maintained a sustainable financial position in the wake of unprecedented reductions in funding. Additional cuts to services in other areas to make up the £3 million savings would cause significant impacts across the Council when all service areas were looking at ways of reducing costs.

In proposing to now revise its CTS scheme, the Council would be following the majority of English councils who had now similarly reduced the levels of discounts offered under local schemes than were funded under CTB. In 2015/16 only 42 out of 326 councils had protected all recipients from a cut in support. On average, councils in England had cut scheme discounts compared with levels of benefits previously provided, by 20 per cent.

The rules governing support for pensioners, who comprised approximately 39 per cent of the caseload in Coventry, would continue to be prescribed nationally.

People of pension age did not receive any reduction in entitlement under a local scheme when compared to the previous CTB scheme. This meant that pensioners would not be impacted by any proposals to revise the local CTS scheme although this inevitably had the impact of loading the weight of a cut onto people of working age.

Following a period of formal public consultation on the proposed changes, which was undertaken from 17th August 2015 to 26th October 2015, and consideration of the consultation analysis and Equalities Consultation Assessment appended to the report, it was proposed that a minimum contribution approach to pass on a 15 per cent reduction in support to all working age people should be adopted. This approach would apply a blanket reduction regardless of individual circumstances or the type or level of income of the customer. The advantage of this approach would be to disperse the cut across the widest possible section of customers to minimise the average impact. The average weekly award of £20.09 (in a Band A property) would reduce by £3.01 to £17.08, leaving the Council to collect the annual balance of around £156.52 from each of these households (around £2.4 million additional charges if applied equally to all working age residents).

The Cabinet had noted that the Finance and Corporate Services Scrutiny Board (1) had considered the Local Council Tax Support Scheme at their meeting on 11 November 2015. They had recommended that, in considering the proposals, the Cabinet should be mindful of Council policy to protect the most vulnerable in the City and to consider other options to achieve the required savings. The Cabinet Member for Strategic Finance and Resources indicated that these issues had been taken into account when looking at various alternative options as identified within the report.

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- 1 Note the outcomes of the consultation responses, resulting equality impacts and other information in this report, then make a decision on the proposed new Council Tax Support (CTS) Scheme**
- 2 Approve the proposed Council Tax Support scheme as set out in appendix 1 of the report and delegate authority to the Director of Resources to make final detailed changes to the Scheme and to implement the scheme from 1 April 2016.**

**107. Freehold Purchase of Hornchurch Close Industrial Estate, Quinton Road, Coventry**

Further to Minute 95 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Executive Director of Place, which set out proposals for the freehold purchase of Hornchurch Close Industrial Estate, Quinton Road, Coventry.

A corresponding private report detailing confidential aspects of the proposals was also submitted to the meeting for consideration (Minute 116 below refers).

An opportunity had arisen to make an investment purchase of the freehold of an industrial estate let to small businesses where the Council was currently the long leaseholder. In doing so it would convert the Council's current depreciating asset

into an appreciating one, on a self-funding basis that avoided future rent increases to the Council and removed dilapidations claims against the Council at the end of the lease.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the adjustment of the capital programme to reflect the expenditure.**

108. **Motion without Notice**

In accordance with Paragraph 10.1 of the Constitution, it was moved by Councillor Gannon, seconded by Councillor McNicholas and agreed:

**(a) That the debates in respect of the following Minutes be combined:**

- 109. Memorandum of Understanding relating to the planned distribution of housing within the Coventry & Warwickshire Housing Market Area (HMA)**
- 110. Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council New Borough Plan – Publication Draft and Supporting Documents**
- 111. New Coventry Local Plan – Publication Draft (2011-2031) and the updated Local Development Scheme (2016)**
- 112. Coventry City Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) – Publication Draft**

**(b) That time limits be suspended to enable 3 Councillors from each Group (Councillors Maton, Lucas and A Khan and Councillors Blundell, Crookes and Lepoidevin) to each have one untimed speech, to be indicated by the Councillor at the start of their speech.**

109. **Memorandum of Understanding relating to the planned distribution of housing within the Coventry & Warwickshire Housing Market Area (HMA)**

Further to Minute 102 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Executive Director of Place, which sought approval of a Memorandum of Understanding in relation to the planned distribution of housing within the Coventry and Warwickshire Housing Market Area (HMA).

The Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) sought to ensure the housing needs of the Coventry and Warwickshire HMA were planned for in full during the current round of Local Plans. It responded to the fact that Coventry was unable to accommodate its full housing needs as well as the recommendations made by the Planning Inspector currently considering the Warwick District Council Local Plan. In doing so the MoU would supersede a previous agreement made at the Coventry and Warwickshire Shadow Economic Prosperity Board (sEPB) in November 2014 and presented to Council in March 2015.

The MoU, attached as Appendix 1 to the report submitted, was presented to the sEPB on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2015 and was accompanied by a covering report (also part of Appendix 1), which recommended the MoU be endorsed by each of the six authorities – Coventry City, Rugby Borough, Warwick District, North Warwickshire Borough, Stratford on Avon District and Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough.

The MoU had been jointly developed over the summer of 2015 by all six authorities with further support from Warwickshire County Council. Its development had been supported by an officer and member reference group of the sEPB and had been informed by updated evidence on population projections, economic growth forecasts and household formation rates. It also contained points of agreement that related to the levels of housing needs and how that housing should be distributed across the Housing Market Area. This distribution supported both demographic and workforce growth as well as considering mitigation and commuting flows between the six authorities.

The report submitted set out the housing needs and a housing requirement to be taken forward into plan making, and the impact on each of the local authority areas. In summary, for Coventry, the objectively assessed housing need indicated that 42,400 homes would be required. This figure was reduced by 3,800 through aligning population and economic growth and 14,000 through redistribution to other local authority areas. This resulted in a housing requirement for the City of 24,600.

The MoU was supported by all Members of the sEPB except representatives of Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council (NBBC), who remained concerned about their own capacity and their ability to plan for an additional 4,020 homes identified as a result of their functional relationship to the City. The lack of support from NBBC at this time was considered further in the proposed response to their Borough Plan, which was also being considered at this meeting.

The approval of the MoU would provide a solid and transparent platform from which to plan for new homes across Coventry and Warwickshire in the coming years. Endorsement of the MoU would also help enable the Council to fulfil its obligations in relation to the Duty to Co-operate and to meet the housing requirements of the housing market area, as required by national planning policy.

**RESOLVED that the City Council endorse the Memorandum of Understanding relating to the planned distribution of housing within the Coventry & Warwickshire Housing Market Area (HMA) as attached at Appendix 1 of the report submitted.**

In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with Paragraph 18.3 of the City Council's Constitution. The Councillors voting for, against or abstaining in respect of the recommendations were as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillors:	Councillors:	
N. Akhtar	Andrews	
P. Akhtar	Bailey	
Ali	Birdi	
M Auluck	Blundell	
Dr R Auluck	Crookes	
Bains	Lapsa	
Bigham	Lepoidevin	
Brown	Male	
Caan	Sawdon	
Chater	Skinner	



Clifford  
Duggins  
Galliers  
Gannon  
Innes  
Kershaw  
A Khan  
T Khan  
Lakha  
Lancaster  
Lucas  
Maton  
Miks  
J Mutton  
M Mutton  
O'Boyle  
Ruane  
Singh  
Sweet  
Thay  
Walsh  
Welsh  
Deputy Lord Mayor

For: 33  
Against: 10  
Abstentions: 0

110. **Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council New Borough Plan - Publication Draft and Supporting Documents**

Further to Minute 103 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Executive Director of Place, which sought endorsement of an officer response to Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council's new Borough Plan – Publication Draft and supporting documents.

Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council (NBBC) formally published their New Borough Plan for a period of representations on the 26<sup>th</sup> October 2015. The period of representations ran for 6 weeks until the 18th December 2015 in accordance with national Regulations relating to the submission of Local Plans. In addition to the Borough Plan, NBBC had also published an updated Statement of Community Involvement as well as a site options document for Gypsy and Traveller sites and the first stage of the Community Infrastructure Levy for consultation. Given the timescales involved, officers had submitted an officer representation to NBBC to ensure initial comments had been provided. It was this representation that was attached as Appendix 1a to the report submitted and presented to members for their endorsement or amendment. To reflect the relevance of the Borough Plan to the Duty to Co-operate a joint officer response had also been prepared by Coventry City Council, Warwick District Council, Rugby Borough Council, North Warwickshire Borough Council and Stratford on Avon District Council. This joint response was closely aligned to the City Council's own response and was attached as Appendix 1b to the report.

In summary, the City Council was unable to support the Borough's plan at this time for the following reasons:

- The Borough Plan did not (as currently presented) make any positive attempts to plan for the unmet housing need originating from Coventry;
- Instead, the Borough Plan sought to delay any action until further work was completed on the NBBC Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. This meant the Plan was not supported by an up to date evidence base and meant all development options may not have been subject to appropriate consideration in terms of infrastructure needs or Sustainability Appraisal;
- A number of development proposals were identified on the city's administrative boundary which would represent extensions to the city's urban area. Although these may be acceptable in principle the City Council had received limited notification of such proposals or invitations to comment on potential infrastructure implications; and
- The Borough Plan also sought to delay any support for the city's unmet need by suggesting further consultation may be required. For the reasons set out above, further consultation was inevitable to secure a sound plan and help respond to the unmet need arising from Coventry.

In relation to the supporting documents, the Council's response highlighted the following key points:

The Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) - Additional reference needed to be added to Appendix A to ensure neighbouring authorities were considered under the duty to cooperate.

The Community Infrastructure Levy and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan - The importance of cross boundary infrastructure, especially in relation to sites adjacent the city boundary.

Gypsy and Traveler site options - The document proposed a number of sites that could potentially be allocated to meet the needs of the Gypsy and Traveler community. This included a site at Burbages Lane, Ash Green, located approximately 75m from the city's boundary. Although there was unlikely to be any concern in principle, the supporting text was unclear about the full extent of the site and the impact it may have on an adjoining Local Wildlife Site, the wider Green Belt and the settled traveller community situated on Burbages Lane within the city's administrative boundary.

**RESOLVED that the City Council endorse:**

- 1. The officer representations to Nuneaton and Bedworth's new Borough Plan – Publication Draft and supporting documents, as set out at Appendix 1a;**

**2. The joint sub-regional officer representations to Nuneaton and Bedworth's new Borough Plan – Publication Draft, as set out at Appendix 1b.**

In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with Paragraph 18.3 of the City Council's Constitution. The Councillors voting for, against or abstaining in respect of the recommendations were as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillors:		Councillors:
N. Akhtar		Andrews
P. Akhtar		Bailey
Ali		Birdi
M Auluck		Blundell
Dr R Auluck		Crookes
Bigham		Lapsa
Brown		Lepoidevin
Caan		Male
Chater		Sawdon
Clifford		Skinner
Duggins		
Galliers		
Gannon		
Innes		
Kershaw		
A Khan		
T Khan		
Lakha		
Lancaster		
Lucas		
Maton		
Miks		
J Mutton		
M Mutton		
O'Boyle		
Ruane		
Singh		
Sweet		
Thay		
Walsh		
Welsh		
Deputy Lord Mayor		

For: 32  
Against: 0  
Abstentions: 10

**111. New Coventry Local Plan - Publication Draft (2011-2031) and the updated Local Development Scheme (2016)**

Further to Minute 104 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Executive Director of Place, which sought approval of the New Coventry Local Plan for a period of public consultation.

The Office for National Statistics recognised Coventry as the fastest growing city outside Greater London with continuing job growth and two successful universities. The Local Plan responded to the growth and the policies and proposals within it to provide a blueprint to support the Council's overarching aim of re-establishing itself as a Top Ten City.

The Plan identified out how and where the city would grow, develop and change and how the Council would work jointly with its partners and neighbouring authorities to support and facilitate this growth. It would be managed through a range of policies, designations and allocations, which would cover a broad selection of policy areas, including:

- Sustainable Development and the Duty to Cooperate;
- Housing;
- The Economy, Jobs and Employment;
- Public Health;
- Retail, Social, Community and Leisure Uses;
- The Green Belt and the Wider Green Environment;
- Heritage and Conservation;
- Urban and Landscape Design;
- Accessibility and Transport;
- Environmental Management, Climate Change and Minerals and Waste; and
- Infrastructure Provision.

