

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**  
**HELD VIA REMOTE ACCESS**  
**AT 6:00 P.M., WEDNESDAY, 5 AUGUST, 2020**  
**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

Dudson, A. (Chairman)	
Witton, P.T. (Vice-Chairman)	
Adamson, G. (Leader)	Kraujalis, J.T.
Alcott, G.	Layton, A.
Allen, F.W.C.	Lyons, Miss O.
Bennett, C.	Martin, Mrs. C.E.
Boucker, A.S.	Mitchell, Mrs. C.
Buttery, M.S.	Molineux, G.N.
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Muckley, A.M.
Crabtree, S.K.	Newbury, J.A.A.
Davis, Mrs. M.A.	Pearson, A.R.
Dunnett, Ms. A.J.	Preece, J.P.T.L.
Fisher, P.A.	Smith, C.D.
Fitzgerald, Mrs. A.A.	Startin, P.D.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Stretton, Mrs. P.Z., M.B.E.
Hewitt, P.M.	Sutherland, M.
Hughes, R.J.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.
Johnson, J.P.	Thompson, Mrs. S.L.
Johnson, T.B.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Jones, B.	Wilkinson, Ms. C.L.
Jones, Mrs. V.	Woodhead, P.E.

***(Councillor P.T. Witton in the Chair due to Councillor A. Dudson not being present at the start of the meeting.)***

**18. Apologies**

None, although it was noted that Councillors Dudson and Stretton would be late joining the meeting due to technical difficulties.

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

<b>Member</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Type</b>
Woodhead, P.E.	<u>Agenda Item 12:</u> <u>New Pavement Licensing Scheme</u> Owner of café premises in Hednesford.	Disclosable Pecuniary

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

**20. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Annual Council meeting held on 24 June, 2020, be approved as a correct record.

**21. Questions Received from the Public under Council Procedure Rule 4B(c)**

(i) The following question was submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4B(c) by member of the public, Emma Hunneyball:

“Following news that the McArthur Glen shopping outlet has been delayed until 2021, what plans do the Council have to regenerate our town centres?”

Councillor G. Alcott, Deputy Leader of the Council and Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader, provided the following response:

“Cannock Town Centre

The Cannock Town Centre Development Prospectus was approved by Cabinet in July 2019 and launched at an event last October, which was well attended by developers, agents and potential investors. The document is publicly available from the Council's website. The Prospectus is primarily a tool for engaging with potential investors and aims to stimulate interest from the private sector in nine Council owned development sites. The ambition of the Council remains to regenerate Cannock Town Centre and create new opportunities for leisure, culture and residential to enhance the current offer. The Council is also currently investing £94,000 in a programme of environmental improvements.

Rugeley Town Centre

Aelfgar: The former Aelfgar school, consisting of 3.42 acres is in the ownership of Staffordshire County Council and together with the Council-owned former squash courts, form a housing development site of some 4.29 hectares. Staffordshire County Council have undertaken land remediation and placed the Aelfgar School site on the market. Cabinet on 30 January 2020 approved the purchase of the freehold interest in the site of the former Aelfgar School, Taylors Lane, Rugeley, for a housing development subject to planning consent being granted. This site will provide approximately 60 homes, of which 30 will be for market sale and 30 for new Council homes.

Rugeley Area Office: In February 2020 the official opening of the Rugeley Area

Office (which had recently relocated inside the market hall from Anson Street in Rugeley) took place. This investment by the Council not only refurbishes space, but was aimed at increasing footfall into the town centre and Rugeley Market Hall whilst providing a valuable local service.

#### Hednesford – Town Centre Regeneration Scheme

Not to be forgotten, the Council have previously undertaken significant regeneration in Hednesford (only a few years ago) which has transformed the town centre. It should be noted that the town centre is in relatively good health given the current economic climate. Furthermore, Cannock Chase Council received a grant of more than £2 million from the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) and the Big Lottery Fund (BIG) for a major transformation of Hednesford Park in 2012. The Council's second-round bid for £2.273 million of funding from the 'Parks for People' programme has been successful and the project delivered some exciting improvements for Hednesford Park.

#### Hednesford – Queens Award

Friends of Hednesford Park had been awarded the prestigious 'Queen's Award for Voluntary Service'. The award was the highest that could be given to volunteer groups across the UK, with a total of 230 organisations receiving the award this year. The award recognised the tremendous hard work and dedication put in by the volunteers who worked tirelessly to support the local community.

