

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**CABINET**  
**HELD ON THURSDAY, 17 JULY, 2014 AT 4:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

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

**1. Apologies**

Apologies had been submitted by S. Brown, Chief Executive.

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

Councillor A. Lovell advised that he was employed by an artificial turf pitch (ATP) manufacturer. No other Declarations of Interests were made in addition to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members' Interests.

**3. Updates from Portfolio Leaders**

**Economic Development and Planning**

Local Growth Deal Announcements

The Portfolio Leader advised that the Growth Deals between Government and each of the 39 Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEP's), were announced on 7 July, 2014. These aimed to focus on local economic priorities, driving growth and creating jobs.

Cannock Chase Council had bid into both the Greater Birmingham and Solihull

LEP (GBSLEP) and the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent LEP (SSLEP) for projects aimed at unlocking growth opportunities in the District.

GBSLEP had secured £357.4m to fund 34 projects across the LEP to capitalise on the HS2 related opportunities and also to focus on key sectors such as advanced manufacturing and life sciences. By 2021, this Deal was intended to deliver 13,000 jobs, 4,000 homes, and upskill 7,633 people.

Within this, Cannock Chase Council, working with Pentalver, received approval of £1.3m capital for providing a new rail/freight interchange to help the company grow its business and create jobs and investment.

The Council had also received an invitation to discuss with Government a further raising of the Council's HRA borrowing limit to help deliver an additional 30 affordable housing units on 3 sites across the district.

The District also expected to benefit from:

- £625K revenue funding to establish a Growth Hub to provide support to businesses across the LEP looking to grow.
- £6m provided to unblock small housing sites as 80% of the District's identified housing plots (more than 3,000 units) had been available for development for three or more years.

SSLEP had secured total funding of £82.2m to fund 34 projects across the LEP aiming to open up employment sites; improve connectivity and ease congestion and support business sector growth and a skilled workforce. By 2021, this Deal would deliver at least 5,000 jobs and 1,000 homes.

No specific Cannock Chase projects had been approved, but the District hoped to benefit from:

- £250K revenue to develop the Stoke on Trent and Staffordshire Growth Hub.
- A provisional allocation of £5m from 2016/17 for a local sustainable transport package aimed at improving connectivity, traffic management and improving bus punctuality.
- A provisional allocation of £6.9m from 2016/17 for an Advanced Manufacturing Skills Hub providing skills and engineers required to grow apprenticeships and traineeships.

## **Environment**

### Redbrook Lane Fly Infestation

The Portfolio Leader advised that the Environment Agency had served notice on the owner of the site and an ongoing criminal investigation was underway.

### AONB Substitution

The Portfolio Leader advised that the issue of substitution to the AONB Board,

as previously reported at Cabinet, was tabled to be discussed at the next meeting of the Board in December.

#### Taxi Drivers

The Portfolio Leader advised that a local liaison committee was being established to bring together all parties for round table discussions, with the first meeting scheduled to be held on 14 August, 2014.

#### **4. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 17 April, 2014**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 April, 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed.

#### **5. Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period July to September, 2014 (Item 5.1 – 5.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council) was noted.

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period July to September, 2014 be noted.

#### **6. Recommendations and References for Determination and Minutes of Policy Development and Other Committees**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the following Policy Development Committees be received for information:

- (i) Culture & Sport – 19 March, 2014
- (ii) Economic Development & Planning – 10 October, 2013; 25 March, 2014
- (iii) Environment – 13 March, 2014
- (iv) Health & Wellbeing – 11 March, 2014
- (v) Housing – 18 March, 2014
- (vi) Town Centre Regeneration – 27 February; 12 March, 2014

#### **7. Annual Performance Review of Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust 2013-14**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Commissioning (Item 7.1 – 7.13, plus Appendices, of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the performance of Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust (WLCT) in delivering the Culture and Leisure Services for the period 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014, be noted.

### Reasons for Decisions

The annual performance review was an integral part of the Council's contract monitoring arrangements with WLCT, enabling the Council to review the Trust's performance and commitments set out in the contract and method statements.

Appendix 1 to the report provided a detailed breakdown of WLCT's performance against performance targets for the year 1 April 2013 to 31 March 2014.

Although it was only the second year of the 10 year contract, a strong relationship was being built between the Council and WLCT and this was represented in the adoption of a cooperative approach to performance monitoring and a mutual commitment to meeting challenges (known and evolving), business requirements and adapting to changing circumstances.

A total of 71 performance measures and targets were monitored and a number of other measures used for which there was no comparator or baseline data available. WLCT had met or exceeded performance in 53 (75%) of its targets and not met target in 18 (25%), albeit that 6 (8%) are within the 5% tolerance threshold. The other 12 (17%) are considered red. Further detailed information was contained in the main body of the report and Appendices.

No default notices had been issued, the contract had been delivered within budget, with agreement reached with WLCT over the level of financial recompense resulting from the delay in opening the swimming pool. The settlement was in accordance with the provision made in the 2013-14 budget.

The report aimed to present a balanced picture of achievements and performance against the targets set, including where performance needed to be improved.

The performance achieved during the second year of the contract was generally good, particularly in respect attendances at the two leisure centres, Cannock Park Golf Course and Community Wellbeing Teams – Arts and Sports.

## **8. Leisure Concessions to Serving Members of the Armed Forces**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Commissioning (Item 8.1 – 8.6 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) The contents of the report be noted.
- (B) The leisure concessions scheme for serving members of the armed forces who are resident in the district be continued for the financial year 2014-15, in accordance with the proposals set out in the report.

### Reasons for Decisions

Cabinet on 21 June, 2012 resolved that leisure concessions be introduced for serving members of the armed forces resident in the District from 30 June 2012 for an initial one year period in recognition of the commitment made by armed

forces' men and women to this country in their service throughout the world.. (Minute 8.)

Following a review by WLCT during the first year of operation of the scheme, Cabinet on 20th June, 2013 resolved to continue with the scheme for a further 12 months. (Minute 8(B).)

Having assessed the impact during the second year of operation, WLCT have agreed to continue with the scheme for the financial 2014-15, subject to an annual review and to there not being a negative financial impact upon the contract in the future.

WLCT will continue to monitor and assess the scheme to determine the costs and benefits associated with making such a concession.

## **9. Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults Protection Policy**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Commissioning (Item 9.1 – 9.5, plus Appendix, of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the revised Safeguarding Children and Vulnerable Adults Protection Policy, attached as Appendix 1 to the report, be recommended to Council for adoption.

### Reasons for Decisions

The Council's existing Safeguarding Children etc. policy had been reviewed and revised to ensure that it remained in line with current legislation, statutory guidance and inter-agency procedures.

The review was undertaken with other district councils across Staffordshire as part of the Staffordshire Safeguarding Children's Board – District Councils Sub-Group, consisting of the 8 district councils in Staffordshire; the result of which was a revised joint policy aimed at providing local synergy and improved clarity for practitioners.

Where appropriate the policy had been amended to include Cannock Chase Council's policies and procedures.

## **10. Update on Feasibility Study for the Development of a Community Sport and Recreation Hub – Stadium Site**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Commissioning (Item 10.1 – 10.10, plus Appendix, of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The update on the feasibility study be noted.
- (B) The Design Masterplan for the development of a sport and recreation hub, attached as Appendix 1 to the report, be approved.
- (C) The two phase approach to deliver the Design Masterplan be approved.

- (D) Commissioning of necessary surveys on the site be approved within existing budgets.
- (E) Submission of a planning application for the Design Masterplan and payment of the associated planning fee be approved from the approved project budget.
- (F) A further detailed report on the capital and revenue costs associated with the delivery of Phase 1 and Phase 2 be received by Cabinet in due course.
- (G) Authority be delegated to the Head of Commissioning, in consultation with the Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader, to take such actions as may be necessary to progress the above resolutions within existing budgets.

#### Reasons for Decisions

The report provided an update to Cabinet on the feasibility study work undertaken and sought agreement to the Design Master Plan for the stadium site, the suggested 2 phase delivery approach and approval to submit a planning application in respect of the site and undertake any surveys as required.

The option outlined in the Design Masterplan included the widest range of facility types, covering a range of differing age groups, a comprehensive indoor and outdoor offer with a number of formal play areas, multi-use games area, footpaths, cycle trails and community allotments.

Progression of the planning application would potentially open up further funding opportunities for development of the site whilst at the same time enabling officers to validate the capital and revenue assessments associated with the project in more detail.

### **11. Adoption of St. John's Churchyard, Heath Hayes, Cannock**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Commissioning (Item 11.1 – 11.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Adoption of the maintenance responsibility of the closed churchyard at St. John's Church, Heath Hayes, as detailed in the report, be noted.
- (B) The use of and reallocation of the contingency budget to cover the one off cost required to bring the churchyard up to an acceptable standard and to provide a budget from 2015-16 to meet the ongoing maintenance cost as set out in the report be approved.

#### Reasons for Decisions

The Council had received a request to adopt and take over the maintenance responsibility of the closed churchyard at St. Johns Church, Heath Hayes.

Closure of St. Johns churchyard was approved on 12 October, 2011 and on the

10 September, 2012 the Parish Council notified the authority of its intention to pass on responsibility for the maintenance of the churchyard to the Council.

There was some confusion as to whether the correct process had been followed which led to an undue delay in dealing with this matter. This was a statutory requirement and the Council cannot refuse to assume responsibility for the maintenance of a closed churchyard if it was formally closed by Order and requested to do so by the Parochial Church Council (PCC) and it had previously been refused by the appropriate Parish Council; in this case Heath Hayes and Wimblebury Parish Council.

The additional responsibilities for the Council were set out in the body of the report and included the need to seek Cabinet's approval to make appropriate budgetary provision to undertake the one off works associated with bringing the churchyard up to an acceptable standard and for the ongoing maintenance regime each year. The estimated costs were £10,000 and £3,500 respectively.

## **12. End of Year Performance Report**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Executive (Item 12.1 – 12.67 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The performance information and the case studies relating to PDPs as detailed at Appendices 1-8 to the report be noted.
- (B) The actions and indicators which are rated Red or Amber be noted, and the remedial action or rescheduled delivery stated to address performance be confirmed.

### Reasons for Decisions

Information for performance actions, indicators and case studies 2013/14 was included for relevant items in Appendices 1 to 8 to the report. The overall rankings for each Portfolio area, as detailed in Section 5 of the report, indicated that 74.3% of targets had been achieved during 2013/14. The recommendations reflected that the performance and any subsequent rescheduling be noted.

## **13. Representatives on Outside Bodies, 2014-15**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Executive (Item 13.1 – 13.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The appointment of representatives to outside bodies for 2014-15 be approved in accordance with the schedule attached as Appendix 1 to the report.
- (B) The Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to make appointments to any additional outside bodies, as

necessary, throughout the Municipal year that would otherwise be determined by Cabinet.

#### Reasons for Decisions

Cabinet is annually required to appoint representatives to a number of outside bodies as detailed in the schedule at Appendix 1 to the report.

For practical purposes, i.e. to avoid the need to report the matter to Cabinet on every occasion, Cabinet was also requested to confirm the Chief Executive's authority, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to make appointments to any additional outside bodies, as necessary, throughout the Municipal year.

#### **14. Update on Partnership Activity**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Executive (Item 14.1 – 14.20 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The update on Partnership Delivery Plans be noted.
- (B) No specific areas of interest for future reports were identified at that time.

#### Reasons for Decisions

At the meeting of Cabinet on 21 June, 2012, the regular Partnership Update report was noted and it was resolved that, in future, an Update would be required on a quarterly basis following the LSP Strategic Board meeting cycle.

The report provided an update on the key areas of focus for the Chase Community Partnership since the last report to Cabinet, together with detailed information and case studies on specific initiatives.

The LSP had adopted its own governance structure and Terms of Reference, and, therefore, the quarterly update reports were intended to provide a summary of Partnership work for information. Any particular areas of interest to Cabinet could be reported in more detail in future Partnership Update reports, hence the recommendation that Cabinet identify specific areas of interest in respect of Partnership working.

While no specific areas of interest were identified, Cabinet expressed concern at the cuts in funding to Youth Services and associated activities, including youth clubs.

#### **15. Final Accounts 2013/14**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 15.1 – 15.29 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The final accounts position for the year ending 31 March, 2014 be noted.
- (B) The financing of the capital programme as outlined in the report be approved.

#### Reasons for Decisions

The final accounts for 2013/14 showed a transfer to Working Balances of £432,000 as compared to a forecast transfer of £192,000; an increase of £240,000.

The majority of the outturn variances, including income variations were identified as part of the 2014/15 budget process and now formed part of the current year's budgets.

Planning Income was some £185,000 down on original budget and some £125,000 below the forecast outturn. A number of favourable variances offset the shortfall.

The outturn also reflected the draft position on Business Rates retention and incorporated a 25% share of pooled income with the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Business Rates pool.

#### **16. Housing Revenue Account Provisional Outturn 2013-14**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 16.1 – 16.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the provisional outturn for the 2013-14 Housing Revenue Account Budget is noted.

#### Reasons for Decisions

The report presented the provisional outturn for the 2013-14 Housing Revenue Account Budget, as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

Income at 31 March 2014 was £19,975,128 compared to the revised budget position of £19,261,890 reported to Council on 13 February 2013. The £713,238 increase related primarily to the generation of additional rent income as a result of an additional rent week during the year and lower than forecast current rent arrears.

Expenditure at 31 March 2014 was £19,686,178 compared to the original budget position of £19,243,230 reported to Council on 13 February 2013. The increase in expenditure related to an increased Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay in accordance with the revised HRA Business Plan, offset by a surplus in respect of the Housing Maintenance Trading Account and budget savings in supervision and management, the provision for bad debts and capital financing.

As a result of the changes, the net surplus of £18,660 (as reported to Council on

13 February, 2013) had changed to a net surplus of £288,950.

Working balances at 31 March 2014 are now £2.795 million compared to the £1.506 million reported to Council on 13 February, 2013.

## **17. Housing Revenue Account Capital Programmes 2013-14 and 2014-15**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 17.1 – 17.22 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The position with regard to actual expenditure in respect of the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme be noted and approval be given to incur £125,488 of additional scheme costs met through the virement of existing resources in respect of the following schemes:-
- |       |   |   |         |
|-------|---|---|---------|
| (i)   | Kitchen Replacement                       | - | £6,698  |
| (ii)  | Structural Reinstatement of PRC Dwellings | - | £70,015 |
| (iii) | Redesign of Communal Entrance Halls       | - | £17,772 |
| (iv)  | Asbestos Testing and Removal              | - | £31,003 |
- (B) The reprogramming/slippage of £319,462 of expenditure from the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme to the 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme, as agreed by the Head of Housing and Waste Management, for the reasons detailed in Appendix 3 to the report be noted.
- (C) The £167,687 of expenditure which had been brought forward from the 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme, to the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme, as agreed by the Head of Housing and Waste Management for the reason detailed in Appendix 3 to the report be noted.
- (D) The availability and use of resources in financing the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme be noted including the £3,875,138 of resources carried forward to 2014-15.
- (E) The current position with regard to estimated expenditure in respect of the 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme be noted and approval be given to incur £96,500 of additional scheme costs met through the virement of existing resources in respect of the following schemes:-
- |      |   |   |         |
|------|---|---|---------|
| (i)  | Structural Reinstatement of PRC Dwellings | - | £60,000 |
| (ii) | Central Heating Programme                 | - | £36,500 |
- (F) The current position regarding the estimated availability of capital resources in 2014-15 be noted.