An Objectively Assessed Need for Housing had been identified of 42,400 homes for Coventry between 2011 and 2031. This had been informed by the Government's most recent population projections. It was not possible however to accommodate this level of housing within the City's administrative boundaries, with the Council's housing land supply identifying a capacity of approximately 25,000 homes. A Memorandum of Understanding had therefore been prepared with the six Warwickshire authorities to propose how the remaining housing need would be redistributed and planned for (see Minute 102 above). The total capacity for new homes was approximately 400 homes higher than the housing requirement agreed in the Memorandum of Understanding with Warwickshire. This helped provide some flexibility to the City's housing land supply, which was a requirement of national guidance. Included as part of this growth were two proposed urban extensions at Keresley and Eastern Green. These two areas represented the first sizeable planned expansion of Coventry's urban area in over 50 years.

In addition to housing needs the plan also responded to the need for employment land. A total requirement of 354ha had been identified, which reflected both the need for new land but also an allowance for qualitative improvements to the City's employment land offer. The plan made provisions for 128ha of employment land within Coventry's boundaries (but with a further 89ha of employment land at Ansty Park and Ryton Park in Rugby Borough). The remaining requirement was

expected to be largely delivered as part of the Gateway proposals in Warwick District.

This would however require the removal of approximately 600ha of land from Coventry's existing Green Belt to provide approximately 6,600 of these new homes and 41.5ha of the new employment land (potentially supporting the creation of 7,000 new jobs). The Cabinet noted, however, that only 48% of the land removed from the Green Belt was likely to be developed, meaning less than 10% of the City's existing Green Belt would be built on over the course of the plan. This was due to assets such as ancient woodlands being protected by other policy designations and new developments incorporating new publicly accessible and useable green spaces to ensure high quality environments. The majority of the remaining supply would be on brownfield land.

The Plan had also continued to ensure the most sensitive and highest value green spaces remained protected in the most appropriate and robust way. This led to the re-designation of some areas previously referred to as Green Belt being redefined to the new national designation of Local Green Space and reflected the fact they did not meet the purposes of Green Belt policy but perhaps more importantly reflected their importance to local communities within the more urbanised parts of the City. It was also noted that Local Green Space designations carried a very similar level of protection as Green Belt policy.

Notwithstanding the levels of growth expected within Coventry's boundaries, the City would not be able to achieve its ambition of becoming a Top 10 City again without the support of its neighbouring authorities, and continued working through the Duty to Cooperate. This reflected the City's tight administrative boundaries and that a substantial amount of the City's housing and employment needs would be delivered in Warwickshire, whilst links to the wider Birmingham conurbation would also be vital for longer term economic growth. The report indicated that there was a genuine chance therefore that some of the development could be brought forward adjacent to the City's boundaries, most notably to the north, east and south. The Local Plan identified its support for such proposals where they supported the sustainable growth of the City, but recognised that the final decisions rested with respective authorities. Indeed, recent proposals such as the Coventry Gateway and the growth of Warwick University were prime examples of how such developments could be achieved.

The version of the Local Plan included at Appendix 1 of the report submitted was the Publication Draft, which meant it was the version of the plan the Council believed was suitable to submit for public examination. It had been developed over a number of years and had full regard to a wide range of consultation responses, a robust evidence base and the Council's responsibilities under the statutory Duty to Cooperate.

The Plan had been prepared in accordance with relevant National Legislation and Planning Regulations, which meant, prior to submission, the plan must be published for a statutory period of 6 weeks public engagement (referred to as a period of representations) which focused on the Plans "soundness" and "legal compliance". This would commence on 18th January 2016.

