



Coventry City Council

---

# **SUMMARY OF CABINET/CABINET MEMBER DECISIONS**

**WEEK COMMENCING 4 MARCH 2013**

**CALL IN FOR THESE DECISIONS ENDS  
9.00 A.M. ON FRIDAY 15 MARCH 2013**

**8 MARCH 2013**

# Public Business

- Denotes items that have been referred to Audit Committee.
- # Denotes items that are to be referred to Council. Accordingly Call-in does not apply.
- ◆ Denotes a matter where the associated report has already been considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or a Scrutiny Board. Where this body has endorsed the recommendations or made recommendations that have been accepted by the Cabinet/Cabinet Member Call-in does not apply.
- \* Denotes other items that have been referred to, or considered by, the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or a specific Scrutiny Board.

Note: The Limitations on Call-in are set out at the end of this sheet.

## Cabinet - 5<sup>th</sup> March, 2013

### #Report 5 Public Leisure Facility Re-Provisioning for the North East of Coventry

#### Councillor Townshend

#### Recommendations

Cabinet:

1. to consider the public petition signed by 6,657 people opposing the closure of Foleshill Sports and Leisure Centre;
2. to approve proposals for the development of wet-side (including swimming pools) and community and associated service facilities at Centre AT7 as a re-provision of the ageing facilities at Foleshill Sports and Leisure Centre, Livingstone Road;
3. to recommend to Council that it provides funding of £7.45m for the development of wet-side (including swimming pools) and community and associated service facilities at Centre AT7 as an addition to the 2013/2014 Capital programme\*;

\* this is on the basis that Cabinet is minded to approve Recommendations 2 and 3 to Council but is not authorised by the Council's executive

arrangements, financial regulations and other rules of procedures to make a determination in those terms.

4. to delegate authority to the Director of City Services and Development and the Director of Financial and Legal Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member (Community Safety and Equalities) to approve the detailed scope and implementation of the proposed works in accordance with the planning permission, along with associated professional appointments;
5. to delegate to the Director of City Services and Development and the Director of Finance and Legal Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member (Community Safety and Equalities) to agree to complete a lease with the Coventry and Warwickshire Award Trust as the freehold owner of Centre AT7 for the construction of the wet-side facility for 47-year term commencing on 1<sup>st</sup> April 2013;
6. to approve the managed decommissioning and closure of Foleshill Sports and Leisure Centre, with the intention of facilitating a seamless transition of service provision in the north east of the city (subject to risk management and budget constraints);
7. to request officers to further investigate potential options for future usage of the Foleshill Sports and Leisure Centre/Livingstone Road site and undertake a marketing/disposal feasibility exercise with a view to reporting back to Members.

**The above recommendations were approved.**

## **Report 6**

### **Lease and Asset Transfer Agreements for proposed academy status of Foleshill C of E Primary School and Stretton C of E Primary School**

#### **Councillor Kershaw**

#### **Recommendations**

Cabinet is requested to:

1. Approve the 125-year lease agreements at a peppercorn rental for Foleshill C of E Primary School and Stretton C of E Primary School with the proposed Academy led by the Coventry Diocesan Board of Education.
2. Approve the asset transfer agreements for Foleshill C of E Primary School and Stretton C of E Primary School with the proposed Academy led by the Coventry Diocesan Board of Education

**The above recommendations were approved.**

**Report 7 Caludon Castle School Academy Conversion: Certificate under the Local Government (Contracts) Act 1997 Indemnity**

**Councillor Kershaw**

**Recommendations**

Cabinet is requested to authorise the indemnity attached to Appendix 1 of this report from the Council to the authorised signatory acting for the Council, against any claim arising from the certificate issued under the Local Government (Contracts) Act 1997, as required for the Caludon Castle PFI academy conversion.

**The above recommendation was approved.**

**Report 8 Education Capital: Priority Schools Building Programme**

**Councillor Kershaw**

**Recommendations**

Cabinet is requested to approve the following recommendations:

1. Note the appointment of Wates Construction Limited as the selected panel member by the EFA to deliver the Coventry PSBP Programme;
2. Authorise officers to continue supporting schools and the Education Funding Agency (EFA) in procuring and delivering the six capital grant funded PSBP schemes;
3. Note the PSBP Programme Board's role as Local Authority oversight and risk management of the PSBP programme, including financial and legal risks; and
4. Agree to receive further monitoring reports on the final stage of the procurement process and delivery of the remainder of the PSBP programme for Coventry.