### Reasons for Decisions

The report presented the outturn expenditure and use of resources in respect of

the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme, and reviewed the 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme in the light of the outturn expenditure and use of resources for 2013-14.

Details of the outturn expenditure for 2013-14 were presented as part of Appendix 1 to the report. Actual expenditure at 31 March, 2014 was £12,581,009 compared to the revised estimate of £12,800,800 reported to Cabinet on 30 January, 2014. The reasons for this decrease of £219,791 were detailed in Appendix 3.

Details of the outturn resources for 2013-14 were presented as part of Appendix 2. A total of £16,456,147 was available at 31 March, 2014 compared to £16,729,824 reported to Cabinet on 30 January, 2014. The reasons for this decrease of £273,677 were detailed in Appendix 4.

A total of £3,875,138 of capital resources were available after financing the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme. This compared to £3,929,024 reported to Cabinet on 30 January, 2014, a decrease of £53,886. A total of £3,875,138 of unused resources had therefore been carried forward to 2014-15.

Expenditure in respect of the 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme was now estimated to be £13,544,290. This compared to £12,966,000 when Council determined the programme on 12 February, 2014. The reasons for this increase of £578,290 were detailed in Appendix 5 and included £96,500 of additional expenditure for which approval was sought.

Estimated available resources in 2014-15 were now forecast to be £16,923,658. This compared to £16,546,024 when Council determined the programme on 12 February, 2014. The reasons for this increase of £377,634 were detailed in Appendix 6.

Following the financing of the estimated 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme, £3,379,368 of resources were anticipated to be available and if not required during 2014-15 would be carried forward to 2015-16.

## **18. Moss Road Estate Reema Flats Redevelopment**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 18.1 – 18.12 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Scheme approval and permission to spend for the Moss Road Estate Reema Flats Redevelopment Scheme be agreed.
- (B) Provision of a community centre is not progressed as part of the agreed Scheme.

### Reasons for Decisions

The proposed scheme would be undertaken in partnership with Keepmoat

Homes Limited and would result in the demolition of 170 defective Reema flats and their replacement with a mixed tenure scheme of 141 houses for rent; this includes 65 Council rented dwellings.

Details of the scheme were set out in section 5 of the report and was in accordance with the agreed development brief. However, 20 houses for shared ownership and 15 houses for outright sale had been substituted with 35 houses for shared equity. A small variation had also been made to the size mix of the 65 Council houses, with the two 4/5 bedroom (8 person) houses being substituted with two further 3 bedroom (5 person) houses. The reasons for the changes were also set out in section 5.

A request had also been received from the Spectrum Residents Association for the provision of a community centre within the scheme. This did not form part of the agreed development brief and would have a significant impact on the proposed scheme, necessitating the loss of at least four houses and an additional estimated cost of £580,000. There were also concerns regarding the running costs and the long-term sustainability of any community centre which was provided.

In view of these factors it was considered that the provision of a community centre should not be progressed as part of the scheme.

## **19. Repurchase of Vacant Former Council Dwellings**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 19.1 – 19.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The action of the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, regarding the reduction in Affordable Housing Grant for the repurchase of vacant former Council dwellings be confirmed.
- (B) The vacancy requirement in respect of the Former Council Dwellings Repurchase Programme be removed.
- (C) The Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, be authorised to determine the specific former Council dwellings for repurchase and that the terms and conditions are agreed by the Head of Economic Development.

### Reasons for Decisions

The Council had an agreed programme to repurchase 10 vacant former Council houses as part of the 2013-14 and 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme.

The property repurchases were to be part funded with Affordable Grant and as a grant condition, properties must have been vacant for at least 6 months.

Difficulties had been experienced in purchasing former Council properties which

meet this criteria, with only 2 dwellings being purchased to date. It was not, therefore, considered that a further 8 purchases could be completed before 31 March, 2015 when the Empty property Affordable Grant Programme ends.

In order not to prejudice the Council's further bid for £1,472,000 of Affordable Housing Grant from 2015-18 Affordable Housing Programme, the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, had informed the HCA that the Council would only be able to purchase 5 vacant dwellings, including the 2 already bought. As a result, the potential availability of Affordable Housing Grant had reduced by £110,000 and confirmation of action was sought.

A budget of £764,000 for the purchase of vacant former Council houses remained in the 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme and of this, £698,000 was fully resourced without the need for additional Affordable Housing Grant. It was, therefore, suggested that this budget should continue to be utilised to repurchase former Council properties but that the vacant requirement be removed. The other property purchase criteria agreed by Cabinet on 25 July, 2013 would, however, continue to be applied.

The specific properties which were repurchased would continue to be determined by the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, with terms and conditions being agreed by the Head of Economic Development.

## **20. Council Housing Estate Car Parking Problems – Provision of Dropped Kerbs**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 20.1 – 20.29 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) A 'dropped kerb scheme' be introduced whereby the Council funds the provision of a dropped kerb in respect of dwellings in its ownership subject to:-
  - (i) The proposed access meeting the highway requirements of Staffordshire County Council as set out in Appendix 1 of the report.
  - (ii) The tenant providing at their own expense access through the front garden boundary (where required) and a hard-standing in accordance with one of the Council's specifications attached as Appendix 2.
- (B) £100,000 of the agreed 2015-16 HRA Capital Programme budget for 'future enhancements' be brought forward to the 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme to fund the 'dropped kerb scheme'
- (C) Scheme approval and permission to spend in relation to the 'dropped kerb scheme' be agreed.

### Reasons for Decisions

Car parking problems were an issue on a number of the Council's housing estates. Works to address problems on certain estates through communal parking were being undertaken through the External and Environmental Works Programme but in some areas the issues could only be resolved through the provision of individual parking spaces within the dwelling curtilage.

Other budget priorities had, however, limited the provision of individual parking spaces to properties which were included in the County Council's Minor Highway Works Programme.

It was, therefore, suggested that the Council re-introduce a 'dropped kerb scheme' whereby, provided that access met the highway requirements (Appendix 1 to the report), the Council fund a dropped kerb (and crossover where required), subject to the tenant providing an appropriate hard-standing (as set out in Appendix 2) and access through the front garden boundary (where required) at their expense.

Whilst there was no agreed 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme budget for this work, it was suggested that £100,000 of the agreed 2015-16 Capital Programme budget for 'future enhancements' be brought forward to fund a 'dropped kerb scheme' during the current year.

## **21. Provision of Photovoltaic Panels to Council Owned Bungalows**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 21.1 – 21.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The scheme to provide photovoltaic panels to Council owned bungalows be undertaken by "Chase Community Energy".
- (B) A compensation formula to address the loss of income if photovoltaic panels are removed as a result of Right to Buy purchases is included in the lease.

### Reasons for Decisions

Two issues had arisen regarding the preparation of the "roof lease" for the provision of photovoltaic panels to additional Council owned bungalows.

Staffordshire Community Energy now wished to establish an identical community benefit society "Chase Community Energy" to deliver the scheme, as this would enable investors to obtain 50% tax relief under the "Seed Enterprise Investment Scheme". The proposed amendment had no implications other than a change in name.

Any bungalow sales under the Right to Buy (RTB) could not be conditional upon

the photovoltaic panels remaining on the property. A tenant exercising the RTB could therefore require the panels to be removed.

Whilst the risk of this was small it would be necessary to compensate "Chase Community Energy" for the loss of income should it occur. A compensation formula was proposed whereby the panels on a bungalow would lose 1/20<sup>th</sup> of their estimated £4,000 value each year and it was suggested that this should form part of the roof lease.

The costs of any compensation would be met from the capital receipts from the bungalow sale.

## **22. Sustainable Communities Act – Request to Support**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 22.1 – 22.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the proposal from Durham County Council to amend the implementation of the social sector size criteria which they had submitted to the Government under the Sustainable Communities Act be supported.

### Reasons for Decisions

Durham County Council had requested the Council's support for a proposal they had submitted under the Sustainable Communities Act. A copy of the letter sent on their behalf was attached as Appendix 1 to the report.

The proposal sought to amend the implementation of the social sector size criteria (termed the "under-occupation penalty in the letter) by allowing social housing providers and tenants time to respond to the changes in housing benefit.

Specifically, the proposal stated that:-

"For a period of two years, where suitable accommodation is not available tenants liable to the under-occupation penalty should be exempted, until suitable accommodation can be found for them, in order to allow registered providers time to implement adjustments and strategies necessary to find/create accommodation."

Details of the measures adopted by the Council to mitigate the effects of the social sector size criteria were outlined in Section 5 of the report.

## **23. Enforcement Action for Spitting**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 23.1 – 23.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Council should take action against spitting in public places; and that this should be implemented by way of the provisions of the Environmental Protection

Act 1990.

### Reasons for Decisions

Historically, spitting had aided the spread of infectious diseases, notably tuberculosis (TB). In more recent times, with improved hygiene and living standards, and routine immunisation, the public health significance had diminished.

Those Councils that had taken a stand on the issue of spitting appeared to have received considerable public support. Spitting in public places was generally regarded as a repulsive anti-social habit.

There was no specific legislation prohibiting spitting in public places. The original ban on spitting in the UK which carried a £5 fine was repealed in 1992. Recently a few local authorities had been tackling spitting using either the litter provisions in the Environmental Protection Act 1990, or by making local byelaws. There appeared to be very little established case law.

## **24. Trial Street Market in Cannock Town Centre**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Corporate Director (Item 24.1 – 24.36 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Having reviewed the information provided concerning the street market trial, Option 2 - continue with a weekly street market – was the preferred option.
- (B) The Corporate Director, in consultation with the Portfolio Leader for Town Centre Regeneration, be authorised to:
  - (i) Agree terms for and undertake a competitive exercise to appoint a market operator, and;
  - (ii) Agree arrangements to extend the existing street market trial in Cannock Town Centre until a competitive exercise has been completed and a street market operator appointed.
- (C) The Corporate Director be authorised to commission a report on potential actions to support Cannock Indoor Market in consultation with the indoor market traders.
- (D) A budget of around £15,000 be made available from existing resources to implement the above resolutions.

### Reasons for Decisions

Bescot Promotions, who operate markets in Walsall, Wednesbury and Halesowen had been operating a weekly street market in Cannock Town Centre on a trial basis since the end of November, 2013. The trial, endorsed by Cabinet

on 19 December, 2013, was considered worthy of support in the hope that the introduction of a well run street market would add vibrancy and value to the Town Centre. The aim was to complement existing retail activities within the Town Centre and to increase footfall for the benefit of all Town Centre businesses. At the end of the trial the market was to be assessed to judge whether or not it had achieved the aims of making the town centre more attractive to shoppers.

The street market trial had been in operation for a period of 7 months. Section 5 of the report evaluated the trial through the views of Cannock indoor market traders; the Retail Group who were commissioned to undertake an independent review of the impact of the street market on the town centre; Bescot Promotions; and other stakeholders and members of the public. The report also considered car park ticket sales data from the Beecroft Road car park, and footfall data from Market Hall Street to assess the impact on visitors to the town centre.

In resolving to continue with the weekly street market Cabinet took into consideration the following:

- The Council commissioned an independent assessment of the impact of the street market from a consultancy expert in markets. They undertook shopper and retailer surveys and provided their own opinion of the street market. The surveys showed that shoppers overwhelmingly support the street market with 84% saying that they would like the street market to stay.
- From the retailer survey, the views of retailers in the town was more mixed but on balance they saw the street market as a benefit.
- The conclusions of the independent assessment were summed up in their comment that the Friday street market was an asset for Cannock town centre. Customers liked it, they used it regularly, and were coming into Cannock because of it.
- It was acknowledged that the street market was having a negative impact on the indoor market, but the response to this should not be to close something which shoppers liked. Cabinet agreed that funding should be provided to report on how the indoor market could be made more attractive to shoppers and how it could be better integrated with the street market.
- Cabinet considered option 3 to run the street market less frequently as a way of reducing its impact on existing traders. However, Cabinet agreed with the independent assessors that a less frequent street market would be a different type of market and this risked losing the momentum and vitality which the weekly street market had achieved.
- Cabinet agreed that the opportunity to run the street market should be opened up to competition. This would provide the opportunity to press operators to provide a quality looking market which brought more food, specialist and craft traders into the town which would assist in reducing competition with existing retailers and traders.

- In the interim, Cabinet agreed that the existing market should continue in order not to lose the benefits which a street market brought to the town centre.

## **25. Draft Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule and a Draft Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Development (Item 25.1 – 25.59 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The proposed charging rates, as detailed in paragraph 3.7 of the report, be published as a draft Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule for consultation purposes together with the draft list of infrastructure projects (Regulation 123 list) at Appendix A of the report, which it is intended be funded in whole or in part from CIL receipts in the first year of operation of CIL charging.
- (B) The draft Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), detailed at Appendix B to the report, be published for consultation purposes to be carried out in parallel with the CIL consultation.
- (C) The Head of Economic Development, in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader, be authorised to make minor amendments to Appendices A (CIL Draft Regulation 123 List of Projects) and B (Developer Contributions SPD) if required, prior to their publication for consultation and approve details of the consultation generally in accordance with section 5 of the report.
- (D) The Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader be authorised to consider the results of the consultation on the Draft Charging Schedule and Regulation 123 List of infrastructure projects and, subject to there being no significant issues requiring re-assessment of the proposals, that they be taken forward to examination.
- (E) A further report be submitted to Cabinet setting out the responses to consultation on the SPD and proposals for its adoption along with the outcome of the CIL examination.

### Reasons for Decisions

The Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) was introduced by Government in 2010 as a means for Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to fund infrastructure required to support development proposed in a Local Plan. It was seen as a fairer way of obtaining funding than the previous system, which involved greater reliance on individual planning obligations (Section 106 agreements or unilateral undertakings), predominantly from a few major developments, with many smaller schemes making no direct contribution to the funding of infrastructure. Most new development relied on infrastructure in some form or other, even if this was needed because of the cumulative impact of a large number of small

developments.

At its meeting on 21 November, 2013, Cabinet agreed to consult on proposals for a Preliminary Draft Charging Schedule. A summary of the consultation responses was set out at Appendix C to the report. The implications for proposed amendments to the Draft Charging Schedule were explained in paragraphs 5.9 to 5.11 of the report. The one proposed change to the Draft Charging Schedule was the recommendation not to levy a charge for specialist market housing complexes for the elderly.