The Council is also working with the Greater Birmingham & Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) to promote a new initiative called 'ShopAppy' which is an online shop window where customers can browse, buy and collect or arrange home delivery and is now available in over 100 areas in the UK.

It is offering 12 months free subscription for all independent retailers in Cannock Chase District. We are therefore asking local retailers to get involved in this particular initiative and help make this a success through its primary objective of encouraging residents to shop local. We hope by supporting ShopAppy it will help boost sales for the independent retailers in our towns. Officers will be handing out a leaflet to retailers over the next couple of weeks which will show them how they can sign up and take advantage of the initiative.

In conclusion, the Council continues to support all of its town centres and it is worth noting that over the last couple of weeks, Officers have been working to support local traders/businesses to safely re-open in line with the Government's Covid-19 secure guidelines and we have seen many businesses re-open successfully and the re-introduction of street markets into Cannock and Rugeley."

Cannock Chase Council has scooped six green flag awards and has retained its top performing District Council status in the West Midlands. Green Flag Award winners were revealed July 2019 nationwide, and Cannock Park, Elmore Park, Ravenhill Park, Castle Ring, Stile Cop Cemetery and Hednesford Park are among the record breaking 1,970 UK parks and green spaces and 131 in thirteen other countries around the world.

This international award is a sign to the public that the space boasts the highest possible environmental standards, is beautifully maintained and has excellent visitor facilities.

Public thanks to all staff for work during this period to bring town backs and

regenerate towns and bring public back in.

Emma Hunneyball asked the following supplementary question:

“How does an online app contribute to increasing footfall into town centres?”

The Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader provided the following response to the supplementary question:

“The ShopAppy app was only just being introduced. By providing an online shop window to local businesses, customers could browse for goods. While they *could* purchase online and arrange for delivery, it was hoped that they would take the time to visit the business to collect their goods and also look at other businesses.

ShopAppy was seen as a local alternative to remote online shopping, which would encourage local spending and support local retailers and independent traders across Cannock Chase.”

- (ii) The following question was submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4B(c) by member of the public, Bob Eccleston:

“What is the Council’s Policy on dogs fouling our footpaths?”

Councillor J.A.A. Newbury, Environment and Climate Change Portfolio Leader, provided the following response:

“This Council is clear in its position that dog fouling is an environmental crime and we treat it as such. In order to do that, council has an Environmental Enforcement Policy which tackles many types of environmental crime including pest control, noise pollution, air pollution, fly-tipping, littering, graffiti and dog fouling. This policy seeks to deal with those issues in a fair, consistent and proportional manner.

In terms of acting against dog fouling specifically, the Council introduced a Public Space Protection Order in 2018 when the previous Dog Control Orders expired. This Order can be viewed on the council’s website. It states it is offence for someone in control of dog to not pick up its waste and to dispose of it appropriately; this applies to any dog fouling in all public places, including footpaths.

Officers in the Council’s Environmental Protection team routinely patrol the district and if they encounter dog fouling, action is taken against individuals responsible. Under the Environmental Enforcement Policy, this would initially take the form of Fixed Penalty Notice. If a Notice remains unpaid, the case is referred to the Council’s Legal Service with a view to bringing a prosecution in the Magistrates Court. All successful convictions are made public in press releases from the council which highlight the consequences of failing to pick up after your dog.

In addition to patrols, officers also put up ‘no fouling’ signs in problem areas where we have received many reports; around 500 of these have been put up in the last 12 months. Cards are also delivered to homes around the worst affected areas; more than 500 of those have been distributed in the past 12 months. Environmental Protection officers also give talks in local schools to raise awareness amongst young people of the issues surrounding dog fouling and other environmental crimes.

Any reported instances of dog fouling are passed on to the council’s Cleansing Service who will clear up mess as soon as practically possible. Council officers rely on the public to assist with efforts to tackle dog fouling by reporting instances and

regular offenders. It is particularly helpful if resident can pinpoint details of regular offenders, for example where they typically walk their dog and at what time.

If Mr Eccleston had concerns about a particular area then Officers could be asked to look at targeted action such as additional patrols and warning signs.”