It would however be necessary to consider all representations to the plan and potentially propose minor amendments prior to its submission to the Secretary of State for Public Examination. In order to avoid the need for a further report to full Council and the delay to the process that would result, it was intended that the Council delegate responsibility for this to the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Enterprise and Employment, the Chair of the Business, Economy and Enterprise Scrutiny Board (3) and the Chair of Planning Committee. This delegated power would also include a special meeting of Scrutiny Board 3 and the Planning Committee in March 2016. In the event that significant issues were highlighted with the Local Plan that would affect its legal compliance or overarching soundness and result in the need for major amendments, a further report would be submitted to Cabinet and Council for their consideration.

Accompanying this stage of the new Local Plan was an update of the Local Development Scheme (LDS). The LDS was a mandatory requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act and set out which documents the Council would produce to establish its new planning policies and when they would be produced. The LDS contained four separate documents planned for development. These included the Local Plan, the City Centre Area Action Plan, the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) and a Supporting Housing Delivery Development Plan Document.

The following amendment (in italics) was moved by Councillor Blundell, seconded by Councillor Crookes and lost:-

*“Recommendation 2) delete the word “approves” and insert the word “note”*

*Recommendation 3) delete the word “approves” and insert the word “note”*

*Recommendation 4) After the words “Authorise a period of” delete the words “six weeks” and insert the words “three months”. Delete the word “statutory, then delete the remainder of the sentence, then insert the words “to include all aspects of the Local Plan”;*

*Recommendation 5) Delete part of the first line from “Delegate Authority” up to and including “Chair of Planning Committee” and insert the words “Bring back to Full Council”. In line 4, delete the word “statutory”. In the 5<sup>th</sup> line, delete the word “minor”. In the 5<sup>th</sup> line after “amendments to the Local Plan”, delete the words in brackets “(where this is necessary to correct any errors and aid clarity)”.*

***Recommendations now to read:***

*Recommendations*

*The Council is recommended to:*

- 1) Consider the responses received to the Local Plan – Delivering Sustainable Growth: September 2014, which are referenced in Para 3.1 and 3.2, summarised in Appendix 3 and contained in full on the Councils website;*

- 2) *Note the "Local Plan Publication Draft (2011-2031)" document;*
- 3) *Note the updated Local Development Scheme (2016);*
- 4) *Authorise a period of three months public engagement to include all aspects of the Local Plan;*
- 5) *Bring back to Full Council to take full account of the responses received to the period of public engagement, propose amendments to the Local Plan and submit the plan to the Secretary of State for a period of Public Examination."*

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

1. **Note the responses received to the Local Plan – Delivering Sustainable Growth: September 2014, which are referenced in Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2, and summarised in Appendix 3 (page 595) of the report submitted and contained in full on the Councils website.**
2. **Approve the "Local Plan Publication Draft (2011-2031)" document.**
3. **Approve the updated Local Development Scheme (2016).**
4. **Authorise a period of six weeks statutory public engagement beginning on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and ending on 29<sup>th</sup> February 2016.**
5. **Delegate authority to the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Enterprise and Employment, the Chair of Scrutiny Board 3 and the Chair of Planning Committee, to take full account of the responses received to the statutory period of public engagement, propose minor amendments to the Local Plan (where this is necessary to correct any errors and aid clarity) and submit the plan to the Secretary of State for a period of Public Examination.**

In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with Paragraph 18.3 of the City Council's Constitution. The Councillors voting for, against or abstaining in respect of the recommendations were as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillors:	Councillors:	
N. Akhtar	Andrews	
P. Akhtar	Bailey	
Ali	Birdi	
M Auluck	Blundell	
Dr R Auluck	Crookes	
Bigham	Lapsa	
Brown	Lepoidevin	
Caan	Male	
Chater	Sawdon	
Clifford	Skinner	
Duggins		

Galliers  
Gannon  
Innes  
Kershaw  
A Khan  
T Khan  
Lakha  
Lancaster  
Lucas  
Maton  
Miks  
J Mutton  
M Mutton  
O'Boyle  
Ruane  
Singh  
Sweet  
Thay  
Walsh  
Welsh  
Deputy Lord Mayor

For: 32  
Against: 10  
Abstentions: 0

**112. Coventry City Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) - Publication Draft**

Further to Minute 105 of the Cabinet, the City Council considered a report of the Executive Director of Place, which sought approval of the City Centre Area Action Plan for a period of public consultation. The Plan was attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

At a time when Coventry's population continued to grow, its city centre would continue to be a focal point, but must respond in order to stop a period of decline, primarily within its retail offer. This was placed in context through the Council's Shopping and Centres Study (2014), which identified Coventry as the country's 13<sup>th</sup> biggest city but with a retail centre ranked 58<sup>th</sup>. As such, there was a clear disparity between the City's population and the quality of its retail offer.