In order to introduce CIL within the District the following key requirements needed to be met:

- There must be an up-to-date Local Plan to set the policy context for the proposed charges. The Local Plan Part 1 2006/2028 was adopted by Council on 11 June, 2014.
- There must be evidence from the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), which accompanied the Local Plan, that there was a need for some funding to be provided from CIL, having taken into account all other funding sources including S106 agreements, agreements under S278 of the Highways Act, service providers own funds, grants and loans from Government or European funding. The current evidence on the extent of the funding gap was that it amounted to over £10 million.
- The Regulations specified that in setting levy rates charging authorities “must strike an appropriate balance between” the desirability of funding infrastructure from CIL and “the potential effects (taken as a whole) of the imposition of CIL on the economic viability of development across its area”. The viability evidence described in paragraphs 5.5 - 5.8 of the report provided the basis for meeting this requirement.

The latest version of the IDP (May 2014) identified which projects may require funding from CIL. This had been used to compile a draft list of projects in liaison with Staffordshire County Council (education and transport) known as a Regulation 123 list which was set out at Appendix A to the report.

The consultation also included proposals for relief from charges where infrastructure costs incurred via planning obligations when added to CIL charges could make development unviable and proposals for payments by instalments set out in paragraphs 5.22 and 5.24 of the report.

Finally the introduction of CIL would mean making changes to the policies on the circumstances when S106 agreements were negotiated. As indicated in the Local Plan a revised Developer Contributions SPD had been produced for consultation to set out these changes to S106 agreements. This included policy elaboration on the process for delivering affordable housing via S106 agreements in addition to infrastructure also as indicated in the Local Plan.

## **26. Removal of Supporting People Grant by Staffordshire County Council**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Corporate Director (Item 26.1 –

26.12 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The decision by Staffordshire County Council to remove £300,000 Supporting People grant funding from Cannock Chase Council for Social Alarms and Sheltered Housing support services as a result of the implementation of their Medium Term Financial Plan be noted.
- (B) Concern about the absence of any public consultation by Staffordshire County Council with tenants / clients who may be affected by the withdrawal or reduction of these grants be formally expressed.
- (C) The introduction of a service charge for all Council sheltered housing tenants from 1 April 2015 as an alternative way of funding the existing level of support services when the Supporting People grant is removed from 1 April 2015 be approved.
- (D) The Council should continue to provide a free service but at a reduced cost (Option 2) when the Supporting People grant was removed from 1 October, 2014.
- (E) Consequently, Council should be recommended to:
  - (i) Approve bridging funding of £107,000 to maintain the service from 1 October 2014 to 31 March 2015 funded from HRA Revenue Account working balances.
  - (ii) Approve the criteria set out in Appendix 1 and the associated funding requirement of up to £117,234 for the provision of a free social alarm service for up to 1,350 vulnerable Council tenants from 1 April 2015.
  - (iii) Approve the programme to replace existing hard wired alarm systems with dispersed alarms funded from the HRA capital allocation of £120,000 brought forward from 2015/16 financial year into the current financial year.
- (F) Subject to Council approval of (E) (i) to (iii), then:
  - (i) Permission to Spend be approved for the scheme.
  - (ii) An increase in the charges levied for out of hours call handling and lone worker arrangements for other organisations be approved.
  - (iii) Selection of a partner via a tender for the provision of the social alarms and out of hours service be approved from 2015/16 financial year.
  - (iv) Authority be delegated to the Corporate Director to take such actions as may be necessary to implement the agreed option.

#### Reasons for Decisions

Staffordshire County Council had funded a range of services for vulnerable individuals across Staffordshire. The Council had three contracts with Staffordshire County Council to deliver supported housing services in respect of

sheltered housing (c£90,000) and community alarms (c£214,000) as well as a contract to accept tele-care referrals handled by the social alarms service. There were a range of other voluntary sector providers in Cannock Chase who were funded in similar way for providing mental health services, domestic violence and elderly support.

In December, 2013, Staffordshire County Council approved their Medium Term Financial Plan which included a reduction in the Supporting People budget of £11m by £4m in 2014/15 and a further £2m in 2015/16. The County Council no longer received a ring fenced grant for Supporting People – instead, it was included in the overall revenue allocation received from central government.

The County Council conducted a review of the services funded by what were known as Supporting People grants and had come to a number of conclusions about services which would result in the withdrawal or reduction of existing levels of funding. The County Council confirmed that they did not intend to conduct any public consultation on these issues.

The recommendations in the report were in response to confirmation by Staffordshire County Council that 100% of the grant funding for social alarms would be removed as at 30 September 2014 (£214,000 p.a.) and 100% of the grant funding for sheltered housing support (£90,000 p.a.) would be removed by 31 March 2015. Other service providers in Cannock Chase affected by these County Council decisions were also identified.

## **27. Removal and Replacement of Bus Shelters in the District**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Corporate Director (Item 27.1 – 27.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The list of bus shelter improvements identified in Appendix 1 from the General Fund Reserve for bus shelters in 2014/15 be approved.
- (B) Permission to spend the capital funds of £24,000 be approved and Officers be authorised to take all appropriate actions to implement these decisions.
- (C) The use of underspends from the Town Centre Improvement Fund allocations to meet the cost of £5,600 to rectify safety issues with the surface of Cannock bus station be approved.

### Reasons for Decisions

Cabinet on 16 October, 2008 previously determined policy on the maintenance of bus shelters which were the responsibility of Cannock Chase Council.

The Cabinet minute from the meeting confirmed that “the 18 Council owned bus shelters at the bus stations in Cannock, Hednesford and Rugeley be maintained; that the remaining Council owned bus shelters across the District be no longer repaired or maintained and be removed without replacement if they present a

health and safety hazard to the public". Maintenance budgets were adjusted accordingly based on this policy decision.

Consequently, some improvements had been made to certain bus shelters in the District as a result of specific funding but there were a number of other bus shelters that were now posing safety issues due to a lack of maintenance in the past 5.5 years, which needed to be addressed.

**28. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting because of the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph(s) 1, 2 and 3, Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**CABINET**

**HELD ON THURSDAY, 17 JULY, 2014 AT 4:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 2**

**29. Housing Revenue Account Borrowing Programme**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 29.1 – 29.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The action of the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Head of Finance and the Housing Portfolio Leader, regarding a bid to the Department for Communities and Local Government for £2,810,000 of additional borrowing approval to provide 30 additional Council dwellings, in accordance with the schedule of sites attached as Appendix 1 to the report, be confirmed.
- (B) The potential use of £300,000 of agreed uncommitted resources to support the bid be noted.
- (C) A further report be submitted on the proposed schemes if the Council's bid is successful.

Reasons for Decisions

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) invited bids from local authorities to increase their Housing Revenue Account (HRA) borrowing limits in order to provide additional affordable housing.

The Council had an HRA borrowing cap of £85.029 million. Whilst borrowing to this maximum formed part of the agreed HRA Business Plan, there was revenue capacity to increase the amount subject to the Government increasing the existing cap.

The HRA Borrowing Programme therefore provided the opportunity to increase the Council's new build programme. However, bids needed to be submitted by 16 June 2014 and as a result it was not possible for a proposed bid to be considered by Council.

A bid for £2,810,000 of additional borrowing approval had therefore been

submitted by the Head of Housing and Waste Management following consultation with the Head of Finance and the Housing Portfolio Leader. Confirmation of action was, therefore, sought.

The bid related to the provision of 30 additional Council dwellings on three sites as set out in Appendix 1 to the report.

The DCLG bidding guidance expected local authorities to contribute existing resources to reduce their HRA borrowing request. In order to increase the prospects of success, £300,000 of Council resources had, therefore, been provisionally allocated to the three schemes. Cabinet were, therefore, asked to note the potential use of these uncommitted resources.

The additional borrowing approvals formed part of the Local Growth Fund and bids required the support of the Local Enterprise Partnership. The Council's bid was supported by the Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP.

Should the Council's bid be successful, a further report would be submitted regarding the development of the proposed schemes.

The meeting closed at 5.50 pm

---

LEADER

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**

**CABINET**

**HELD ON THURSDAY, 21 AUGUST, 2014 AT 4:00 P.M.**

**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

Adamson, G.	Leader of the Council
Holder, M.J.	Deputy Leader of the Council and Crime and Partnerships Portfolio Leader
Lovell, A.	Corporate Improvement Portfolio Leader
Mitchell, Mrs C.	Culture & Sport Portfolio Leader
Bennett, C.	Environment Portfolio Leader
Davis, Mrs. M.A.	Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader
Allen, F.W.C.	Housing Portfolio Leader

**30. Apologies**

Apologies had been submitted by Councillors G. Alcott, Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader; and Mrs. D.M. Todd, Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader. An apology had also been submitted by Mr. S. Brown, Chief Executive.

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

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

**32. Updates from Portfolio Leaders**

**Deputy Leader and Crime and Partnerships**

Staffordshire Police and Crime Panel

The Deputy Leader advised that the Staffordshire Police and Crime Panel had agreed a scheme of substitutes to address concerns about meetings being potentially inquorate. A revision to the Terms of Reference of the Panel had been drafted to this effect, which was required to be approved by all constituent local authorities. In accordance with the original Terms of Reference, the appointment would need to be made from the ruling Group at Council to reflect

the political control of the authority. The Deputy Leader suggested that, in accordance with the approved procedure for making additional appointments, the matter should be determined by the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council, which was agreed.

## **Corporate Improvement**

### Council Website

The Portfolio Leader advised that the Council's website was being redeveloped to be more functional and user-friendly. Although the redevelopment work had presented an opportunity for generating income through advertising, it had not been taken up as the resource implications of the associated moderation outweighed the relatively small potential income, circa £5,000.

## **Environment**

### Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Liaison Group

The Portfolio Leader advised that a liaison group, which had been established to foster good working relationships between the Council and taxi trade, had held its inaugural meeting on 6 August, 2014, with 9 Taxi trade representatives; 2 Councillors; and 2 Officers in attendance. The liaison group was intended to act as a forum where issues could be raised and discussed to assist in the understanding of differing views and achieve resolution, where possible.

### Enforcement Action for Spitting

The Portfolio Leader reminded Members that with effect from 1 September, 2014, the Council would commence taking action against spitting in public places by way of the provisions of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.

## **Health and Wellbeing**

### Contract for New Home Improvement Agency

The Portfolio Leader advised that confirmation had been received from the County Council that it now intended to proceed with the new arrangements for the delivery of Disabled Facilities Grants using the new Home Improvement Agency that had been procured.

## **Housing**

### Affordable Homes Programme 2015-18

The Portfolio Leader advised Members that, following Cabinet's agreement on 17 April, 2014 to a bid for £1,472,000 of Affordable Housing Grant from the Homes and Communities Agency, under the 2015-18 Affordable Homes Programme, he was pleased to confirm that the Council's bid had been agreed in full.

The additional resources would enable the Council's new build programme to be extended by a further 12 dwellings, to a total of 92 properties. The additional dwellings would be built on former garage sites and would be let at affordable rents equivalent to social housing rents. A report detailing the proposed sites, the dwelling mix and the method of procurement would be submitted to Cabinet in the future.

**33. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 17 July, 2014**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 17 July, 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed.

**34. Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period August to October, 2014 (Item 5.1 – 5.2 of the Official Minutes of the Council) was considered.

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period August to October, 2014 be noted.

**35. Recommendations and References for Determination and Minutes of Policy Development and Other Committees**

None received.

**36. St Michael's Drive, Brereton – Service Roads and Former Garage Site**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Manager (Item 7.1 – 7.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The rear and side service roads to the Council's shops and flats at St Michael's Drive, Brereton be re-surfaced as part of the 2014-15 Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme.
- (B) A budget of £24,000 be established to undertake the work through virement from the agreed contingency budget within the 2014-15 Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme.
- (C) Scheme approval and permission to spend in relation to the re-surfacing work be agreed.
- (D) The former garage site at St Michael's Drive be retained for the Council's future new build programme.

Reasons for Decisions

The service roads to the Council's shops and flats at St Michael's Drive, Brereton were in extremely poor condition and required comprehensive re-surfacing at an estimated cost of £24,000.

There was no agreed budget to undertake the work and it was suggested that a budget be established from the £100,000 contingency sum which formed part of the agreed 2014-15 HRA Capital Programme.

The side service road also provided access to a former garage site which Cabinet previously agreed to dispose of, for residential development. There were however, limited sites to support any further extensions to the Council's new build programme and it was suggested that the former St Michael's Drive garage site be retained for the construction of further Council dwellings.

### **37. Rent Setting Policy**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Manager (Item 8.1 – 8.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the revised housing rent setting policy as set out in Appendix 1 of the Report be agreed and implemented with effect from 1 April, 2015.

#### Reasons for Decisions

Following consultation, the Government had determined the revised national rent policy for social housing which would become operational in 2015-16.

The new policy would form part of the regulatory framework for social housing and as a result the Council's rent setting policy had been reviewed.

A revised policy, which had been formulated in accordance with the revised national rent guidance was attached as Appendix 1 to the report. It was proposed that the policy be agreed and implemented from 1 April, 2015.

### **38. Chase Line Rail Service – Revenue Support**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Development (Item 9.1 – 9.6 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) A request from Centro, for Cannock Chase Council to provide a funding contribution as detailed in paragraph 5.4 of the Report, to maintain the Chase Line incremental rail services between Birmingham-Walsall-Cannock-Hednesford-Rugeley for Year 5 and part of Year 6, from December 2014 – March 2016 be agreed.
- (B) The Council's existing Rail Revenue Support and Rail Revenue Reserve budgets be used to provide financial support for the incremented rail services.
- (C) The Head of Economic Development, in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader, be authorised to enter into agreements with Centro and Staffordshire County Council for the continued operation of the existing incremental rail services, subject to agreement for contributions being secured from Centro and Staffordshire

County Council.

- (D) The Council engage in further discussions with Centro, Staffordshire County Council, the Department for Transport, London Midland, Network Rail, the Office of Rail Regulation, the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) and the Stoke on Trent and Staffordshire LEP with the aim of achieving the continued operation of existing Chase Line rail services until March, 2016 and, if possible, their increase, for the remainder of the West Midlands rail franchise until June, 2017 and beyond in a future franchise.

### Reasons for Decisions

Improving Chase Line rail services was a Council transport priority and it had previously agreed to provide funding to maintain services to Rugeley. The Council's short term priority was to identify a package that would allow retention of existing service levels, for the remainder of the West Midlands franchise to March 2016 and to secure their inclusion in a future franchise funded by the DfT. The application of the Council's Rail Revenue Support budget of approximately £9,750 per annum, to support the Chase Line services was both appropriate and value for money and recommended.