**The above recommendations were approved.**

**Report 9 Proposed Expansion and Changes to Admission Numbers for 12 Primary Schools for September 2014: Determination of Statutory Notices**

**Councillor Kershaw**

**Recommendations**

Cabinet is asked to approve the proposals summarised in the statutory notices of 17 January 2013 for all 12 schools subject to the granting of planning permission, taking into account the recommendations of the Cabinet Advisory Panel (School Organisation) following their consideration of representations on 27 February 2013 regarding Wyken Croft School.

**The above recommendation was approved.**

**In addition:**

A Briefing Note from the Cabinet Advisory Panel (School Organisation), detailing their recommendations in respect of Wyken Croft School was circulated. A copy is attached for information.

**The Cabinet agreed with the recommendations proposed.**

**Report 10 Secondary SEN Broad Spectrum Schools: Consultation on the Revocation of Statutory Notices and Revised Proposals**

**Councillor Kershaw**

**Recommendations**

Cabinet is requested to approve the following recommendations:

1. Approve consultation in relation to the proposals to:
  - a) revoke the proposals relating to Alice Stevens, Baginton Fields and Sherbourne Fields determined by Cabinet on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2009; and
  - b) make a prescribed alteration to Alice Stevens School under Section 19(2) of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, to establish a new secondary broad-spectrum special school co-located with Ernesford Grange Secondary School;
2. Delegate authority to the Director of Children, Learning and Young People and Cabinet Member (Education) to agree any necessary consultation document (s);

3. Receive a further report on the outcome of the consultation on the proposals to revoke the statutory notices determined by Cabinet on March 10<sup>th</sup> 2009 and the revised proposals for Alice Stevens.

**The above recommendations were approved.**

## **#Report 11 Coventry Health and Well-Being Strategy**

**Councillors O'Boyle and Mrs Lucas**

### **Recommendations**

1. Cabinet are requested to recommend that the Council approve the Coventry Health and Well-Being Strategy attached as Appendix 1 of this report.

**The above recommendation was approved.**

## **Report 12 Discretionary Housing Payment Policy**

**Councillor Duggins**

### **Recommendations**

Cabinet is requested to:

- 1) Approve the Discretionary Housing Payment policy.
- 2) Approve the policy of restricting, where possible, Discretionary Housing Payment expenditure to the amount of the Government contribution

**The above recommendations were approved.**

**NOTE:** A copy of the Equality Impact Assessment was circulated to Members and is attached for information.

## **#Report 13 Coventry Housing & Homelessness Strategy 2013-18**

**Councillor Ruane**

### **Recommendations**

1. Cabinet are requested to support the Coventry Housing & Homeless Strategy 2013-18 and recommend that Council approve it at their meeting on 19<sup>th</sup> March 2013.

**The above recommendation was approved.**

## **Report 14 2013/14 Transportation and Maintenance Capital Programme**

**Councillors Harvard and McNichoas**

### **Recommendations**

1. Approve the 2013/14 capital programme of schemes for maintenance and integrated transport as detailed in table 3 below.
2. Approve the schemes designated 'A' for construction in 2013/14 as indicated in table 3, and delegate authority to the Cabinet Member for City Services and Transport, as appropriate, to approve the schemes not designated 'A', as indicated in table 3.

**The above recommendations were approved.**

## **Report 15 Coroner's District Amalgamation**

**Councillor Townshend**

### **Recommendations**

Cabinet is requested to confirm:-

1. To the Ministry of Justice that Coventry City Council has no objection to the amalgamation of the Coventry and Warwickshire Coroner's districts to form one Coroner's Area
2. That the new Coroners Area be known as the Coventry and Warwickshire Area

**The above recommendations were approved.**

## **#Report 16 Developing Coventry's international links**

**Councillor J Mutton**

### **Recommendations**

**Cabinet** is asked to agree the recommendations set out below.

- (1) International activity undertaken by the Council should continue to focus on three priorities:
  - Peace, reconciliation and supporting democracy
  - Economy, business and trade
  - Culture, education and community links
- (2) To pursue formal civic twinning arrangements between the city of Coventry and the Indian city of Jalandhar
- (3) To work with local businesses to explore the development of new international links with Brazil
- (4) To continue to recognise the value of community-led international links and initiatives, providing civic support to such activities when it is appropriate

**The above recommendations were approved.**

## **Report 17 Outstanding Issues**

The Cabinet are recommended to consider the list of outstanding items as set out below and to ask the Member of the Management Board concerned to explain the current position on those which should have been discharged at this meeting or an earlier meeting

**The above recommendation was approved.**

## **Report 18a Authority for Attendance at Conference**

### **Recommendations**

To give approval for the attendance of Councillors J Mutton and Harvard and the Assistant Director - Streetscene and Greenspace, at a visit to Kiel, Germany, organised by the Lord Mayor's Office of Kiel Town Hall to be held from 14<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup> March, 2013.