In recent years however, significant investment in city centre public realm improvements had complemented substantial investments in job creation such as the new Severn Trent head offices and hi-tech business at the University Technology Park. Likewise, more people were now living in the city centre following delivery of new homes over the last 10 years. Coventry University also continued to grow, not only in terms of its student numbers, but also its national and global reputation and the size and quality of its campus.

The Area Action Plan looked to build upon these recent successes and provide a platform for the future to help guide and deliver new developments and investment. It included well known and established proposals such as Friargate, City Centre South and the completion of Belgrade Plaza, but also introduced new



ideas and aspirations. For example, new residential led regeneration around the area north of Corporation Street and Fairfax Street, continued growth of the Technology Park, new approaches to city centre parking provision and longer term aspirations for the regeneration of the northern half of the City's retail area.

In addition to new buildings, the Area Action Plan provided a fundamental focus on urban and landscape design, environmental quality, protection of historic assets, green infrastructure, water courses and new routes and linkages helping people move around the city centre and its adjoining areas in an easier and more coherent way. These aspects would all be fundamental in continuing to improve the overall feel and safety of the city centre and the quality of its built environment.

The development of an Area Action Plan was therefore essential to help provide a clear overview of how all these different aspects could work together to improve the city centre whilst shaping and directing future development. The Cabinet noted however, that the Area Action Plan could not define exactly how specific sites would be developed, but it could set clear markers and provide a firm steer as to how development could be brought forward. This provided a blueprint for the city centre, allowing it to respond to the rapid change that it was expected to face in the coming years.

In this context, the Area Action Plan had been developed in two specific sections. The first would consider overarching policy guidance focused around the four key areas of city centre heritage; the built environment; the natural environment; and accessibility.

The second section would provide a more detailed overview of the Principal Areas that have been identified around specific characteristics, two further regeneration areas to the north of the city centre, focused around Bishop Street and Fairfax Street; and an area of planned stability with small infill opportunities to the south of the city, focused around Warwick Row.

The version of the Area Action Plan included at Appendix 1 of the report was the Publication Draft, which meant it was the version of the plan the Council believed was suitable to submit for public examination. It had been developed over a number of years and had full regard to a wide range of consultation responses, a robust evidence base and the Council's responsibilities under the statutory Duty to Cooperate.

The Plan had been prepared in accordance with relevant National Legislation and Planning Regulations, which meant prior to submission the plan must be published for a statutory period of 6 weeks public engagement (referred to as a period of representations) which would focus on the Plans "soundness" and "legal compliance". This would commence on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016.

It would however be necessary to consider all representations to the plan and potentially propose minor amendments prior to its submission to the Secretary of State for Public Examination. In order to avoid the need for a further report to full Council and the delay to the process that would result, it was intended that the Council delegate responsibility for this to the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Enterprise and Employment, the Chair of the Business, Enterprise and Economy Scrutiny Board (3) and the

Chair of Planning Committee. This delegated power would also include a special meeting of Scrutiny Board 3 and the Planning Committee in March 2016. In the event that significant issues were highlighted with the Area Action Plan that would affect its legal compliance or overarching soundness and result in the need for major amendments, a further report would be submitted to Cabinet and Council for their consideration.