In February 2011, the DfT announced it would consider funding new or enhanced rail services from April, 2015, subject to local authorities sponsoring them for an initial three year period and establishing a positive business case. If short term funding for three years could be found to reinstate and maintain the incremental Chase Line services, longer term funding would be picked up by the DfT, in the next franchise after the existing West Midlands franchise ended, subject to affordability being demonstrated through a Benefit Cost Ratio of 1.5. The DfT had indicated that the franchise was likely to run for its full period until March, 2016, with a possible extension to June, 2017.

Centro was more recently advised by the DfT in May, 2014, that there was no prospect of them funding the services before March, 2016, hence the need to agree funding for a longer period, than envisaged. Centro submitted their business case work (from 2012-15) to the DfT in March, 2014, seeking their agreement to fund these services on a permanent basis in any re-negotiated contract from 2015 or 2016. This analysis showed that the services had an estimated Benefit Cost Analysis(BCR) ratio of 1.63:1 and were, therefore, above the DfT minimum threshold of 1.5:1. Centro believed the BCR would rise to more than 3:1 when the effects of electrification and the planned linespeed upgrade, were factored in. The services had seen growth in passenger revenue of more than 70% since introduction. A final decision from the DfT was still awaited.

The financial business case for restoring the withdrawn services, would be enhanced by the Government announcements of capital investment in the Chase Line. This included the announcement in July, 2012 of the £30m, Walsall-Rugeley electrification by December 2017, currently under construction.

The Office of Rail Regulation figures for 2012/13, showed that Cannock, Hednesford and Rugeley Town, generated nearly 600,000 passenger journeys

pa in total and counting Rugeley Trent Valley(Lichfield District), nearly 700,000 passenger journeys pa in total.

The Integrated Transport Authority (ITA) for the Centro metropolitan area, agreed on 25 June, to continue funding the Chase Line service enhancements from 14 December 2014 to 31 March 2016. Staffordshire County Council had given similar support.

**39. Declaration of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) Between Churchbridge and Norton Canes**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 10.1 – 10.6 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The making of an Order under Section 83 of the Environment Act 1995 declaring an Air Quality Management Area be agreed.
- (B) The decision be exempt from the call-in process as a result of the timescales involved.

Reasons for Decisions

The outcome of an assessment of the air quality in the area between Churchbridge and Norton Canes in 2013 was that it was necessary to declare an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) for the following area:

A stretch of the A5 Watling Street between the roundabout junction with the A34 Walsall Road at Churchbridge and the eastern district boundary with Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council.

The declaration of the AQMA was required because levels of nitrogen dioxide had been found to exceed the National Air Quality Objective. Under such circumstances the Council was obliged by the provisions of the Environment Act 1995 to declare an Air Quality Management Area. A map detailing the AQMA was included as Appendix 1 to the report.

**40. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting because of the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraph 3, Part 1, Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**CABINET**

**HELD ON THURSDAY, 21 AUGUST, 2014 AT 4:00 P.M.**

**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 2**

**41. Disposal of 91-93 High Green, Cannock**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Chief Executive (Item 13.1 – 13.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The proposals of the Burton Addiction Centre (BAC) to establish a substance misuse recovery community within the District based at 91-93 High Green, Cannock be noted; and previous property decisions in respect of the disposal of 91-93 High Green also be noted.
- (B) Cabinet agrees in principle to support the BAC by granting the BAC a lease of 91-93 High Green at less than best consideration in recognition of the social benefits from the services to be provided by BAC and the works required to the property.
- (C) The Corporate Director, in consultation with the Portfolio Leaders for Crime and Partnerships and Corporate Improvement, be authorised to lease 91-93 High Green to the BAC on terms and conditions to be agreed including for a consideration significantly less than market value.
- (D) Subject to the agreement of terms with the BAC, the previous decisions to maximise the financial return from the disposal of 91-93 High Green and to reimburse the Maintenance Reserve budget from the capital receipt, be set aside.

Reasons for Decisions

Whilst substance misuse services were available to people living in Cannock Chase there was an unmet need in respect of 'recovery communities', that is, the right environment *after* treatment to maintain rehabilitation. Burton Addiction Centre (BAC), an abstinence-based substance misuse organisation with national recognition for its success rate, had approached the Council with regards to leasing 91-93 High Green, Cannock. BAC wished to develop a

recovery community within Cannock subject to sourcing suitable premises.

The BAC were offering to establish their 'recovery community' within the District based on 91-93 High Green, including the potential of running a social enterprise for this purpose. They had also committed to funding the cost of works required to refurbish 91-93 High Green. In return, they were seeking to lease the premises at a reduced rental.

In January, 2012 Cabinet resolved to dispose of 91-93 High Green with the aim of maximising the financial return to the Council either from freehold disposal or commercial renting. Cabinet agreed to set aside the previous decision to maximise the financial return in the interests of securing the social, health and community safety benefits from establishing BAC services at 91-93 High Green. The Council had the power to dispose of its interest in 91-93 High Green at less than best consideration for the well-being benefits offered by the BAC.

Cabinet agreed also to set aside a previous decision to repay the Maintenance Reserve budget £20,000 out of any capital receipt from the disposal of 91-93 High Green.

Given the approach from BAC to offer a service to Cannock Chase residents which was currently not being met, it was appropriate that the Council reconsidered the previous resolution to maximise financial return in respect of 91-93 High Green. The recommendations asked Cabinet to consider the approach from BAC and provide for the terms to be agreed in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Leaders should Cabinet be minded to support the BAC.

The meeting closed at 4.35 p.m.

---

LEADER

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY 30 JULY 2014 AT 3.00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (Chairman)  
Kraujalis, J.T. (Vice-Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.	Fisher, P.A.
Anslow, C.	Freeman, Miss M.
Ball, G.D.	Pearson, A.
Bernard, J.D.	Snape, P.A.
Bottomer, B.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Dean, A.	Todd, R.

**20. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M. Grocott.

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

The following declaration was made which was in addition to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members Interests:

<b>Member</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Type</b>
Kraujalis, J.K.	Application CH/14/0191 – 46 Langdale Drive, Cannock – single storey rear extension.	Personal

*Resident of Langdale Drive.*

Councillor J.D. Bernard also advised that as Chairman of Norton Canes Parish Council he had seen applications CH/13/045, CH/13/0020 and CH/14/0126 at parish level, but had not been involved in determining the applications.

**22. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

None disclosed.

### **23. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 09 July, 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed.

### **24. Members' Requests for Site Visits**

There were no requests for site visits.

### **25. Application CH/14/0191 – 46 Langdale Drive, Cannock – Single storey rear extension**

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.83 – 6.91 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager provided the Committee with the following update:-

- 3 letters had been received from residents in neighbouring properties stating they were satisfied with the application submitted.

Prior to consideration of the application, representations were made by Mrs M. Price (*Objector to the application*) and Mr W. Curtis (*the Applicant*).

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report and for the reasons stated therein.

### **26. Application CH/14/0158 – The Royal British Legion, Bow Street, Rugeley – Demolition of existing club and erection of 4 No.2 bedroom houses**

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.18 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager provided the Committee with the following update:-

- Following receipt of the application officers became aware of an electricity sub-station being located on the application site. If the Committee is minded to approve the application, then the owners of the sub-station will be consulted about the application.

Prior to consideration of the application, representations were made by Councillor C. Bennett (*Objector to the application*) and Mr R. Carr (*Agent for the Applicant*).

## RESOLVED

That the application be refused as the proposal would result in over-development of the site which would appear incongruous and out of character with the area. Consequently, the intensification of development would result in insufficient parking for the proposed development in an area, which already suffers from lack of on-street parking; to the detriment of the amenity of nearby residents and businesses. As such, the proposal conflicts with policies CP3 and CP15 of the Adopted Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1); Supplementary Planning Document – Parking Standards, Travel Plans and Developer Contributions for Sustainable Transport and the NPPF.

### **27. Application CH/13/0445 – Land to north of 270 Norton East Road, Norton Canes – Residential Development – Erection of 14 houses comprising 4 No.2 bedroom houses, 6 No.3 bedroom houses, 4 No.4 bedroom houses and associated works**

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.33 – 6.53 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager provided the Committee with the following updates:-

- Condition 8 (shown as blank in the report) would require a Coal Mining Risk Assessment to be undertaken if the Committee were minded to approve the application.
- Financial contributions received toward provision of affordable housing would be based on the relevant formula rather than the figure stated in paragraph 4.38 of the application, which was based on current house prices.
- The Council's Trees, Landscaping and Countryside team have stated they have no objections to the application.
- Concerns had been raised locally about potential flood risks which could be caused by the proposed development; however neither the Environment Agency nor Staffordshire County Council's Flood Risk Management team had raised any objections to the application.

Prior to consideration of the application, representations were made by Councillor J. Preece (*Objector to the Application*) (*via a statement which was read out on his behalf by the Development Control Manager*) and Mr C. Timothy (*Agent for the Applicant*).

## RESOLVED

That:

- (A) The Applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the following:

1. A financial contribution towards mitigating the impact of the

proposed development on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation of £450 per net additional dwelling

2. A financial contribution towards the off site provision of affordable housing. The formula to be used for calculating contributions from site below 15 dwellings is extracted from the Council's Evidence base report "Economic Viability Assessment of Future Development of Affordable Housing in Cannock Chase" (2014 Adams Integra)

- (B) On completion of the Agreement the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report and for the reasons stated therein.

**28. Application CH/13/0020 – 71 Burntwood Road, Norton Canes – Outline planning permission for erection of 65 No. houses and associated works (outline, access and layout) and retention of 71 Burntwood Road**

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.54 – 6.82 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager provided the following updates:-

- Staffordshire County Council Highways have requested resolution of technical issues which feature on the drawings for application and inclusion of conditions requiring a refuse strategy and traffic management plan for the site, to include details of off-site highways works and provision of appropriate drainage and lighting.
- A letter had been received from Norton Canes Parish Council stating they were happy for bungalows to be provided on site opposite Legion Close, however there were still concerns regarding car parking issues which would directly affect the schools.
- A letter had been received from Severn Trent Water requesting that condition 4 not be discharged if the application was approved.
- Residents of one property in Legion Close had raised concerns that the proposed development would still be too close to existing properties.
- A letter and a petition had been received from other residents in Legion Close stating they were happy that initial concerns about the proposed development had been dealt with.
- Comments on the application from the Council's Trees, Landscaping and Countryside team were still awaited.
- Two additional conditions to be included requiring a 'reptile mitigation strategy' and biodiversity management plan' to be produced.

Prior to consideration of the application, representations were made by Mr Bagley and Mrs Mason (*Objectors to the application*) and Mr C. Timothy (*Agent for the Applicant*).

## RESOLVED

That:

- (A) The Applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
1. The provision of 20% affordable housing on the application site.
  2. An education contribution of £154,434.
  3. A financial contribution towards mitigating the impact of the proposed development on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation of £450 per net additional dwelling.
  4. A financial contribution towards the provision of off site open space, sport and recreation based on the Council's Developer Contribution SPD.
  5. A financial contribution towards the off site provision of indoor sports facilities based on the Council's Developer SPD.
  6. A financial contribution towards the off site provision of health facilities based on the Council's Developer Contribution SPD.
  7. The provision of on site open space/ cycle paths and balancing ponds and reptile habitat and arrangement for their future maintenance.
- (B) On completion of the Agreement the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report and for the reasons stated therein and to the following additions conditions:-
- (i) Requiring a 'reptile mitigation strategy' and biodiversity management plan'.
  - (ii) Any other conditions and informatives required by Staffordshire County Council Highways.

### **29. Application CH/14/0126 – Land south of Red Lion Lane, Norton Canes – Residential Development, erection of 130 dwellings**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.92 – 6.119 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager provided the following updates:-

- Council Ecologist Update – Some detailed information had been provided by the applicant to deal with biodiversity mitigation as part of discharging a condition in respect of the outline planning consent for the application site (CH/12/0078). Other matters would be dealt through the landscape details.
- No response had yet been received from the Council's, Landscaping team, hence why several landscaping conditions were currently attached to the application. In the event that such details are agreed prior to the issue of consent, such conditions may not be necessary.
- Comments from consultees such as Staffordshire County Council Highways, the Environment Agency and the Staffordshire Police Crime Design Prevention Officer would be included as informatives

in the decision notice.

Prior to consideration of the application, representations were made by Councillor Mrs. P.Z. Stretton (*Objector the application*) and Mr C. May from Pegasus Planning (*Representative of the Applicant*).

The Development Control Manager advised Committee that the issue raised by Councillor Stretton in respect of the provision of an alternative form of play area to the proposed Multi Use Games Area (MUGA), was not a matter for consideration under planning application CH/14/0126. The appropriate way to deal with this would be via Condition 6 of the outline planning permission CH/12/0078, which was yet to be discharged and any subsequent variation of the S106 Agreement relating to that planning permission (CH/12/0078).

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the application be approved subject to the necessary conditions contained in the report and for the reasons stated therein.
- (B) That delegated powers being granted to the Development Control Manager and Economic Development & Planning Portfolio Leader to resolve the issue of provision of suitable play equipment on the application site via the discharge of condition 6 of planning permission CH/12/0078.
- (C) That delegated authority be given to the Council's Development Control Manager to authorise the completion of a Deed of Variation to the Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 completed on the 6 June 2014 if necessary to enable the agreed play provision to be provided.

**30. Application CH/14/0149 – The Tackeroo, Bracken Close, Hednesford, Cannock – Residential Development – 13 No.2 bedroom apartments**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.19 – 6.31 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED

That:

- (A) The Applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 to secure the following:-
  1. A financial contribution towards the provision of off site affordable housing. The formula to be used for calculating contributions from sites below 15 dwellings is extracted from the Council's Evidence base report 'Economic Viability Assessment of Future Development of Affordable Housing in Cannock Chase' (2014 Adams Integra).

2. A financial contribution towards mitigating the impact of the proposed development on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation of £450 pre net additional dwelling
  3. A financial contribution towards the provision of off site open space of £653.45 per 1 bedroom dwelling to be constructed; £1306.90 per 2 bedroom dwelling to be constructed; £1960.35 per 3 bedroom dwelling to be constructed; £2,613.80 per 4 bedroom dwelling to be constructed.
- (B) On completion of the Agreement the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report and for the reasons stated therein.

The meeting closed at 4:55pm

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY 13 AUGUST, 2014 AT 3.00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.	Fisher, P.A.
Anslow, C.	Freeman, Miss M.
Ball, G.D.	Pearson, A.
Bernard, J.D.	Snape, P.A.
Bottomer, B.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Dean, A.	Todd, R.

**31. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. Kraujalis and M. Grocott.

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

No further declarations were made in addition to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members Interests.

**33. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

Councillor P. Fisher declared that he had been lobbied by the Parish Council and a number of neighbours in respect of Application CH/14/0183, Amazon UK, Towers Business Park, Rugeley.