Bob Eccleston asked the following supplementary question:

“Is it the case that we would need to provide video or photographic evidence for enforcement action to be taken? (Concerned about doing so in small community like Bridgtown. Is it really this something they need to be doing?)”

The Environment and Climate Change Portfolio Leader provided the following response to the supplementary question:

“Officers would say that they are unable to take enforcement action without evidence to support a prosecution. Unless Officers see an offence for themselves, the best they can hope for is supporting photographic or video evidence. If there are a few spots where offences regularly occurred, then Officers could target those areas and would welcome any support the community might offer to alleviate the problem.”

**(iii)** The following question was submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4B(c) by member of the public, Bob Eccleston:

“As a resident of Bridgtown for 35 years, I was under the impression that we had plain rules stating that businesses could trade between the hours of 7am till 7pm Monday to Friday, and 8am to 1pm on a Saturday. These times were negotiated with the then BRAG (Bridgtown Residents Action Group). There was exceptions to this rule, those being shops and pubs. Can you tell me when these rules were lifted?”

Councillor Mrs. C.E. Martin, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader, provided the following response:

“I have consulted with the relevant Officers from Licensing and Planning and there is no evidence of any local rules stipulating restrictions on opening hours for businesses in Bridgtown and no evidence of opening hours being negotiated with a local residents group. If Mr Eccleston has any further information relating to his questions, then I am happy to look into this further with the relevant Officers.”

Bob Eccleston asked the following supplementary question:

“Who is in support of Bridgtown residents if the Council is backing companies to get out of this current position?”

The Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader provided the following response to the supplementary question:

“No further information was available to give at this stage, but if Mr Eccleston wanted to contact me then I could look to find out further information about this matter.”

- (iv) The following question was submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 4B(c) by member of the public, Stuart Haynes:

“As Cannock Chase District Council is a member of the SAC Partnership and party to the commissioning of ‘The Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) Access Management and Monitoring Measures Detailed Implementation Plan: Car Parking’, can the Cabinet member confirm the view of the administration in respect to the report and confirm the full details of the oversight, governance and accountability arrangements for the SAC Partnership?”

*(Councillors A. Dudson and Mrs P.Z. Stretton joined the meeting at this point.)*

Councillor J.A.A. Newbury, Environment and Climate Change Portfolio Leader, provided the following response:

“The Special Area of Conservation Partnership is overseen by a Joint Strategic Board comprised of one senior officer, or their representative, from each of the competent authorities within the area covered by the SAC. Those competent authorities include this council, neighbouring districts and boroughs, Staffordshire County Council, Wolverhampton City Council, Natural England, Forestry England, the Staffordshire Wildlife Trust, the National Trust, RSPB and the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty. Ultimately, Council representatives on the Joint Strategy Board are accountable to elected members, as are all representatives on the many outside bodies this Council is involved with.

The SAC covers several separate pockets of land within the Cannock Chase AONB, not the AONB as a whole. The Joint Strategic Board oversees the development, implementation and monitoring of the Strategic Access Management and Monitoring measures and agrees an annual work programme. It also reviews an annual report on the collection, management and spending of the mandatory funding for the SAC from new developments.

The Joint Strategic Board is advised by a Project Group who co-ordinate the delivery of plans, the accumulation of funds and other additional work as needed to ensure compliance with Habitat Regulations by implementing mitigation measures. Members of that Project Group include appropriate officers of the competent authorities and, by invitation, officers or technical/professional representatives from stakeholder organisations involved with SAC. The SAC Partnership’s roles and responsibilities are set out within a memorandum of understanding agreed by this Council’s Cabinet in November 2014.

Regarding the ‘Detailed Implementation Plan on Car Parking’ referred to in Mr Haynes’ question, from Cannock Chase District Council’s perspective, the report is intended to eventually form part of a 15-year plan to enable all organisations involved in SAC Partnership to meet their legal duty to protect and enhance this Special Area of Conservation and ensure any impact from future developments is mitigated or avoided altogether.

Cannock Chase is often thought about primarily as woodland, but much of it is comprised of lowland heath. This is one of the rarest habitats in the world; Britain is lucky to have around a fifth of the remaining lowland heath in the world but we have lost around 80% of it since the Industrial Revolution. Much of Cannock Chase’s lowland heath continues to be eroded today.