The following amendment (in italics) was moved by Councillor Blundell, seconded by Councillor Crookes and lost:

*Recommendation 2) delete the word “approves” and insert the word “note”;*

*Recommendation 3) After the words “Authorise a period of” delete the words “six weeks” and insert the words “three months”. Delete the word “statutory”, then delete the remainder of the sentence. Insert the words “to include all aspects of the City Centre Area Action Plan”;*

*Recommendation 4) Delete part of the first line from “Delegate Authority” up to and including “Chair of Planning Committee” and insert the words “Bring back to Full Council”. In the 5th line, delete the word “minor”. In the 5th line after “amendments to the Area Action Plan”, delete the words in brackets “(where this is necessary to correct any errors and aid clarity)”.*

*Recommendations now to read:*

*The Council is recommended to:*

- 1) Consider the responses received to the City Centre Area Action Plan – The Preferred Approach, which are referenced in Para 3.1 and 3.2, summarised in Appendix 2 and contained in full on the Council’s website;*
- 2) Note the “City Centre Area Action Plan – Publication Draft (2011-2031)” document;*
- 3) Authorises a period of three months public engagement to include all aspects of the City Centre Area Action Plan;*
- 4) Bring back to Full Council to take full account of the responses received to the period of public engagement, propose amendments to the Area Action Plan and submit the plan to the Secretary of State for a period of Public Examination.*

**RESOLVED that the City Council:**

- 1. Note the responses received to the City Centre Area Action Plan – The Preferred Approach, which are referenced in Paragraphs 3.1 and 3.2, and summarised in Appendix 2 (page 719) of the report submitted and contained in full on the Council’s website.**
- 2. Approve the “City Centre Area Action Plan – Publication Draft (2011-2031)” document.**
- 3. Authorise a period of six weeks statutory public engagement beginning on 18<sup>th</sup> January 2016 and ending on 29<sup>th</sup> February 2016.**
- 4. Delegate to the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Enterprise and Employment, the Chair of Scrutiny Board 3 and the Chair of Planning Committee, to take full**

**account of the responses received to the statutory period of public engagement, propose minor amendments to the Area Action Plan (where this is necessary to correct any errors and aid clarity) and submit the plan to the Secretary of State for a period of Public Examination.**

In respect of the above, a recorded vote was required in accordance with Paragraph 18.3 of the City Council's Constitution. The Councillors voting for, against or abstaining in respect of the recommendations were as follows:

<u>For</u>	<u>Against</u>	<u>Abstain</u>
Councillors:	Councillors:	
N. Akhtar	Andrews	
P. Akhtar	Bailey	
Ali	Birdi	
M Auluck	Blundell	
Dr R Auluck	Crookes	
Bigham	Lapsa	
Brown	Lepoidevin	
Caan	Male	
Chater	Sawdon	
Clifford	Skinner	
Duggins		
Galliers		
Gannon		
Innes		
Kershaw		
A Khan		
T Khan		
Lakha		
Lancaster		
Lucas		
Maton		
Miks		
J Mutton		
M Mutton		
O'Boyle		
Ruane		
Singh		
Sweet		
Thay		
Walsh		
Welsh		
Deputy Lord Mayor		

For: 32  
Against: 10  
Abstentions: 0

### 113. **Question Time**

The following Members answered oral questions (and supplementary questions) as set out:

	Question Asked By	Question Put To	Subject Matter
1	Councillor Male	Councillor Maton	Classification of the Green Belt
2	Councillor Birdi	Councillor Lancaster	Maintenance of Canal Foot Bridge
3	Councillor Blundell	Councillor A Khan	Mayoral display shields
4	Councillor Lapsa	Councillor Lancaster	Penalty Notices

114. **Statements**

- (a) The Cabinet Member for Children and Young People, Councillor Ruane, made a statement in respect of the “Children’s Services Improvement Plan.”

Councillor Andrews responded to the Statement.

- (b) The Leader, Councillor Lucas, made a statement in respect of the “Expansion of Jaguar Land Rover.”

Councillor Blundell responded to the Statement.

115. **Debates**

There were no debates.

116. **Freehold purchase of Hornchurch Close Industrial Estate, Quinton Road, Coventry**

Further to Minute 107 above, the City Council considered a private report of the Executive Director of Place, which set out confidential aspects of proposals for the freehold purchase of Hornchurch Close Industrial Estate, Quinton Road, Coventry.

**RESOLVED that the City Council approve the adjustment of the capital programme to reflect the capital expenditure.**

(Meeting closed at 6.10 pm)