**The above recommendation was approved.**



---

**To**  
Cabinet

5<sup>th</sup> March 2013

**Subject**

Proposed Expansion and Increase in the Admission Number of Wyken Croft Primary School - Outcome of Consideration of Objections to the Proposal by the Cabinet Advisory Panel - School Organisation 27<sup>th</sup> February 2013

---

**1 Purpose of the Note**

- 1.1 To inform the Cabinet of the outcome of the meeting of the Cabinet Advisory Panel - School Organisation which took place on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2013, concerning the proposed expansion and increase in the admission number at Wyken Croft Primary School.

**2 Recommendations**

- 2.1 The Cabinet is requested to note that the Cabinet Advisory Panel - School Organisation supported the proposed expansion of this primary school. Three objections had been received opposing the expansion and the increase in the admission number following the publication of statutory notices on 17<sup>th</sup> January 2013. The Panel considered the issues indicated in paragraph 3 below.

**3 Information/Background**

- 3.1 The Panel considered the three written objections submitted against the Wyken Croft proposal. In addition the Panel listened to the case put by Local Authority officers, including the Head Teacher of Wyken Croft in support of the proposed expansion and an oral presentation from one of the three objectors. The main basis for the objections was concern over the impact on local residents over increased traffic on both Wyken Croft and the Walsgrave Road.
- 3.2 The Panel noted that the Education Funding Agency (EFA) have made it clear to the Local Authority that input from the Authority will be strictly limited and managed by the EFA, and that the Council is effectively being kept at arms length.

**RECOMMENDATIONS of the CABINET ADVISORY PANEL**

- 3.3 Having considered the 3 objections received, the Panel made the following three specific recommendations which they considered to be a sensible way forward, and which are intended to reduce possible future difficulties as the new build of Wyken Croft School passes through the formal planning processes:

1. Council officers be tasked with seeking to determine whether the EFA would be prepared to establish a forum to enable local residents to participate in the proposals in respect of Wyken Croft, specifically to enable them to contribute to finding possible solutions to traffic difficulties within the area of Wyken Croft.
2. Council officer's be tasked with exploring appropriate communication channels to ensure that local residents (specifically those in Wyken Avenue and Wyken Croft) who are most likely to be effected by the planned rebuild, are kept informed of the progress of the redevelopment plans should the proposals be approved by Cabinet.
3. Those responsible for managing and determining the planning process should be encouraged to be sensitive to the particular challenges that will be faced in terms of traffic flow, parking for both staff and parents, and inconvenience to residential neighbours given the proposed substantial increase in pupil numbers from 3 to 4 forms of entry, which to date is unprecedented in Coventry.

Ashley Simpson  
Capital Programme & Strategic Planning Manager  
Children, Learning and Young People Directorate  
Telephone No. 024 7683 1520

Elaine Atkins  
Solicitor  
Finance and Legal Service Directorate  
Telephone No.: 024 7683 1582

## Equality and Consultation Analysis Template

### Guidance for completion

- Equality analysis is a way of considering the effect on different groups protected from discrimination by the Equality Act 2010, during the Council's decision making processes.
- These 'protected groups' are those defined by race, age, gender, disability, sexual orientation, gender reassignment, religion or belief, pregnancy, maternity or breastfeeding.
- Please remember to consider children and young people as a specific group that you may need to consider the impact on, and engage with during this analysis.
- Equality analysis will help you consider whether the decision you want to take:
  - will have unintended consequences for some groups; and
  - if the service or policy will be fully effective for all target groups.
- The Council also has a statutory duty to consult.
- This equality and consultation analysis template will require you to demonstrate how equality information and the findings from consultation with protected groups and others, has been used to understand the actual or potential effect of your service or policy on the protected groups and to inform decisions taken.
- The template should summarise key issues arising from information that has been collected, analysed and included in other key documents e.g. Needs Analysis, Baseline Reports etc.
- This form should be completed on an ongoing basis at each stage of any formal decision making process. Failure to comply with this will put the Council (and specifically the elected member or officer making the decision) at risk of judicial review.
- For further help and support please contact Helen Shankster on 7683 4371 (consultation advice), Sheila Bates on 7683 1432 (CLYP consultation advice) or Jaspal Mann on 7683 3112 (equalities advice).