**34. Minutes**

The Development Control Manager made the following comments in relation to the minutes:-

With regard to Minute 27 – CH/13/0445, Land to north of 270 Norton East Road, Norton Canes a condition regarding protective fencing had been included

Minute 28 (B) to read “.....and to the following additional conditions:-

Requiring a “reptile mitigation strategy” .....

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 30 July, 2014 be approved as a correct record subject to the amendments outlined above.

**35. Members' Requests for Site Visits**

There were no requests for site visits.

**36. Application CH/14/0183, Amazon UK, Towers Business Park, Power Station Road, Rugeley, External alterations to existing warehouse building, incorporating altered pedestrian entrance on north east frontage; alterations to site access including new gate house and facilities for lorry drivers; new on-site lorry parking, additional car parking (344 spaces), circulation arrangements and associated works (amended plans and additional information)**

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.21 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that a letter had been received from the applicant's agent suggesting that some of the conditions listed in the report were not necessary or should be reworded and requesting that Condition 14 be removed. In response he commented that he was seeking delegated authority to amend some of the conditions as necessary so that they did not impact on Amazon's operations. Additionally he wanted Condition 14 to be retained as it was considered essential.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Henry Lowe, General Manager (Amazon Rugeley) who was in support of the application.

RESOLVED:

(A) That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

(B) That delegated authority be granted to the Development Control Manager to amend some of the conditions as necessary so that they did not impact on Amazon's operations and that Condition 14 be retained.

**37. Application CH/14/0225, 5 & 7 Ironstone Road, Cannock – residential development, demolition of 5 & 7 Ironstone Road and erection of a row of three 2 & 3 bedroom terrace houses and a detached 2 bedroom bungalow**

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.22 – 6.41 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Quinn who was objecting to the application.

The Development Control Manager read out a statement on behalf of Midland Heart (applicant) which attempted to address the concerns being raised by the objector. It was agreed that a copy of the letter be forwarded to the objector.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

1. The proposed development would introduce a terrace of dwellings to the front with small gardens and a bungalow and a parking court to the rear of the application site, which would be out of character with the surrounding pattern of development, which comprises detached dwellings set in large gardens. Furthermore, the bungalow and car park when viewed from neighbouring dwellings and Ironstone Road would appear incongruous and have an adverse impact on the amenity of neighbours and the wider street scene. As such, the proposal represents poor design and is contrary to the aims of Policy CP3 of the adopted Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part1) 2014, and the NPPF, which seek to secure high quality design and amenity.

2. The activity and noise associated with the movement of vehicles on the proposed parking court would have an adverse impact on the amenity of existing neighbours and occupiers of the proposed dwellings by way of noise and disturbance. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy CP3 of the adopted Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1) 2014, and the NPPF, which seek to safeguard the amenity of residents.

3. The tandem nature of two parking spaces and overall location of the proposed parking court would be an impractical parking solution for a communal parking area. This would reduce parking available to the development and limit its usage, which may result in convenience parking by new residents along the un-adopted road to the front of the site at the inconvenience of existing residents. As such, the proposal is contrary to Policy CP3 of the adopted Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1) 2014, and the NPPF, which seek to secure high quality design and safeguard the amenity of residents.

The meeting closed at 3.30 pm

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE**  
**TUESDAY 05 AUGUST 2014 AT 10:00AM**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT:  
Councillors

Grice, Mrs. D. (Chairman)  
Dudson, A. (Vice-Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.	Hardman, B.
Anslow, C.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Bottomer, B.	Todd, R. (substitute for Preece, J.)
Fisher, P.A.	

**7. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J. Preece, who was substituted by Councillor R. Todd.

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

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

**9. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 7 July, 2014, be approved as a correct record and signed.

**10. Licensing Sub-Committees Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Licensing Sub-Committees held on 29 May and 12 June, 2014 be noted.

**11. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting because of the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in paragraph 2, Part 1, Schedule 12A Local Government Act, 1972 (as amended).

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE**  
**TUESDAY 05 AUGUST 2014 AT 10:00AM**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 2**

**12. Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication report of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 6.1 – 6.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chairman invited all those present to introduce themselves and outlined the procedure to be followed at the Hearing. All parties confirmed their understanding of the procedure.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority presented the Council's case by taking the Committee through the report outlining the relevant issues for consideration.

The Driver and Members of the Committee were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer. No questions were asked.

The Driver then presented his case to the Committee.

Members of the Committee and the Officer of the Licensing Authority were then afforded the opportunity to ask question of the Driver. No questions were asked by the Officer.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Driver were then given the opportunity to sum up their respective cases. No summation was provided.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Driver then left the room in order that the Committee could deliberate in private, accompanied by the Council's Legal Adviser and Secretary to the Committee.

Following deliberation, the Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Driver returned to the meeting, and the Chairman read out the decision of the Committee:

RESOLVED:

The Committee was of the view that the Driver was still a fit and proper person to hold a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence.

However, the Committee does wish to issue the Driver with a formal warning as to his future conduct and that he should take this warning seriously.

### Reasons for the Decision

The Committee took a dim view about persons, particularly taxi drivers who were licensed by this Authority, who litter the streets of the Cannock Chase District.

The Committee was concerned that the Driver had been caught littering by Council Officers twice within a period of only one month at the same location.

### **13. Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver**

*Prior to the consideration of this report, Councillor F.W.C. Allen declared a personal and pecuniary interest in that he knew the Driver concerned, and so left the meeting accordingly and did not return..*

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication report of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 6.1 – 6.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chairman invited all those present to introduce themselves and outlined the procedure to be followed at the Hearing. All parties confirmed their understanding of the procedure.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority presented the Council's case by taking the Committee through the report outlining the relevant issues for consideration.

The Driver and Members of the Committee were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer. No questions were asked.

The Driver then presented his case to the Committee.

Members of the Committee and the Officer of the Licensing Authority were then afforded the opportunity to ask question of the Driver. No questions were asked by the Officer.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Driver were then afforded the opportunity to sum up their respective cases. No summation was provided by the Officer.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Driver then left the room in order that the Committee could deliberate in private, accompanied by the Council's Legal Adviser and Secretary to the Committee.

Following deliberation, the Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Driver returned to the meeting, and the Chairman read out the decision of the Committee:

RESOLVED:

The Committee was of the view that the Driver was still a fit and proper person to hold a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver' Licence.

However, the Committee was concerned as to the two convictions in April 2014 and has decided to:-

1. Issue a warning to the Driver as to the littering offence; and
2. Issue a severe warning to him as to the more serious offence of smoking in a licensed taxi.

Reasons for the Decision

The Committee noted that the Driver admitted both offences and that he has to repay a total of over £800 to the Court.

The Committee noted the Driver's previous good record since first being licensed by the Council in 2001.

The formal warnings, it is hoped, will ensure the Driver does not commit any further offences of this nature in the future.

The meeting closed at 11:30am

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL**  
**FRIDAY 19 SEPTEMBER, 2014 AT 10:00 A.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

Bernard, Mrs. A.F.	Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.
Bennett, C.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.
Bottomer, B.	

**1. Appointment of Chairman**

Councillor C. Bennett was appointed Chairman for the meeting.

**2. Apologies**

No apologies for absence were received.

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

No declarations of interest were made.

**4. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

That the public be excluded from the remainder of the meeting because of the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Paragraphs 2 and 3, Part 1, Schedule 12A, Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).



**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**

**APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL**

**FRIDAY 19 SEPTEMBER, 2014 AT 10:00 A.M.**

**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 2**

**5. Appeal Against Refusal of Tenancy Succession**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 5.1 – 5.13 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

One of the Appellants and a Representative for the Appellant were in attendance to present the Appellants' case.

The Chairman invited all those present to introduce themselves and then outlined the procedure for the Hearing.

The Officer representing the Council presented the Council's case by taking the Panel through the report. The Appellant, Appellant's Representative and Members of the Panel then asked questions of the Officer representing the Council.

The Appellant and Appellant's Representative then presented the Appellant's case to the Panel. The Officer representing the Council and Members were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Appellant. Questions were asked Members only.

The Officer representing the Council and the Appellant and Appellant's Representative were then given the opportunity to sum up their respective cases.

The Panel then deliberated in private, calling on only the Council's Legal Advisor and Senior Committee Officer for advice.

All parties returned to the meeting and the Chairman outlined the decision of the Panel as follows:-

**RESOLVED:**

That the Appeal be allowed to the extent that whilst the Appellants cannot in law succeed to the tenancy, the Panel will allow them to remain in the property and thus they will be granted an Introductory Tenancy of the said property.

**Reasons for Decision**

The Panel carefully considered all relevant factors, issues and the representations made by the Appellants. It accepted that both the law and the Council's Succession Policy were very clear in that there had already been one previous succession to the tenancy and thus a second succession was not permissible.

However the Panel was sympathetic to the Appellants' case and of the specific needs of their family. This was an unusual and genuine case where the Panel was of the view that the property currently being occupied was suitable for their needs.

As the Appellants were unable to succeed to the secure tenancy, the only way they were able to remain in the property was by becoming Introductory Tenants.

The meeting closed at 10:47am

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**CANNOCK COMMUNITY FORUM**  
**WEDNESDAY 25 JUNE, 2014 AT 7.00PM**  
**AT THE CIVIC CENTRE, CANNOCK**

PRESENT: District Councillors:

Kraujalis, J.T. (Chairman)  
Alcott, G. (Vice-Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.                      Toth, J.  
Freeman, Miss M.                Witton, P.  
Mitchell, Mrs. C.

Cannock Chase Council Officers:

Mr. S. Brown, Chief Executive  
Mrs. W. Rowe, Senior Committee Officer

Also Present

Chief Inspector Stephen Morrey, Cannock Chase Local Policing  
Commander, Staffordshire Police  
Local Residents (approximately 16)  
Councillor G. Adamson  
County Councillor Mrs. A. Spicer

**1. Appointment of Chairman and Vice Chairman**

Councillor J.T. Kraujalis was appointed Chairman and Councillor G. Alcott was appointed Vice-Chairman of the Forum for the forthcoming Municipal year.

**2. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from District Councillors C. Anslow, Mrs. M.A. Davis and P.A. Snape.

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

There were no interests declared.

**4. Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 4 March, 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

## **5. Questions for Staffordshire Police – submitted in advance**

Questions from Mr. G. Taylor, local resident:

- 1. Smoking and dealing of cannabis outside fish and chip shop in Westbourne Avenue on a regular basis*
- 2. Speeding on the A34 between Cannock town centre and White Lion Public house – vehicles frequently crossing pedestrian lights when they are showing red*

Chief Inspector Morrey introduced himself to Forum members. He explained that he had been in post for 12 weeks and would endeavour to attend local meetings where possible. His contact details were available on the Staffordshire Police website should anyone wish to contact him.

He had spoken briefly to Mr. Taylor prior to the meeting regarding the questions submitted. The issue regarding smoking and dealing of cannabis outside the fish and chip shop in Westbourne Avenue was not recorded as being a particular problem. Patrols of the area had taken place and these had not picked up anything significant. However, should anyone see anything suspicious they should inform the Police as soon as possible.

He confirmed that the issue of speeding was not only a problem in the area in question. The problem existed throughout the District. He commented that there were proposals to establish a joint initiative with partners to tackle speeding issues in the future.

Mr. Taylor commented that he had witnessed dealing taking place in the area mentioned. The Chief Inspector stated that if the public were witnessing such activities it was important to report it to the Police.

## **6. Questions for Staffordshire County Council Highways – submitted in advance**

Question from Mr. G. Taylor, local resident:-

*“Emptying of gullies on the A34 Stafford Road below Westbourne Avenue, Cannock (the gully on the corner of Cardinal Way is overflowing and has been for years and the gullies outside the new Tesco Express need attention)”*

Mark Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager, Staffordshire County Council Highways provided the following response and a copy of the email had been given to Mr. Taylor:-

“Issues such as blocked gullies can be reported directly to the highways line on 0300 111 8000 or via email [highways@staffordshire.gov.uk](mailto:highways@staffordshire.gov.uk) where the customer will be issued with a unique reference number which then can be used to chase progress.

We currently have a fleet of 7 gully emptying vehicles in Staffordshire, 5 of these vehicles are used on what we refer to as cyclical cleansing where they have a defined programme to work through on a road by road gully by gully basis. The other 2 vehicles in the fleet are what we term as reactive crews, they are split one North and one South of the county, these machines are scheduled works that have been generated from enquiries/inspections and are of a more urgent/reactive nature.

Once reported the reactive crew will attend the problem gully and clear as necessary or determine what further action (if any) is required”.

Mr. Taylor confirmed that he was happy with the response that had been provided and would contact Mr. Keeling outside of the meeting.

## **7. Questions for Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services**

No questions have been submitted in advance of the meeting.

## **8. Potential parking issues associated with Cannock Hospital – questions submitted by Mr. L. Cooper**

Question from Mr. L. Cooper, local resident:

*“With Cannock Hospital due to come under control of the Trust running New Cross, greater use of facilities has to be applauded. However, there will be associated problems, particularly with additional patients, visitors and staff travelling to the venue by car.*

*It is an unfortunate fact of life that, while healthcare is extremely important, the car now impacts heavily on daily routines and causes disruptions that need to be addressed. Main problem is irresponsible parking, particularly by those who don't want to use a car park, and in this respect, students who are also part of the scenario.*

- 1. Has the Trust discussed potential parking problems with authorities in this area – District Council, Police and Highways? If so, with what conclusions? They will be aware of the impact at New Cross and measures needed to reduce it.*
- 2. What will be done to prevent Blue Badge holders creating problems through irresponsible parking on double yellow lines in Brunswick Road – part of measures implemented to alleviate congestion in this area?”*

Mandi Dunbar, Mid Staffs NHS Foundation Trust provided the following response:-

“We have discussed concerns regarding parking, increased activity and access to Cannock Chase Hospital with our colleagues at The Royal Wolverhampton Hospitals NSH Trust, the Trust who will take over responsibility for Cannock Chase Hospital later this year. They are considering this as part of their overall plan for Cannock Chase Hospital”.

Mark Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager, Staffordshire County

Highways provided the following response:-

“In terms of the current situation with parking arrangements on the Public Highway, the County Council are aware of the parking issues on Brunswick Road and checks are carried out by our Civil Parking Officers on a regular basis. We have recently extended the restrictions on Brunswick Road within the residential area, and further restrictions have been supported by the Local Parking Committee in the forward programme”.

The Chief Executive added that he had recently been at a meeting with the Chief Executive of Wolverhampton hospital where it had been noted that car parking was a big issue; the current parking was inadequate and the extra outpatients would add to the problem. He explained that the Civic office staff car parking was also being looked at as additional County Council staff had been working in the building, renting out floors 4, 5 and a section on floor 1 with a proposal to rent out further space. These additional staff would mean that the staff car park would become inadequate. Joint solutions were being considered to address this problem and the hospital would need to find capital monies.