It was noted in the AONB's 2018 State of Cannock Chase report that a number of studies carried out on behalf of the SAC and AONB noted the likely impact of increased visitor numbers, particularly damage to plant communities as result of increased traffic emissions. Cannock Chase is a beautiful place to visit and many travel a long way to do just that. Most visitors to the Chase would agree that preserving and enhancing its natural wealth should be our first priority, even before visitor enjoyment. That is the basis of these options put together by the SAC Partnership.

This report is not the final stage of the conservation proposals; it is a set of options and principles for mitigating damage to the SAC. They are far from being set in stone. The SAC Partnership recently lost a key member of staff so their replacement will need to be recruited and trained sufficiently. There will be plenty of opportunity for public to comment on these proposals in the future; this was always intended as Officers from this Council have estimated it could be well over a year before any concrete, detailed plans come forward. The Cabinet member and Officers will ensure that the public are informed of any and all opportunities to feed in in coming months and years.

Money for any car park works would be funded by developer contributions, not taxpayers, and only an estimated £437,000 of the total £7.8 million pot of money that has been reported by the media has been tentatively earmarked for car parking changes.

No part of the Chase would be blocked off. There is a need to protect the parts of the SAC most sensitive to damage by human activity by encouraging visitors to visit more robust areas less susceptible to damage. Currently, lay-bys and car parks are disproportionately distributed around the edge of the SAC which is exacerbating this issue.

This Council might be named after Cannock Chase, but we are not a landowner in the SAC area. Staffordshire County Council has made these proposals on land which it owns, land which forms the largest part of the SAC.

This plan is the first time that the patchwork of relevant organisations involved with the SAC have come together to work on a joint strategy. This is preferable to the piecemeal changes which have happened in the past, such as car parking charges being introduced at Forestry England's site at Marquis Drive. Changes can now be discussed more openly and with public consultation which this Council is committed to supporting. A holistic approach to conserving the SAC means regular users can be safeguarded more effectively than each landowner acting in isolation.

There will be further consultation on more detailed proposals once they are developed but as indicated it is likely to be some time before these come forward and there is no firm timescale for that due to recent staff changes. Council officers involved with the SAC are duty bound by the Cabinet resolution of 2014 to keep Council informed at all stages of this process.

To conclude, this Council is waiting for firm proposals from the County Council and SAC Partnership before taking a final view but we are supportive of measures to protect the SAC, as required by our statutory obligations.

I am open to hearing and discussing other ideas and proposals from residents as long as they deliver the conservation outcomes needed, namely that visitors are

encouraged to visit areas other than the most vulnerable parts of the SAC.”

Stuart Haynes then asked the following supplementary question:

“How will Councillors ensure residents have the chance to respond on this report and further consultation plans, as plans have been hidden before now?”

The Environment and Climate Change Portfolio Leader provided the following response to the supplementary question:

“I understand the concerns raised over the number of responses to the consultation. The SAC probably needed to do more work on making sure relevant documents are in place, but I will speak to Officers as we want people to understand and feed into the process and put their own thoughts into the mix as much as possible. Nothing was due to take place consultation wise in the immediate future, but there was no reason why conversations can't still take place and aim to be as transparent as possible.”

Stuart Haynes then asked that a resident representative be appointed to the SAC Partnership and Committee.

***(Councillor Dudson in Chair)***

## **22. Chairman's Announcements and Correspondence**

### **(i) Chairman's Charity 2020/21**

The Chairman advised Members that the charity he had chosen to support during his term of office was 'Liberty Staffordshire'.

Liberty Staffordshire assisted young people and young adults with physical or learning difficulties by offering social and emotional development opportunities in and around Staffordshire. The organisation was founded in 2015 and became a registered charity in 2019.

The Chairman noted that the work Liberty did in and around the local area was outstanding, and he looked forward to raising as much money as possible to donate to the charity.

## **23. Leader's Announcements and Correspondence**

### **(i) NHS Shielding**

“The programme for the extremely clinically vulnerable has now paused as at 1 August 2020.

Once again, I would like to thank all of those in our communities who helped the vulnerable during lockdown, from the NHS to the Police, shop workers, Council staff, other key workers and many others, including our wonderful volunteers. As a trustee of the Chase Coronavirus Support Network I saw how well all of these different organisations, both voluntary and statutory, worked together for the benefit of the most vulnerable. It made me extremely proud that Cannock Chase had such a wonderful response to the lockdown. I am sure that there would have been even more deaths in our District if it had not been for this tremendous combined effort.”