### Context

<b>Name of analysis</b>	Discretionary Housing Payment policy
<b>Officer completing analysis</b>	Barrie Strain
<b>Date</b>	15 February 2013

## **1. Briefly describe the area of work this analysis relates to:**

The Council's Revenues and Benefits division administers housing and council tax benefit (HB/CTB) to 40,000 Coventry households. When someone in receipt of HB/CTB requires further support to help with housing or council tax costs then they have recourse to apply for a discretionary housing payment (DHP). The discretionary scheme has been administered by Council's for more than ten years.

In April 2013 government funding for the DHP scheme in Coventry will increase by more than 140 per cent to a little under £800,000. This increase in funding is intended to enable Council's to help support those most severely impacted by changes to housing and council tax benefit.

The Council has taken this opportunity to review the DHP policy and due to the level of funding involved it is necessary for the policy to be approved by Cabinet.

The DHP policy is intended to contribute towards the following outcomes:

- alleviate poverty
- support vulnerable young people in the transition to adult life
- support people into employment and sustain people in employment
- tenancy sustainment and homelessness prevention
- keep families together
- support vulnerable residents in the local community
- support people through difficult life events.

## **Scoping the analysis**

### **2. Who are the key stakeholders, both existing and potential, that could be impacted by this work?**

DHPs are available to people in receipt of HB/CTB. The DHP scheme is, by definition, discretionary. Secondary legislation provides guidance in respect of who can claim a DHP but the decision to award a DHP, for what period an award is made and the level of an award are at the discretion of the LA.

The reviewed DHP policy, in tandem with a review of processes and procedures, is intended to help to ensure that decisions are consistent and objective. A separate procedures document for officers has been produced to supplement the DHP policy.

As DHPs are not benefit awards there is no formal right of appeal against decisions. The Council is required to review decisions where the customer is dissatisfied. Any requests for decisions to be reviewed are considered by a senior officer.

The authority does not hold data on the protected characteristics of DHP recipients and so HB/CTB data is used as proxy data. It is recognised that DHP recipients, by definition,

are vulnerable - they are people who require support above and beyond the support provided through HB/CTB - benefits which are available to those on a low income.

In addition to the benefit recipients, other stakeholders with an interest in the DHP policy include:

- Private and social landlords
- Advice agencies
- Support organisations
- Housing policy and services
- Community Services
- Scrutiny Board 5

**3. From the list above, which of these constitute protected groups?**

Due to the very nature of DHPs and associated socio-economic and demographic issues, people who access the service are more likely to be classed as vulnerable or having protected characteristics. The DHP scheme will therefore benefit:

- Low income households in receipt of benefits
- Low income working households
- Children in low income households
- Disabled people
- Families
- People from black and minority ethnic backgrounds
- Single parents
- People with caring responsibilities
- Women
- People approaching pension age
- Pensioners

**4. Which of the key stakeholders (including representatives of protected groups) will need to be kept informed, consulted or actively involved in this area of work?**

Key Stakeholder	Type of Involvement*	Method(s) used
Social landlords	Consultation/information	Ongoing meetings/seminars addressing numerous aspects of welfare reform, including how best to use the DHP budget
Housing Policy and Services	Involvement/information	Ongoing meetings to look at how the two service areas can work collaboratively to ensure DHP funds are channelled appropriately
Scrutiny Board 5	Consultation	SB5 and the welfare reform

		subgroup continue to provide oversight of the various facets of welfare reform including the application of DHPs
Advice agencies/third sector	Consultation/information	Ongoing meetings and stakeholder events

\* *Information, Consultation or Involvement*

**5. Which, if any, parts of the general equality duty is the service relevant to? Please mark with an 'X'.**

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation.**
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not.
- Foster good relations between people who share relevant protected characteristics and those who do not.

**6. What information is available to be used as part of this analysis?**

In 2011/12, 528 applications for DHPs were processed - 465 were awarded and 63 were unsuccessful.

