

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET

HELD ON THURSDAY, 20 OCTOBER, 2016 AT 4:00 P.M.

IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors:

Adamson, G.	Leader of the Council
Alcott, G.	Deputy Leader of the Council and Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader
Kraujalis, J.T.	Corporate Improvement Portfolio Leader
Bennett, C.	Crime and Partnerships Portfolio Leader
Mitchell, Mrs. C.	Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader
Preece, J.P.T.L.	Environment Portfolio Leader
Davis, Mrs. M.A.	Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader
Allen, F.W.C.	Housing Portfolio Leader
Todd, Mrs. D.M.	Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader

54. Apologies

None.

55. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restriction on Voting by Members

No other Declarations of Interest were made in addition to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members' Interests.

56. Updates from Portfolio Leaders

Leader

Boundary Commission Initial Proposals for New Parliamentary Constituencies

The Leader advised that the Boundary Commission had published (on 13 September, 2016) initial proposals for new constituencies in England. No changes were recommended in respect of the Cannock Chase constituency and the Leader would write to the Commission to confirm that the Council was in support of the proposal.

Members of the public could give the Commission their views on the proposals during the 12 week consultation period, either via the Commission's consultation

website or in person at public hearings being held in every region.

Crime and Partnerships

Staffordshire Police Chief Constable

The Portfolio Leader advised that Staffordshire's Chief Constable, Jane Sawyers, had announced plans to retire in the summer of 2017, following over 32 years with Staffordshire Police. Members agreed that a letter should be sent to the Chief Constable offering the Council's best wishes for the future.

Housing

Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) Unlocking Housing Sites Programme

The Portfolio Leader advised that the Council had a development programme to build 25 new Council Houses on 5 garage sites with its Development Partner, Novus Property Solutions. To enable the programme to be extended to 39 units on 11 sites, a bid for funding was made to the GBSLEP Unlocking Housing Sites Programme. The request for £17,900 per unit was rejected and an offer of £15,000 per unit had been received. Although this was £113,000 less than requested, and excluded any administration fees charged by the GBSLEP, it was anticipated that this could be met through additional Revenue Contributions to Capital (RCCO) within the Housing Revenue Account.

It was expected that the GBSLEP would make a formal offer to the Council outlining the funding conditions and a further report would then be presented to Cabinet.

57. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 22 September, 2016

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 September, 2016, be approved as a correct record and signed.

58. Forward Plan

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period October to December, 2016 (Item 5.1 – 5.2 of the Official Minutes of the Council) was considered.

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period October to December, 2016 be noted.

59. Recommendations of Scrutiny Committees

None received.

60. Housing Services 2015-16 Annual Report

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 7.1 – 7.30 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

(A) The draft 2015-16 Housing Services Annual Report (attached to the report

as Appendix 1) be agreed for circulation to all the Council's tenants.

- (B) If required, the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, be authorised to make amendments to the draft 2015-16 Housing Services Annual Report prior to circulation.

Reasons for Decisions

The Council was required to publish the 2015-16 Annual Housing Report as set out in the Regulatory Standards by the Homes and Communities Agency.

The Annual Report was required to be circulated to all tenants and this would be achieved as part of the autumn edition of Hometalk.

The draft Annual Report was attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

61. Public Spaces Protection Order (Gating) Consultation

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 8.1 – 8.18 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That formal consultation be commenced in accordance with Section 72 of the Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 on the draft Public Spaces Protection Order, with consultation to run between 17 November, 2016, and 29 December, 2016.

Reasons for Decision

The Anti-Social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014 (the Act), provided that existing Gating Orders made under Section 129A of the Highways Act 1980 would expire in three years from the date the Act came into force, namely 21 October, 2017. The power to make new Gating Orders was also repealed by the Act with effect from 20 October, 2014.

Section 59 of the Act provided local authorities with powers to make Public Spaces Protection Orders (PSPOs). These orders were intended to address activities carried out in public spaces which were considered to be of an antisocial nature. They may be used by councils to maintain and/or extend the requirements of Orders scheduled to expire.

The PSPO would identify a particular public place and either prohibit specified activities/behaviour or require specified actions/steps to be taken. The measures would impose similar restrictions and requirements to those which could be created under Gating Orders and were designed to make public spaces more welcoming to the majority.

A local authority could make a PSPO if it was reasonably satisfied that a number of conditions were met, namely that:

- the activities carried out in a public place within the authority's area had had a detrimental effect on the quality of life of those in the locality or that it was likely that activities carried out would have such an effect.;
- the effect or likely effect of the activities was, or was likely to be of a persistent or continuing nature;

- the activities were or were likely to be unreasonable, and;
- the impact of the activity justified the restrictions imposed by the Order.

By virtue of Section 72 of the Act, before introducing a PSPO the Council was obliged to carry out consultation with the chief officer of police, the local policing body, community representatives and owners/occupiers of land covered within the Order. The consultation would be publicised widely through the Council's website, Twitter, Facebook, via press releases to local media, e-mailing parish/town councils and community groups and leaving copies for public perusal in libraries and Council offices. In addition, the Council would publish in a local newspaper which covered the whole district a notice of its intention to make a PSPO.

It was intended that the consultation would be open for approximately 6 weeks and once responses to the consultation were collated, the Order could be amended and the final proposals put before Cabinet for approval.

62. Heritage Trail Bridge Rebuild, Rising Brook. Rugeley – Application for Permission to Spend

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Development (Item 9.1 – 9.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That permission to spend £83,000 toward the reinstatement of the Cannock Heritage Trail Bridge over the Rising Brook, Rugeley, be granted.

Reasons for Decision

In 2012 the bridge which spanned the Rising Brook collapsed. The bridge formed part of the Chase Heritage Trail forcing this part of the trail to be closed and temporarily diverted over County Council land.

The bridge was made safe in 2012 by propping up the structure using rock armour boulders as a temporary measure. At that time the Rugeley Flood Alleviation Scheme (FAS) had not been approved or fully designed. The decision was taken not to carry out any permanent repairs as the design of the FAS could have had major implications on the bridge in its current location.

Now that the FAS had been fully designed and approved by the Environment Agency and was now progressing through the submission of a planning application, there was a need to undertake the reinstatement of the bridge. It was critical that the reinstatement of the bridge be completed as access for any works of that nature would be impossible once the FAS was in place.

The meeting closed at 4:20 p.m.

LEADER