(ii) Test and Trace

“As Members will know there is a Staffordshire-wide Test and Trace system to identify Covid-19 positive individuals and their contacts and to ensure that the relevant self-isolation requirements are adhered to. This is led by the Director of Public Health.

There have been a higher number than expected cases in parts of Burton and an outbreak linked to a pub in Stone.

Our Council Officers are working closely with the County Council, Public Health England, the Regional Convenor and other district and borough councils. Thankfully, there are no significant issues of concern to report to date in relation to Cannock Chase District.”

(iii) Devolution and Local Government White Paper

“The Government will issue in the autumn a white paper for consultation about its plans for expanding devolution, creating more elected mayors in England, and giving them and existing mayors more powers, and for the creation of more unitary authorities.

While we welcome the potential devolution of powers away from Whitehall, it does seem a strange time, in the middle of a pandemic and the worst economic recession in 300 years, to talk of local government reorganisation which will detract from all councils’ ability to respond to the crisis that we are in.

It is widely agreed that local government has responded extremely well to the unprecedented situation that we have found ourselves in. No doubt we can look forward to discussions with our neighbouring authorities about this issue.”

**24. Questions Received under Council Procedure Rule 8**

No Questions were received.

**25. Recommendations Referred from Cabinet, Committees etc.**

Consideration was given to the following recommendation to Council agreed by Cabinet at its meeting held on 16 July, 2020, in respect of:

Priority Delivery Plans – Outturn for 2019/20 and Revisions for 2020/21 (Draft Minute No. 6)

“That Council, at its meeting to be held on 5 August 2020, be recommended to approve the revised Priority Delivery Plans for 2020/21, as detailed in Appendices 3a to 3d of the 16 July 2020 Cabinet report.”

An amendment was moved by Councillor P.E. Woodhead, and seconded by Councillor A.M. Muckley that the matter be referred back to Cabinet for reconsideration.

A vote was taken on the amendment and not carried.

A vote was then taken on the substantive motion.

RESOLVED:

That the revised Priority Delivery Plans for 2020/21, as detailed in Appendices 3a to 3d of the 16 July 2020 Cabinet report, be approved.

**26. Motions Received under Council Procedure Rule 6**

- (i) Consideration was given to the following Motion, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 6, by Councillor P.D. Startin, Deputy Leader of the Opposition:

“The Covid-19 pandemic continues to have a profound impact in our local communities, this impact is not only on health, it is also socially and economically damaging. The repercussions may be felt for a long time.

The sheer nature of a public health pandemic means much of the recovery is beyond our control. However, we can have a positive influence over our town centres. They are the responsibility of this Council.

I propose a review be undertaken in respect of car parking charges and, whilst that review takes place, a parking charge holiday of 3 months. This would increase footfall and help to attract people back into our local towns. It would show traders that we are on their side and it would encourage people to visit the markets, go for a coffee, have lunch and help the shops that are in desperate need of customers. It would encourage residents to shop locally.

It is noted that the Council is under a heavy financial burden, but that burden will be significantly worse if we fail to support the local shops, cafes and pubs across the District. It is our duty to help them to weather the storm and provide a supportive boost.

Not only would this support local businesses, it would also help residents who have been financially affected by the crisis. It would encourage people to safely adjust to this new way of life, helping to provide some sense of normality, improve mental wellbeing and increase social engagement whilst taking the necessary social distancing precautions.

Therefore, we move that as a matter of urgency that Cabinet reviews car parking charges and implements a holiday period whilst this review takes place. I hope this Council will help to better facilitate use of our town centres by supporting this motion and help the various and numerous traders in recovery from this horrendous situation.”

The matter was put to the vote.

The vote was tied and the Chairman used his casting vote.

RESOLVED:

The Motion was not upheld.

- (ii) Consideration was given to the following Motion, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 6, by Councillor Mrs. C.E. Martin, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader:

“The Managing Director writes to Staffordshire County Council asking that they consider a three month amnesty (i.e. waiving all charges) on disposal of trade waste at the recycling centres.

This will encourage the use of the sites and discourage illegal fly-tipping. This period will also allow for information to be gathered re: businesses that need to dispose of trade waste and the data used for analysis in later investigations in concert with the Environment Agency and Environmental Health, should the problems start to re-occur.