Age

Age Group	% of working age claims
17 - 24	9.8
25 - 34	23.7
35 - 44	24.8
45 - 54	21.9
55 - 64	19.8

Anecdotal evidence suggests people of pension age are less likely to claim DHPs as their circumstances tend to be more settled. Pension age claimants constitute approximately 40 per cent (22,000) of the HB/CTB caseload.

People of pension age are largely protected from reductions in benefit arising from welfare reform and therefore demand on the DHP budget from pensioners is unlikely to increase significantly. The DHP budget is available to people of any age providing

housing benefit is in payment. The DHP policy is not expected to impact on people according to their age.

### Race

Percentage (and number) of neighbourhoods (Census output areas) in Coventry that are ethnically diverse		Council Tax Benefit claimants 2012 (% of working age population)		
		Below average		Above average
'Ethnic diversity' of the area (% of total population from a Black or Minority Ethnic background, 2001)	Below average	67% (450 areas)	33% (217 areas)	
	Above average	53% (166 areas)	47% (146 areas)	

The table above shows how the 979 small neighbourhoods in Coventry are divided by whether they have high Council Tax Benefit claimant rates and whether they are 'ethnically diverse areas'.

One third (33%) of less ethnically diverse areas have above average Council Tax Benefit claimant rates.

About half (47%) of more ethnically diverse areas have above average Council Tax Benefit claimant rates.

The correlation between an area's Council Tax Benefit claimant rate and its levels of ethnicity and diversity is strong.

Data shows that people living in areas of above average ethnic diversity have a slightly greater propensity to claim HB/CTB and are therefore more likely to access DHP funding.

Language and cultural barriers may impact on people from BME communities trying to access DHP funding and the revenues and benefit service will continue to provide translation facilities and written material in alternative languages.

### Disability

In the 2001 Census, 18.6% of all Coventry residents declared a limiting long term illness.

Approximately 2,667 (40 per cent) of non-passported cases have a household member who is disabled. A non-passported case is one in which the claimant or partner is not passported to full benefit on the grounds that they receive income-based job seekers allowance, income-based employment support allowance or income support.

Approximately 6,814 people of working age do not receive a passported benefit.

The CTB database does not currently record whether a passported household has a disabled member because the household automatically receives full benefit. It is

therefore difficult to provide accurate information on the number of working age households with a disabled member.

It is reasonable to conclude that the percentage of working age passported households with a disabled member would be as high if not higher than for non-passported cases. The DCLG EIA of localising CTS states that approximately 48 per cent of working age CTB claimants have a disabled household member.

Gender

Gender of claimant	% of working age claims
Female	58.1
Male	41.9

The table above relates to the gender of the claimant. It should be noted that the claimant may have a partner. In cases where the claimant is female, 15 per cent have a partner. In cases where the claimant is male, 33 per cent have a partner.

Children

% of total working age cases with children	46.5
% of working age cases where a child is present in the household who are lone parents	68.2
% of working age cases where a child is present in the household and one or more child/children are under 5	44.4

The government estimates that 45 per cent of children in poverty are in households that get no CTB, while a further 21 per cent are in households that receive only partial CTB

**7. What are the information gaps?**

Currently the DHP database does not record data about protected characteristics and therefore HB/CTB data has been used as a proxy. During 2013/14 enhancements will improve the level and depth of information available in respect of DHP claimants so that information about protected groups is more accessible.

This information will be monitored in 2013/14 and, if appropriate, the equality analysis will be updated.



## Data analysis

### **8. Please summarise below the key issues that your data is telling you.**

Many of the welfare changes coming into effect in April will detrimentally impact on protected groups and the Department for Work and Pensions has conducted equality analysis in relation to these changes.

People of pension age are exempt from many of the forthcoming changes and are likely to continue to place limited demand on DHP funds.

The DHP scheme can be used to mitigate the impact of some of the changes for some of the those most affected but the DHP scheme, and the operation of the DHP policy, will not determine who is impacted. This policy does not represent a material change to the nature of the current DHP scheme which has been in operation for several years and it is not expected that the formalisation of the DHP policy will adversely impact protected groups.

## Generating and evaluating options

### **9. What are the different options being proposed to stakeholders?**

No options have been presented to stakeholders.