A District Councillor commented that she had attended a public meeting today where the Chief Executive of Wolverhampton Hospital had made reference to building a multi-storey car park. The Chief Executive advised that a number of options would be considered and a multi-storey car park had been mentioned as being a potential solution. However, a proposal like that would require planning permission and consultation with the public.

Reference was made to the need to consult the public on such an important issue. It was acknowledged there was a lack of adequate car parking but it was considered important to ensure that charges remained at a reasonable level.

The Leader of the Council stated that the important issue was that Cannock hospital had been saved; parking was a secondary issue. When staff from Wolverhampton transferred to Cannock there would inevitably be issues around parking; however there were proposals to provide a shuttle bus which would help. Discussions with the Trust would continue in order to find a solution.

The issue of the parking of blue badge holders along Brunswick Road was raised and it was acknowledged that this was causing problems and required attention.

Mr. Cooper mentioned the parking of students who did not want to pay car parking charges and were therefore parking on the streets. He commented that the increased restrictions in the Brunswick Road area had pushed the problem further up the road. He made reference to Hamelin Street and Lysander Way where parking problems existed. Access for buses, refuse collection vehicles, ambulances and fire engines was restricted due to the parking in this area. He considered that Staffordshire County Council Highways, Staffordshire Police and the Parking Wardens would need to get together to address these parking problems.

Stephen Morrey commented that although Staffordshire County Council Highways were the lead on this matter he confirmed that a joined up approach

between partners was to way forward and he agreed to look into this.

The Forum noted that it was difficult for Highways Officers to attend all evening meetings that they were asked to attend. It was understood that each Local Parking Committee promoted 4 priorities per year. The Joint Parking Committee prioritised the proposed schemes and it was important to share them out throughout the District. Therefore Forum members should note that it may be some time before the parking problems in this area were resolved.

The Chairman was disappointed that a Highways Officer was not in attendance. It would have been useful for an Officer to be present to address these concerns. He commented that a request would be made to the County Council regarding the possibility of a Highways officer being in attendance at Forum meetings. He also suggested that it would be useful if the County Council Highways team produced a report regarding the parking issues in the Brunswick Road area and this be forwarded to Members of the Forum. Should Members consider it necessary they could request that this matter be placed on the agenda of the next meeting.

## **9. Questions for Cannock Chase District Council – submitted in advance**

### **(A) FRIDAY STREET MARKET:**

Four questions have been submitted regarding the Friday street markets. Questions 1 and 2 are from Glyn Farr and questions 3 and 4 are from Barry Grainger:-

- 1. How was the review of the Friday street market undertaken and will the findings be available for public scrutiny and how was the effect on local traders measured and were the indoor market traders included in the survey ?*
- 2. What are the medium to long term plans for the Indoor Market Hall as other local authorities are investing in their markets to regenerate town centres ?*
- 3. Why has the Council been complicit in setting up a Friday street market in competition to their regular indoor market resulting in the reduction of their regular traders income and consequently risking their ability to pay their weekly Council rent ?*
- 4. Why has the weekly Friday street market continued past the 6 months trial period when the legally signed agreement with Bescot Promotions terminated 6 months from 29 November 2013 and during this trial period the 50% of craft and specialist stalls (Item 5 of the agreement) has rarely been achieved ?*

Glenn Watson, Economic Development and Planning Services Manager and Bob Phillips, Head of Service (LEP Consultant) were unfortunately both on leave week commencing 23 June, 2014 and therefore unable to attend the Forum. Mr. Phillips offered to convene a separate meeting with relevant officers and the Portfolio Leader if required. However, he provided the following response to the questions raised (these were outlined on the agenda):-

1. This information will be available in the report which will be considered by

the July Cabinet meeting. The report will be available to the public and the Council is happy to make this report available to Mr Farr and Mr Grainger as representatives of the indoor market traders.

2. The Council's current medium to long term plans are to continue to do all it can to ensure that the indoor market remains a successful and well occupied market. Over recent years the market has enjoyed good levels of occupancy with on average of some 90% of stalls let. The Council has supported its traders by freezing stall rents for the last 5 years and, when the traders had a local committee, the Council met with them on a regular basis to support market promotions and discuss the investment needs of the market. The Council would like to see the traders reforming their local committee so that promotions and improvements can again be discussed on a regular basis.
3. The Council is committed to trying to improve Cannock town centre as a place to visit and shop. Street markets are a recognised way of bringing vitality and vibrancy into town centres and the Council took an opportunity to test out what a street market could do in Cannock. The impact on the town centre and on the indoor market traders will be the subject of the report to Cabinet. It is quite wrong to suggest that the Council set out to reduce the income of the indoor market traders. Before going ahead with the street market the Council met with a small number of traders from the indoor market whose views were that a street market was worth trialling to see if it could bring more custom into the town centre and ultimately into the indoor market. The actual impact of the market will be considered by Cabinet in July.
4. It is clearly sensible to make a decision on the future of the street market while it is still operating. Unfortunately, because of the lateness of the elections this year, there was no meeting of Cabinet in May and the first meeting post the end of May is in July. The agreement to operate the street market was extended to take in the Cabinet meeting. The ability of the market to achieve the percentage of craft and specialist stalls sought in the trial agreement will be considered by Cabinet in July.

Barry Grainger commented that he was satisfied with the response provided and understood that it would be discussed at the forthcoming Cabinet meeting. He said that, speaking on behalf of the Cannock Traders, it was difficult to understand why the Council was risking an asset that brings in a regular income; traders were not making a profit because of the increased competition from the street market.

The Chief Executive advised that the District Councillors wanted to see the town centre be a success and to increase vitality and footfall and this must be of benefit to all. If nothing was done there was a chance the town centre would have further deteriorated. A decision had therefore been made to try and revitalise the town centre by trialling the Friday street markets. Cabinet in July would be considering the way forward with the street market. There were three options to consider – (i) cease to run a street market, (ii) continue on a weekly basis or (iii) to continue less frequently. He confirmed that the report would be a public document.

Glyn Farr made reference to the state of the indoor market and considered that work was required to improve such things as the lighting and toilets – anything

that would attract customers and traders. He added that other local authorities had provided money to improve their existing markets; however Cannock Council had decided to opt for a street market instead. He asked whether there was any money available to make the indoor market more attractive.

The Chief Executive advised that Cabinet could consider the matter of investment in the indoor market when discussing the report at their meeting in July. He also asked the two representatives from the indoor market to note that the Council would like to see the traders reforming their local committee so discussions could take place on a regular basis. He also commented that a number of Cabinet members were in attendance at the Forum and had heard the discussions and feelings of the traders.

Mrs. Haywood, a local resident made reference to the street market which she considered was operating illegally. She also mentioned the "Freedom March" taking place in the town centre on Friday 27 June involving Armed Forces personnel. She sought assurances that the street market would not be blocking the route.

The Chief Inspector assured the Forum that a number of key partners had been involved in planning the Freedom March and had worked closely together to organise this event. Operational plans had been established to ensure the route would not be blocked by the street market.

Mrs. C. Salmon, representative of Friends of Cannock Park commented that she had sympathy for the indoor market traders. She considered that if the Friday street market was affecting their trade to the extent that they could no longer continue trading this would have an effect on the Tuesday and Saturday markets too. She also commented that a number of the Friday street market traders were not displaying a trading name so customers were unaware of whom they were buying goods from. Additionally she asked whether checks were being made to establish if the traders were legal and were paying the relevant insurance. She made reference to the market operator who, she was led to believe, was only paying a £22 consent fee for 40 stalls and questioned how this could be fair to the other traders. She considered any income should come to Cannock Council and not to the market operator.

The representatives from the indoor market advised that the majority of the street market traders were from out of town so money was going out of the District; whereas the indoor market traders were all local people.

The Chief Executive confirmed that a number of Cabinet Members were in attendance and making notes on what was being said. These issues would all be taken into account in the July Cabinet meeting when the matter was discussed.

**(B) COMMUNITY FORUMS:**

Question from Graham Burnett (Cannock Chase Resident):-

**Are the current Council Community Forums format the most effect means of communicating with the residents of the district on matters that concern**

**them?**

*What do they cost the Council to host and are they an effective use of Police and Council officer's time, and other resources, in answering questions that appear often to be raised only by Councillors for their own benefit when they have access to information from Council Officers through their normal duties?*

*Could the expense and resource spent on Community Forums be used more effectively elsewhere for better value to the local community?*

*Can the Council prove forums are effective given that only Councillors and other officials are recorded as attending in the minutes? How can the all-important levels of local resident participation and attendance be monitored effectively as there is no apparent means of recording these beyond a vague head count?*

*Has this Council done any work in assessing the Forums effectiveness and considering any other means of engaging with a wider audience of residents on the issues discussed at Forums?*

*The election of Forum Chair and Vice Chair is restricted to only Councillors from the local wards and voting is restricted to themselves. How can this process be justified as a democratic one when the Forums claim to represent the local residents and yet they allow no permanent representation on them?*

*Can we be assured that these forums are an effective means of influencing Council policy by residents and not simply a box tick exercise to fulfil a criteria set simply to impress external auditors or verifiers of the Councils own processes?*

The following response has been provided by Steve Partridge, Democratic Services Manager:-

“The Council would like to thank Mr. Burnett for raising concerns about the effectiveness of its four Community Forums as a means of communicating and engaging with local residents. The Council itself has identified the need to review the Community Forums, and has included it in the Transformation Priority Delivery Plan for 2014-15, and will be undertaking a consultation / review exercise later in the year. The issues raised will be included as part of this consultation.

The forums, which were initially set up a number of years ago, meet on a quarterly basis in each of the four main population areas within the district, i.e. Cannock; Heath Hayes, Norton Canes and Rawsley; Hednesford; and Rugeley and Brereton, and form part of the Council's annual Calendar of Meetings. They are intended as a means of discussion on any matters of local concern, i.e. relating to the relevant Wards therein, which may be raised by members of the public or the relevant Ward Members; they are also intended as a means of consultation on, for example, planning or budgetary matters.

In order to ensure that appropriate Officers can be in attendance, if required, i.e. as opposed to having a number of representatives present 'just in case', we ask that questions be submitted in advance. This is particularly the case if questions

are of a technical nature or relate to an area that is not the Council's responsibility, such as highways or Police matters; or any other potential invitees, such as the Fire and Rescue Service or local Health Trust.

The Police; relevant County Councillors; and local Parish / Town Councillors, plus representatives from local Health Authority / Trust; local Voluntary Organisations; local Residents' Associations; and local business organisations, where known, are all invited to attend, as is the local MP, and members are given advance notice of the meetings and asked to publicise them on notice boards etc to encourage public attendance. However, it is recognised that public attendance / participation is limited. This could be for a number of reasons, including those referred to.

Finally, the Council would like to give an assurance that the forums are not simply a tick box exercise; however, as previously mentioned it shares the concerns about their ongoing effectiveness and plans to undertake a consultation / review exercise later in the year.

If members of the public would like to participate in the proposed review, any ideas or suggestions on how they could be improved should be emailed to [membersservices@cannockchasedc.gov.uk](mailto:membersservices@cannockchasedc.gov.uk) using the title 'Review of Community Forums'. Any ideas or suggestions will be considered as part of the proposed review".

The views of Forum members on the proposed consultation / review exercise were welcomed. Some members of the public suggested that the venue of the Chamber was intimidating; it was a public forum and the public should feel part of the meeting. The Chairman explained that the public were not restricted to sitting in the public/press area at Forum meetings; they could sit closer to the front and therefore feel more part of the meeting.

The Vice-Chairman reiterated the comments he made at the last meeting explaining that alternative venues had been used for the Forums in the past; none of which were considered to be any better than the Chamber. However, any suggestions for alternative venues would be considered.

Members of the public considered that unless there was a major issue on the Forum agendas it was difficult to attract attendance. The public in attendance at the meeting were of the opinion that the Community Forum's were useful and that's why they attended the meetings. However, they were not happy with Officers providing written answers on the agenda and not attending the Forum. They would prefer Officers to be at the meeting as well so that any further questions could be addressed. It was further suggested that the advertising of the meetings could be improved and providing a microphone would help people hear the proceedings better. The Chief Executive explained that there was no budget for the Forums and both of these issues had cost implications. The press were informed of the meetings and usually printed an article advertising that they were taking place.

He encouraged the public to get involved in the consultation / review as their views were important and would be considered.

## 10. Mid Staffs NHS Foundation Trust - Update

Mandi Dunbar, Personal Assistant to Jeff Crawshaw, Deputy Chief Executive, Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust has provided the following update:-

*“Our Directors have concluded that, as the Trust continues to be going through the Trust Special Administration (TSA) process, it would not be appropriate for them to attend the Community Forums at this time. The Directors would like to assure local people that services at both Cannock Chase and Stafford Hospitals continue as usual and would encourage people to continue to use them as appropriate.*

*If there are any specific questions on the day-to-day business of the hospitals, we would be very pleased to email you answers/updates from the Directors.*

*If you have any questions around the TSA process and future of services, these would need to be addressed to the TSA. Please let me know if you'd like me to put you in touch with them.*

*The TSA can be contacted at: [www.tsa-msft.org.uk/contact-us](http://www.tsa-msft.org.uk/contact-us) or for confidential matters at: [TSApublic@MidStaffs.nhs.uk](mailto:TSApublic@MidStaffs.nhs.uk)”*

District Councillors were disappointed with the response provided and that there was no representative from the NHS Trust in attendance at this meeting or previous meetings. It was considered that in view of recent events representatives should attend and provide an explanation.

The Chief Executive suggested that a letter be forwarded to the NHS Trust to advise them that the Forum was concerned about the update that had been provided and that there was no representative from the Trust in attendance.

## 11. Update on the position of the negotiations in respect of the Asda s.106 monies for the Artificial Turf Pitch

The Chief Executive explained that a press release was issued on 1 April 2014 and this was outlined on the agenda:

### **FUNDING DISPUTE SETTLED**

*Over £500,000 will be invested in sports facilities in the District after a long-running dispute between Cannock Chase Council and Asda was resolved. The dispute centred on the use of £527,500 Section 106 funding received by the Council from Asda in May 2005 as part of the construction of their Avon Road store in Cannock.*

*Fresh negotiations between the Council and Asda have now resulted in an agreement. The Council will retain the £527,500 for investment in a sports and recreation hub at the former Cannock Stadium site and return to Asda the interest accrued on this amount. These funds will be used in conjunction with other funds and granted funding bids to establish new sports and recreation facilities on this site following an extension public consultation last year.*

*The £527,500 has to be spent within six years and Asda will be given proper recognition as being the co-funder of any sports facilities delivered by the funding.*

*Councillor George Adamson, Cannock Chase Council Leader, said "I am pleased that this long-standing dispute has been resolved and that the funds are now protected for investment in sports facilities in the District".*

*Doug Wilson, Head of UK Property Communications said "We are delighted that the issue has been resolved and that the funds will be invested into sports facilities that will benefit the local community".*

The Chief Executive commented that he was delighted this matter had now been resolved and that the money would be invested into sports facilities in the District.