Businesses could also be approached as to their views. For example, are the charges too high or the opening hours not long enough, is there a presumption that the illegal fly-tipping is a concomitant factor to illegal trade waste services anyway?”

The matter was put to the vote.

The vote was tied and the Chairman used his casting vote.

RESOLVED:

That the Managing Director writes to Staffordshire County Council asking that they consider a three month amnesty (i.e. waiving all charges) on disposal of trade waste at the recycling centres.

*Break at 20:15 (connection for Councillor P.A. Fisher was lost at this point)*

*Meeting resumed 20:25*

**27. Comments and Questions on Part 1 Minutes of Cabinet, Committees, Sub-Committees and Panels under Rule 9**

- (i) The following Question on Part 1 Minutes was submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 by Councillor P.E. Woodhead, Leader of the Chase Independents & Green Group:

Cabinet, 18 June 2020: Review of Leisure Concessions to Serving Members of the Armed Forces 202/21 (Minute No. 150)

“Could the Portfolio Leader please update Members any progress being made to look at extending the scheme supporting Leisure Concessions to Serving Members of the Armed Forces to Women Born in the 1950’s and subject to the impact of pension inequality further to the request by the so called WASPI women to the Leader and copied to myself in November of 2019?”

Councillor Mrs. C. Mitchell, Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader, provided the following response:

“Both Officers and myself have been in dialogue with the Council’s Leisure provider, Inspiring Healthy Lifestyles (IHL), in an attempt to find the most appropriate solution to this matter, but as I am sure you can appreciate this is not quite as simple as it first seems. In respect of age, the qualifying criterion for the Council’s Concessions Card Scheme uses the Government’s determination of pensionable age, which by

definition is different for men and women.

In order for the Council to consider a change to its current criteria and policy it needs to understand the overall impact on the extent of concessions that the Council could offer to different groups of people, and the financial implications of the various options.

Any such policy change would need to be considered and approved by Members, the full costs of which would have to be met by the Council.

I am still currently awaiting IHL's assessment of the financial implications, for which the Council would have to meet, but as I am sure you can appreciate both Council officers and Inspiring Healthy Lifestyles have had more immediate problems to deal with since the temporary closure of all culture and leisure facilities on 20 March 2020.

I am sure Councillor Woodhead and all Members would appreciate that at this time, as Government restrictions ease, our primary focus should be aimed at ensuring our culture and leisure facilities re-open safely and even more importantly that they are robust and financially sustainable going forward.

Clearly it is to everyone's benefit to ensure our Leisure partner is able to survive this period of closure and is supported to return to the previous levels of operation as soon as possible after they re-open.

Councils also are experiencing extreme additional financial pressures so to commit to introducing further concessions at this stage without knowing the full impact on the Council or our Leisure provider does not seem sensible. It would seem more prudent and practical and, as already explained to Councillor Woodhead, to review all current leisure concessions offered by the Council as part of future contract discussions with the Inspiring Healthy Lifestyles, but only after robust and sustainable financial recovery plans are in place for our Leisure provider.

I am pleased to report that Chase Leisure Centre re-opened for dry side activities on 25th July and on this Saturday, dry side activities re-commenced at Rugeley Leisure Centre and the swimming pool re-opened at Chase."

Councillor P.E. Woodhead asked the following supplementary question:

Can I seek assurance this would form part of the contract negotiations with IHL, and if not, could the matter come to Council to decide if it wished to continue to support WASPI women in any way we could?

The Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader provided the following response to the supplementary question:

"It was frustrating that we haven't got any further forward on this matter, but it had to be appreciated it was not an easy task to find out who was affected by the policy age wise, as well as understanding the financial impact. The Council was however almost there with the introduction of a similar scheme for looked after children in the District. The issue was raised with us in November 2019, and we in turn raised it with IHL as soon as we could (December 2019 / January 2020). I assure Councillor Woodhead that if there was anything we can do to help all WASPI women and pensioners and generally, we would do it. As a Council we want everyone to be able to use the facilities, but this did come at a cost."