### **10. How will the options impact on protected groups or those experiencing deprivation?**

Not applicable

### **11. Please detail how you could mitigate any negative impacts.**

This policy is not expected to have any negative impacts on service users.

**12. Identify which contractors or service users would be negatively affected by the options**

No service users have been identified as being negatively impacted by this policy.

### **Formal consultation**

**13. Who took part in the consultation? *Please also specify representatives of any protected groups.***

No formal consultation has been undertaken

**14. What were the key findings of the consultation?**

Not applicable

**15. Are there any gaps in the consultation?**

Not applicable

**16. Following the consultation, what additional equality issues have emerged?**

Not applicable

**17. Which of the options have changed following consultation and equality analysis, and how?**

Not applicable

### **Equality impact of final option**

**18. Please confirm below which option has been chosen for implementation.**

Not applicable

19. Please indicate which of the following best describes the equality impact of this analysis.

There will be **no equality impact** if the proposed option is implemented.

There will be **positive equality impact** if the proposed option is implemented.

There will be **negative equality impact** if the preferred option is implemented, but this can be objectively justified.  
*Please state clearly what this justification is and what steps will be taken to ameliorate the negative impact.*

20. What will be the impact on the workforce following implementation of the final option? *Please make reference to relevant equality groups (with protected characteristics under the Equality Act).*

The DHP scheme is currently administered within the revenues and benefits division by specific DHP officers. An additional post has been created to increase resilience and capacity as demand for DHPs is expected to increase significantly in 2013/14.

The implementation of the DHP policy has no overall impact on the workforce, or any protected groups within the workforce, as the policy is based on current working practices and procedures.

**Formal decision-making process**

Please detail below the committees, boards or panels that have considered this analysis

Name	Date	Chair	Decision taken

## Approval

This equality analysis has been completed by:

**Officer**

B. Strain

**Service Manager**

Tim Savill

**Note:** Failure to comply with duties on equalities and consultation will put the Council (and specifically the elected member or officer making the decision) at risk of judicial review

**Director**

**Elected Member**

**Date**

## Monitoring and review

*This section should be completed 6-12 months after implementation*

- a) Please summarise below the most up to date monitoring information for the newly implemented service, by reference to relevant protected groups.

[Click **here** and type]

- b) What have been the actual equality impacts on service users following implementation?

*Analyse current data relating to the service and think about the impact on key protected groups: race, sex, disability, age, sexual orientation, religion or belief, pregnancy or maternity, gender reassignment.*

It may help to answer the following questions: Since implementation

- Have there been any areas of low or high take-up by different groups of people?
- Has the newly implemented service affect different groups disproportionately?
- Is the new service disadvantaging people from a particular group?
- Is any part of the new service discriminating unlawfully?

[Click **here** and type]

**c) What have been the actual equality impacts on the workforce since implementation?**

[Click **here** and type]

**Equality Analysis and Consultation Template**  
July 2012 · Version 2.0.1

The latest version of this template can be found at:  
<http://beacon.coventry.gov.uk/equalityanddiversity/>  
*Please ensure you are using the latest version of the template.*

## Limitations on Call-in

A call-in will normally be regarded as appropriate **UNLESS**:-

1. it falls within paragraph 4.5.26 of the Scrutiny rules (part 4 of the Constitution) – ie. it relates to:
  - (i) a matter which is to be determined by the Council.
  - (ii) a decision of the Cabinet/Cabinet Member taken as a matter of urgency and the Chair of the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee (or his/her nominee) had been invited to attend the meeting where the urgent decision had been taken or the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee has previously agreed the need for urgency.
  - (iii) a decision made by an employee exercising delegated authority.
  - (iv) decisions of the Licensing and Regulatory Committee.
  - (v) decisions of the Planning Committee.
  - (vi) decisions of the Appeals and Appointments Panels.
  - (vii) decisions of the Audit Committee.
  - (viii) a matter where the associated report has already been considered by the Scrutiny Co-ordination Committee or a Scrutiny Board who have endorsed the recommendations or made recommendations that have been accepted by the Cabinet/Cabinet Member.
2. The call-in form is not completed correctly.
3. The call-in form is received after the specified time.
4. The reason for the call-in is unclear or does not relate directly to the decision specified on the call-in form.
5. The reason for the call-in is a question, the answer to which can be found in the report relating to the decision which is being called in.



**Customer and Workforce Services**  
Council House  
Earl Street  
COVENTRY CV1 5RR