The Leader of the Council wished to place on record his thanks to the Legal team who had pursued this matter over the years. He was pleased that the money would be invested in a sports and recreation hub at the former Cannock Stadium site. The Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader also commented that she was pleased that this had been resolved after years of dispute. She confirmed that it was anticipated that work would commence at the Stadium early next year.

Christine Salmon was thanked for her help in establishing that covenants existed on the Stadium land. These covenants placed restrictions on the land and stated that certain areas had to be used for leisure purposes.

## **12. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings**

Questions were invited from members of the public and these would be included on the Agenda for the next meeting. Any questions from members of the public should be submitted on the form available at the meeting. Submission of written questions in advance will ensure that appropriate representatives can be invited to attend meetings to debate the issues and answer any questions.

## **13. Date of Next Meeting**

The next meeting will be held on Tuesday 16 September, 2014 at 7.00pm.

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**HEATH HAYES, NORTON CANES AND RAWNSLEY COMMUNITY FORUM**  
**MONDAY 30 JUNE, 2014 AT 7.00 P.M.**  
**AT PROSPECT VILLAGE HALL, WILLIAMSON AVENUE, RAWNSLEY**

PRESENT: Councillors

Bernard, J.D. (Chairman)  
Buttery, M.S. (Vice-Chairman)

Bernard, Mrs. A.F.    Spicer, Mrs. A.  
Dean, A.                Stretton, Mrs. P.Z.  
Hardman, B.            Todd, Mrs. D.

Other Councillors Present: Bottomer, B.H.  
Todd, B.

Officers:                    T. McGovern, Corporate Director  
                                  J. Hunt, Senior Committee Officer  
                                  M. Walker, Environmental Protection Manager

Also present:                Members of the Public – approximately 15  
                                  PCSO Dale  
                                  J. Beddows, Norton Canes Parish Council  
                                  L. Bullock, Heath Hayes & Wimblebury Parish  
                                  Council

**1.        Appointment of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**

Councillor J.D. Bernard was appointed Chairman and Councillor M.S. Buttery was appointed Vice-Chairman of the Heath Hayes, Norton Canes and Rawnsley Community Forum for the forthcoming Municipal Year.

**2.        Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M.J. Holder and J. Preece.

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

There were no interests declared.

**4.        Notes**

The Notes of the meeting held on 24 March, 2014 were agreed as a correct record.

## **5. Questions for Staffordshire Police**

PCSO Liz Dale was in attendance.

### **Stray Dogs**

A local resident raised concern that her call had never been dealt with which was made to the Police in June concerning a stray dog. The resident reported that the dog was vicious and posed a risk to other dog walkers and members of the public. She reported that she then made a call to the Council who advised that the Council no longer had a dog warden service, however if the dog was caught and contained then the Council's contractor could collect the stray dog.

The Council's Environmental Protection Manager reported that the Council now used a contractor to pick up stray dogs. He explained the procedure and advised the public that the best course of action was to contain a stray dog, the Council's contractor would then pick the dog up which would be taken to a kennel. Should the owner wish to have their dog released, a fee would be incurred and collection would need to be made within 7 days.

### **Speeding Traffic**

Members of the public expressed concern with regard to speeding vehicles coming from the Green Pipe at Littleworth Road into Sevens Road which then meets with Cannock Wood Road. They were concerned as speed restrictions were not being adhered to which could lead to accidents. The public were keen to know if any speed reducing measures could be considered.

It was reported that speed reducing measures would need to be considered by Staffordshire County Council Highways and that this matter would be reported back to them. PCSO Dale reported that the Police could conduct some speed checks in the area and also advised that Speedwatch were trying to set up a group in Cannock Wood. Community Speedwatch was also present.

## **6. Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services**

It was reported that there were no questions received.

## **7. Questions received for Staffordshire County Council (Highways)**

The following questions were submitted by Mr. Gibbs, Local Resident.

**The following questions were submitted by Mr. Gibbs, Local Resident**

**(1) When will John street Wimblebury be properly resurfaced?**

John Street Wimblebury – Surfacing – the Highways Department acknowledges the current condition of John Street in Wimblebury. They cannot provide dates of reconstruction at this time until further budgetary information is available in order to form future programmes. In the meantime their maintenance teams will monitor and make the necessary repairs to identified defects.

**(2) It has been said that to cover Staffs between Kinver and Stoke there is only one Highways Inspector. Is this true?**

There are approximately 15 Highway Inspector's across the County divided up within given areas; these include the re-active inspectors who will deal with enquiries from the public and urgent defects.

**(3) Is there any inspection of highway repair or surfacing, and if so are their reports available for public scrutiny?**

All recorded defects are recorded on a system (IHMS) and a list of all defects in the area was provided at the previous forum (2 December 2013). However, printing lists is of little value as issues change hourly as defects are repaired and reported. A list of recently repaired defects are available on the website

[www.staffordshire.gov.uk/transport/staffshighways/abouthighways/Potholes2.aspx](http://www.staffordshire.gov.uk/transport/staffshighways/abouthighways/Potholes2.aspx)

**(4) Why when Forum Minutes clearly identify a need for a response is none made?**

Staffordshire County Council always provides a response for public forums when required. At this particular forum no questions were submitted in advance therefore, no officers were required to attend. The demand on officer's time for evening meetings is extensive and the Council does not have the resources to attend them all. Staffordshire County Council covers as many of the Cannock Chase forums as possible where required.

When unable to do so, and a question has been submitted in advance a written response may be provided for inclusion in the agenda and/or read out by the Chair of the forum. Staffordshire County Council Officers are available for the public to speak to during office hours five days a week. If members of the public wish to raise any questions or speak to Highways officers directly then this can be done by calling 0300 111 8000 or via email - [highways@staffordshire.gov.uk](mailto:highways@staffordshire.gov.uk)

**The following question was raised at the last Community Forum**

**A question was put forward regarding the amount of expenditure for each of the district/boroughs within the County regarding spending on the highway for the last financial year 2013/2014**

It would be difficult to give specifics based on the extensive amount of maintenance activities that are undertaken across the 3,500 miles of road in Staffordshire. Over a £million was spent in surfacing alone within the Cannock Chase District areas last year. However, there are many other maintenance activities that are undertaken such as drainage, signals, streetlights, winter maintenance, signs, lines etc. Information on expenditure is published on the Staffordshire website

In response to a question raised by a member of the public, the Chairman reported that there were 14 more Highway Inspectors with 1 Inspector covering between Stafford and Stoke.

**8. Question raised at the last Community Forum**

**Confirmation had been sought as to how the system for recording complaints was handled by the Council's Contact Centre. This followed a complaint being made in respect of fly tipping, which resulted in no report number being issued and as a consequence, the matter had taken 3 weeks to resolve.**

**The following response was provided by the Council's Environmental Protection Manager:-**

Reports of fly tipping are received in the Council's Contact Centre where they are initially logged and then referred to Environmental Services (Waste and Engineering Services) for removal. Removal is carried out as soon as practicable, generally within three working days. However, in the case of larger deposits of waste the need to engage a private Waste Disposal Contractor may extend this period. Delays in the removal of waste may also arise when the waste is dumped on private land.

Where evidence of the fly tipper or producer of the waste is available, the Environmental Health (Environmental Protection Team) will be involved in relation to any enforcement action.

The member of the public who initially raised concern asked why he was never given a reference number from the Council's Contact Centre and why it had taken over 3 weeks to resolve.

The Council's Environmental Protection Manager reported that the item in question which required removal was large and this contributed towards the delay. He explained that if the item was causing an obstruction onto the highway it would have been removed quicker. He also advised that where a complaint was submitted to the Contact Centre, a reference number was usually provided to the customer. He could not provide

details on this particular complaint which was submitted, however he would check with the Council's Contact Centre to see if a reference number had been generated.

**9. Question received by Member of the Public**

The following question has been submitted by Mr. G. Burnett, local resident.

**Are the current Council Community Forums format the most effective means of communicating with the residents of the district on matters that concern them.**

“What do they cost the Council to host and are they an effective use of Police and Council officer's time, and other resources, in answering questions that appear often to be raised only by Councillors for their own benefit when they have access to information from Council Officers through their normal duties

Could the expense and resource spent on Community Forums be used more effectively elsewhere for better value to the local community

Can the Council prove forums are effective given that only Councillors and other official are recorded as attending in the minutes .How can the all-important levels of local resident participation and attendance be monitored effectively as there is no apparent means of recording these beyond a vague head count

Has this Council done any work in assessing the Forums effectiveness and considering other any means of engaging with a wider audience of residents on the issues discussed at Forums

The election of Forum Chair and Vice Chair is restricted to only Councillors from the local wards and voting is restricted to themselves How can this process be justified as a democratic one when the Forums claim to represent the local residents and yet they allow no permanent representation on them?

Can we be assured that these forums are an effective means of influencing Council policy by residents and not simply a box tick exercise to fulfil a criteria set simply to impress external auditors or verifiers of the Councils own processes”.

**The following response has been provided by the Council's Democratic Services Manager:-**

The Council would like to thank Mr. Burnett for raising concerns about the effectiveness of its four Community Forums as a means of

communicating and engaging with local residents. The Council itself has identified the need to review the Community Forums, and has included it in the Transformation Priority Delivery Plan for 2014-15, and will be undertaking a consultation / review exercise later in the year. The issues raised will be included as part of this consultation.

The forums, which were initially set up a number of years ago, meet on a quarterly basis in each of the four main population areas within the district, i.e. Cannock; Heath Hayes, Norton Canes and Rawnsley; Hednesford; and Rugeley and Brereton, and form part of the Council's annual Calendar of Meetings. They are intended as a means of discussion on any matters of local concern, i.e. relating to the relevant Wards therein, which may be raised by members of the public or the relevant Ward Members; they are also intended as a means of consultation on, for example, planning or budgetary matters.

In order to ensure that appropriate Officers can be in attendance, if required, i.e. as opposed to having a number of representatives present 'just in case', we ask that questions be submitted in advance. This is particularly the case if questions are of a technical nature or relate to an area that is not the Council's responsibility, such as highways or Police matters; or any other potential invitees, such as the Fire and Rescue Service or local Health Trust.

The Police; relevant County Councillors; and local Parish / Town Councillors, plus representatives from local Health Authority / Trust; local Voluntary Organisations; local Residents' Associations; and local business organisations, where known, are all invited to attend, as is the local MP, and members all are given advance notice of the meetings and asked to publicise them on notice boards etc to encourage public attendance. However, it is recognised that public attendance / participation is limited. This could be for a number of reasons, including those referred to.

Finally, the Council would like to give an assurance that the forums are not simply a tick box exercise; however, as previously mentioned it shares the concerns about their ongoing effectiveness and plans to undertake a consultation / review exercise later in the year.

If members of the public would like to participate in the proposed review, any ideas or suggestions on how they could be improved should be emailed to [membersservices@cannockchasedc.gov.uk](mailto:membersservices@cannockchasedc.gov.uk) using the title 'Review of Community Forums'. Any ideas or suggestions made will be considered as part of the proposed review.

Members of the public discussed the lack of advertising of the Heath Hayes, Norton Canes and Rawnsley Community Forum and asked that the Forum also be advertised at Prospect Village Hall in the future. There was some confusion in respect of ownership of the notice board which would need to be pursued further.

## 10. Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust

Mandi Dunbar, Personal Assistant to Jeff Crawshaw, Deputy Chief Executive, Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust has provided the following update:-

“Our Directors have concluded that, as the Trust continues to be going through the Trust Special Administration (TSA) process, it would not be appropriate for them to attend the Community Forums at this time. The Directors would like to assure local people that services at both Cannock Chase and Stafford Hospitals continue as usual and would encourage people to continue to use them as appropriate.

If there are any specific questions on the day-to-day business of the hospitals, we would be very pleased to email you answers/updates from the Directors.

If you have any questions around the TSA process and future of services, these would need to be addressed to the TSA. Please let me know if you'd like me to put you in touch with them.

The TSA can be contacted at: [www.tsa-msft.org.uk/contact-us](http://www.tsa-msft.org.uk/contact-us) or for confidential matters at: [TSApublic@MidStaffs.nhs.uk](mailto:TSApublic@MidStaffs.nhs.uk)”

The Council's Corporate Director reported that The University Hospital of North Staffordshire would take over running the services of Stafford Hospital, and the Royal Wolverhampton Trust would take over the running of Cannock Chase Hospital which was planned from November.

It was reported that Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group would be putting forward a range of proposals for the Minor Injuries Unit at Cannock Chase Hospital which was due to be published sometime this summer.

Members of the public and representatives requested that a letter be forwarded to Mid Staffs NHS Foundation Trust with a request that representatives attend future Community Forums.

The Forum discussed the Minor Injuries Unit at Cannock Chase Hospital and concern was expressed with the proposal for GPs to take over the service and change the hours it operated. It was also reported that x-ray machines were located in the hospital but not being used on patients who could be left to travel to Stafford if they had a suspected fracture.

The Corporate Director advised that these issues could be raised as part of the planned consultation by Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group on changes to the MIU service. The Forum was keen to see public participation when the consultation process commenced and hoped a public meeting would take place in Cannock. The Corporate Director

agreed to pass this request onto the CCG.

**11. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings**

The Chairman reported that the next Forum was scheduled for Monday 8 September, 2014 and questions from members of the public should be submitted on the forms supplied.

**12. Dates of Future Meetings**

The next meeting of the Heath Hayes, Norton Canes and Rawnsley Community Forum would be held on :-

- Monday 8 September, 2014 – venue TBC

---

CHAIRMAN

(The meeting concluded at 7.40 p.m.)

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**HEDNESFORD COMMUNITY FORUM**  
**TUESDAY 1 JULY 2014 AT 7.00 P.M.**

**HELD AT THE AQUARIUS, VICTORIA STREET, HEDNESFORD**

PRESENT:

District Councillors:

Adamson, G.	Gamble, B.
Ball, G.D.	Grice, Mrs. D.
Cartwright, Mrs S.M.	Todd, R.

Other District  
Councillors:

Mr. J. Toth (Cannock East Ward)  
Mrs. A. Spicer (Heath Hayes East & Wimblebury Ward)

County  
Councillors:

Mrs C. Mitchell (Hednesford Division)

District  
Officers:

T. McGovern, Corporate Director  
M. Berry, Senior Committee Officer  
Ms. K. McBey, PR & Marketing Officer

Also present:

Local residents x 4  
Sergeant S. Lawlor, Staffordshire Police  
PCSO 16719, Staffordshire Police  
D. Ballett, Brindley Heath Parish Council  
and Friends of Hednesford Park  
Mrs L. Whitehouse, on behalf of Hednesford Traders' Association  
D. Wisehall, Heart of Hednesford Restoration Project  
C. Owen, Heart of Hednesford Restoration Project  
M. Allsopp, The Aquarius

**1. Election of Chairman and Vice-Chairman**

Councillor G. Adamson was elected Chairman of the Forum for 2014-15, and Councillor A. Pearson was elected Vice-Chairman.