- (ii) The following Question on Part 1 Minutes was submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9 by Councillor P.E. Woodhead, Leader of the Chase Independents & Green Group:

Cabinet, 16 July 2020: Updates from Portfolio Leaders (Draft Minute No. 3)

“The Cabinet member gives an update regarding the Cannock Town Centre Environmental Improvements (page 6 of the Cabinet meeting 16/7/20 minutes) where work is progressing on work involved yet the Priority Delivery Plan proposals for 2020/21 in the same Cabinet meeting (item reference 5.33 of the Cabinet meeting 16/7/20 agenda papers) and brought to this meeting as a recommendation state that “Timescales for this work will slip and will be considered as part of the Economic Recovery work planning”. Please can the Cabinet member confirm which is the correct statement?”

Councillor G. Alcott, Deputy Leader of the Council and Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader, provided the following response:

“In February 2020, Cabinet considered and approved a Permission to Spend report for the Environmental Improvements scheme for Cannock town centre. The total cost of the scheme was £94,000 and this is being funded from an earmarked reserve. Members will recall that this is a one-off investment which is designed to brighten up the town centre before the McArthurGlen Designer Outlet West Midlands opens in early 2021. The scheme is comprised of a number of elements including:

- £1,500 – updating display cabinets in and around the town centre with new updated maps and promotional material;
- £31,000 – comprehensive painting scheme, primarily in the core town centre, to include welcome signs and all street furniture;
- £8,500 – new graffiti art scheme on roller shutter doors for Council owned empty units;
- £53,000 – improvements to the exterior façade and appearance of the Prince of Wales Theatre given its dated aesthetic appearance – subject to the outcome of a survey of the exterior of the building to make sure the structure is suitable for these improvements. If not feasible for any reason then an alternative option would be brought back to Members for further consideration.

Cabinet agreed that delegated authority should be given to the Head of Economic Prosperity to implement the proposed works including procurement of contractors in consultation with the Town Centre Regeneration and Economic Development & Planning Portfolio Leaders.

The revised Priority Delivery Plan for 2020/21 does say that timescales for the project have slipped and that the schemes within the project will be reviewed on an individual basis and that certain environmental improvements for Cannock Town Centre could progress subject to work being in compliance with social distancing measures.

All elements of the environmental improvements for Cannock Town Centre that can be implemented will be during 2020/21 as originally planned. This includes the improvements to the roller shutter doors and improvements to the street furniture in the town centre. However, improvements to the Prince of Wales Theatre are likely

to be the subject of further reporting and will be dependent on the outcome of the survey.”

Councillor P.E. Woodhead asked the following supplementary question:

“If we were saying with the Priority Delivery Plans that we wanted to pause some things whilst we considered what could be delivered, was it not appropriate to consider pausing work on this matter until the Recovery Overview Board had had a chance to consider all available options?”

The Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader provided the following response to the supplementary question:

“I do not intend to delay any of this work whatsoever. The matter had gone through Council, Cabinet and public consultation, and needed to be done to improve Cannock town centre, improve quality of life for the traders and bring shoppers back in. If the proposed work on the Prince of Wales theatre couldn’t take place then alternatives uses for that money would be found.”

## **28. Constitution Amendments**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Monitoring Officer (Item 11.1 – 11.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the proposed amendments to the Constitution, as detailed in Appendix 1 of the report, be approved.

## **29. New Pavement Licensing Scheme**

*(Councillor P.E. Woodhead left the meeting at the start of this item having declared a pecuniary interest in it, and did not return.)*

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Prosperity (Item 12.1 – 12.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Councillor Martin moved that the setting of a fee for granting of Pavement Licences be waived.

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) All the functions, powers and duties contained within the Business and Planning Act 2020, in respect of pavement licences, be delegated to the Head of Economic Prosperity.
- (B) The Head of Economic Prosperity be given delegated authority to determine applications for licences under this legislation, including the duration of licences and any conditions attached.
- (C) The Head of Economic Prosperity can delegate the power to determine applications for licences under this legislation to other appropriate Officers who had suitable knowledge, qualifications and experience of licensing regimes.
- (D) The Head of Economic Prosperity be authorised to produce policies and

procedures for the issuing of Pavement Licences.

(E) The setting of a fee for the granting of a Pavement Licence be waived.

**30. Comments and Questions on Part 2 Minutes of Cabinet, Committees, Sub-Committees and Panels under Rule 9**

No comments or questions on Part 2 Minutes had been submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.

The meeting closed at 9:00 p.m.

---

CHAIRMAN