**2. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor A. Pearson.

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

There were no interests declared.

**4. Notes**

The Notes of the meeting held on 03 March, 2014, were agreed as a correct record.

**5. Questions for Staffordshire Police**

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting; however Sergeant Lawlor and PCSO 16719 were in attendance to take questions from the floor.

The Chairman thanked the Police for their swift action in resolving the issue of Travellers who had moved on stadium site over the previous weekend.

M. Allsopp – Ongoing problems of residents who were living in flats above business premises along Market Street; issues now included school children going to flats and buying cigarettes and drinking alcohol. Landlords do not appear to be interested in dealing with the problems.

*Sgt. Lawlor replied that the Police knew who the individuals concerned were and would deal with the short-term issues via increased patrols of the area, however the long term challenge was to meet with and speak to the landlords about how to tackle problem residents.*

**6. Questions for Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services**

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting.

**7. Questions for Staffordshire County Council Highways Department**

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting.

**8. Questions for Cannock Chase District Council**

**8a. Mr G. Burnett, Local Resident**

“Are the current Council Community Forums format the most effect means of communicating with the residents of the district on matters than concern them?

What do they cost the Council to host and are they an effective use of Police and Council officer’s time, and other resources, in answering questions that appear often to be raised on by Councillors for their own benefit when they have access to information from Council Officers through

their normal duties.

Could the expense and resource spent on Community Forums be used more effectively elsewhere for better value to the local community.

Can the Council prove forums are effective given that only Councillors and other officials are recorded as attending in the minutes. How can the all-important levels of local resident participation and attendance be monitored effectively as there is no apparent means of recording these beyond a vague head count.

Has this Council done any work in assessing the Forums effectiveness and considering other any other means of engaging with a wider audience of residents on the issues discussed at Forums.

The election of Forum Chair and Vice-Chair is restricted only to Councillors from the local wards and voting is restricted to themselves. How can this process be justified as a democratic one when the Forums claim to represent the local residents and yet they allow no permanent representation on them?

Can we be assured that these forums are an effective means of influencing Council policy by residents and not simply a box tick exercise to fulfil a criteria set simply to impress external auditors or verifiers of the Councils own processes.”

*S. Partridge, Democratic Services Manager, provided the following written response in advance of the meeting:*

*“The Council would like to thank Mr. Burnett for raising concerns about the effectiveness of its four Community Forums as a means of communicating and engaging with local residents. The Council itself has identified the need to review the Community Forums, and has included it in the Transformation Priority Delivery Plan for 2014-15, and will be undertaking a consultation / review exercise later in the year. The issues raised will be included as part of this consultation.*

*The forums, which were initially set up a number of years ago, meet on a quarterly basis in each of the four main population areas within the district, i.e. Cannock; Heath Hayes, Norton Canes and Rawnsley; Hednesford; and Rugeley and Brereton, and form part of the Council’s annual Calendar of Meetings. They are intended as a means of discussion on any matters of local concern, i.e. relating to the relevant Wards therein, which may be raised by members of the public or the relevant Ward Members; they are also intended as a means of consultation on, for example, planning or budgetary matters.*

*In order to ensure that appropriate Officers can be in attendance, if required, i.e. as opposed to having a number of representatives present ‘just in case’, we ask that questions be submitted in advance. This is*

*particularly the case if questions are of a technical nature or relate to an area that is not the Council's responsibility, such as highways or Police matters; or any other potential invitees, such as the Fire and Rescue Service or local Health Trust.*

*The Police; relevant County Councillors; and local Parish / Town Councillors, plus representatives from local Health Authority / Trust; local Voluntary Organisations; local Residents' Associations; and local business organisations, where known, are all invited to attend, as is the local MP, and members all are given advance notice of the meetings and asked to publicise them on notice boards etc to encourage public attendance. However, it is recognised that public attendance / participation is limited. This could be for a number of reasons, including those referred to.*

*Finally, the Council would like to give an assurance that the forums are not simply a tick box exercise; however, as previously mentioned, it shares the concerns about their ongoing effectiveness and plans to undertake a consultation / review exercise later in the year.*

*If members of the public would like to participate in the proposed review, any ideas or suggestions on how they could be improved should be emailed to [membersservices@cannockchasedc.gov.uk](mailto:membersservices@cannockchasedc.gov.uk) using the title 'Review of Community Forums'. Any ideas or suggestions made will be considered as part of the proposed review."*

**8b. Mr A. Riley, Hednesford Bingo Club**

1. "Problems with rubbish bins and grit bin at the Chase Gateway Centre.
2. Road Safety – measures need to be taken regarding the speeding of cars across the main entrance of the Chase Gateway Centre."

*T. McGovern, Corporate Director, provided the following response at the meeting:*

- *"Council Officers meet with Mr Riley on a regular basis to discuss such issues;*
- *The bulk of the car park was the responsibility of Aldi, and as such, Council Officers had discussed a range of issues with Aldi management over the previous few months, however progress had been slow so far;*
- *A new regional manager for Aldi had taken up post from mid-June, so the Planning & Economic Development Services Manager was going meet with him in July to progress and resolve the issues previously discussed;*
- *In respect of traffic calming/road safety, Staffordshire County Council's Highways department were satisfied for Aldi to install traffic calming measures if required, however the layout of the entrance junction the car park should negate any potential speeding issues."*

**8c.** Councillor G. Ball – Update on Hednesford Town Centre Regeneration

*T. McGovern, Corporate Director, provided the following update on behalf of the Planning & Economic Development Services Manager::*

- *“Only one unit remained unoccupied within the Victoria Shopping Park, for which a tenant had been identified and solicitors instructed to proceed with the letting;*
- *A number of new units at the end of Market Street by the traffic lights were still available to rent, however agents were currently negotiating two potential lettings;*
- *In early April Aldi reduced the short stay parking on its section of the Rugeley Road Car Park from 4 hours down to 2 hours. This change was introduced with little advance notice and without consulting the Council or other local interests. The Council has expressed its disappointment with Aldi’s actions and Aldi have agreed to meet Council Officers in the next few weeks to review the new arrangements;*
- *In advance of the discussions with Aldi the Council had commissioned a survey to quantify the number of vehicles using the Rugeley Road Car Park, and their typical length of stay. It is anticipated that this data will demonstrate that there would be no justification in further restrictions being introduced by Aldi. The survey took place at the end of June.*
- *Finally, officers were assessing the practicality of creating a dedicated loading/unloading area within its section of the Rugeley Road Car Park to service the units by the Park. This work was being undertaken in response to concerns previously raised at the Forum and following discussions with other local residents.*

*T. McGovern also advised that the key regeneration programme for the Town Centre was considered to be complete, so at future Forums meetings updates on specific issues would be provided as necessary, rather than a recurring update on the Town Centre.*

L. Whitehouse – Will the traffic speeds and road layout at the approach to Market Street and Victoria Street be reviewed?

*T. McGovern replied that this was not actively being looked into, however issues should be logged with Staffordshire County Council’s Highways department for them to review.*

*The Chairman advised that he had spoken to M. Keeling, Community Infrastructure and Liaison Manager at the County Council, and asked for a safety audit to be carried out to establish if there are any particular issues in the area.*

Councillor Grice commented that the regeneration project had been completed and thanked those involved, but raised that issues of parking problems were still ongoing.

Councillor Gamble agreed with the comments of Councillor Grice regarding parking problems, and queried if the loading bays at the Chase Gateway were going to be in place soon?

*T. McGovern replied that a solution had not yet been agreed, so therefore no timeframe was in place.*

Councillor Ball queried what was happening in respect of the proposed closure of Hednesford library?

*The Chairman gave the following response:*

- *As part of a County-wide review into library services, the County Council's Cabinet had earmarked Hednesford library for closure if it could not be run by volunteers instead;*
- *The County Council's Corporate Review Scrutiny Committee had 'called-in' this decision and would be discussing it on Monday 7 July;*
- *If decision were to go ahead, Cannock and Rugeley libraries would become the only two in the District which were directly funded by the County Council;*
- *In comparison to 2012/13, Hednesford library was the only one in the District which had seen an increase in footfall during 2013/14.*

*Councillor Toth commented that the library was a community asset, and finding volunteers was not a simple task as running a library was not a straightforward process.*

*D. Wisehall commented that he expected a lot would happen amongst residents and businesses locally to promote the library and try to secure its future.*

*The Chairman and County Councillor Mitchell both advised that anybody with concerns about the plans must ensure they put forward their views into the forthcoming consultation.*

*Councillor Ball also advised that Hednesford Town Council were due to meet with the County Council to determine a plan of action for the library depending on the final decision about its future.*

**8d.** Councillor G. Ball – Update on Hednesford Park

*T. McGovern, Corporate Director, provided the following update:*

- *"A Project Manager, Landscape Architect and a Community & Education Officer had all been appointed;*
- *An architect had also been appointed to go out to tender for the refurbishment of the Pavilion which was intended to commence in November 2014;*
- *The Friends of Hednesford Park were continuing to promote the Park with local events and were proposing to become a charity protected*

*by limited company;*

- *Officers were also working on a specification for refurbishing the War Memorial fencing/gates/pillars taking into account this year's Armistice Day;*
- *Officers had also held a consultation event in the Park to discuss the tree felling. This event had been well received by the public who attended in large numbers. Some trees have already been felled to make way for the new road off the car park extension and to clear sight lines from the Park up to the War Memorial;*
- *The Landscape Group (the Council's parks contractor) have been relocated to a new site within the Park as the Pavilion needed to be handed over to the contractor although it continued to be used as a home for Friends of Hednesford Park until such time as they can be relocated to a purchased storeroom on the site;*
- *The Council also hosted the Municipal Tree Officers Association and the Parks & Open Spaces Manager gave a keynote speech on the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) Scheme and the importance of tree management in the Park;*
- *The Hednesford Signal Box (although not part of the HLF bid) was also relocated into the Park where it will be tied into the future proposals for the Park, albeit these will now be modified to accommodate this piece of heritage;*
- *Tenders have now been received by the Council for the hard surfacing (paths) within the Park which is planned to start later on this year."*

County Councillor Mitchell (in her capacity as the District Council's Portfolio Leader for Culture & Sport) advised that it was important to let people know why the tree felling was happening and that re-planting of trees was also taking place at the same time.

Councillor Toth suggested that it would be helpful to put out updates and information in the local press about the works taking place, and also promote the free tennis provision which were being offered.

*County Councillor Mitchell (in her District Council capacity) replied that the free tennis had been advertised through the Wigan Leisure & Culture Trust and the local tennis club.*

*T. McGovern advised that the Council was shortly going to be submitting a planning application for the provision of a full size Artificial Turf Pitch on the former Sports & Social Club Site on Bradbury Lane.*

A local resident queried whether a miniature golf course could be provided as an alternative to football pitches and tennis courts?

*T. McGovern replied that were no plans by the Council to install such a facility within the District, as a survey undertaken by the Council for Sport England had identified golfing provision in the District as 'over provided'.*

County Councillor Mitchell (in her District Council capacity) advised that if the opportunity were to arise for such provision to be made available, then this would be looked into as appropriate.

## 9. Mid-Staffs NHS Foundation Trust Update

The Chairman drew the Forum's attention to the update which had been provided by Mandi Dunbar, Personal Assistant to Jeff Crawshaw, Deputy Chief Executive, Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust:-

*"Our Directors have concluded that, as the Trust continues to be going through the Trust Special Administration (TSA) process, it would not be appropriate for them to attend the Community Forums at this time. The Directors would like to assure local people that services at both Cannock Chase and Stafford Hospitals continue as usual and would encourage people to continue to use them as appropriate.*

*If there are any specific questions on the day-to-day business of the hospitals, we would be very pleased to email you answers/updates from the Directors.*

*If you have any questions around the TSA process and future of services, these would need to be addressed to the TSA. Please let me know if you'd like me to put you in touch with them.*

The TSA can be contacted at: [www.tsa-msft.org.uk/contact-us](http://www.tsa-msft.org.uk/contact-us) or for confidential matters at: [TSApublic@MidStaffs.nhs.uk](mailto:TSApublic@MidStaffs.nhs.uk)"

The Chairman raised that the update provided was inadequate given that the Trust was still suffering ongoing problems, and that a public meeting held in Stafford by the Trust should also take place in Cannock and Hednesford to seek patients' views on future service provision.

Councillor Grice suggested that representatives from the Royal Wolverhampton Trust (RWT) should come to Cannock to seek these views if they are still going to be taking over Cannock Hospital.

*The Chairman agreed with this suggestion and stated that representatives would be invited to the next meeting of the Forum. He also advised that there were still outstanding issues in respect of the Minor Injuries Unit at the Hospital as the Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) had now backtracked on its initial proposals.*

C. Ballett raised that local GPs surgeries had been advertising for new doctors, however the vacancies were going unfilled.

M. Allsopp raised that the Cannock and Stafford CCGs regularly held 'public' meetings at The Aquarius, and representatives from the RWT had also asked about hosting meetings at the venue.

*The Chairman commented that when CCGs meetings take place, attendees should ask for the public question time to be taken as the first agenda item to allow as many people as possible to ask questions.*

The Chairman then advised that the RWT would be invited to attend the September 2014 meeting of the Forum, and that the Mid-Staffs Trust would be requested to hold a public meeting in Cannock as had happened in Stafford.

Councillor Gamble also requested that the Cannock Chase CCG be asked to attend the September meeting of the Forum.

#### **10. Agenda Items for Next Meeting**

The Chairman reported that the next Forum was scheduled for Wednesday 17 September 2014 at the Museum of Cannock Chase and advised that any questions would need to be submitted on the forms supplied.

K. McBey, PR & Marketing Officer advised attendees about a 'Great War March' which would be taking place on Saturday 2 August, 2014, in Cannock, Hednesford and Rugeley Town Centres to commemorate the start of World War One and remember those whose died in the conflict.

The meeting closed at 8:02pm

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**RUGELEY AND BRERETON COMMUNITY FORUM**  
**HELD ON MONDAY, 23 JUNE, 2014 AT 7:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE MAIN BAR AREA, RUGELEY ROSE AND COMMUNITY CENTRE,**  
**TAYLOR'S LANE, RUGELEY**

PRESENT: Councillors:

Grocott, M.R. (Chairman)	
Bennett, C. (Vice Chairman)	
Allt, Mrs. A.	Jones, R.
Bottomer, B.H.	Molineux, G.N.
Dudson, A.*	Whitehouse, Miss. S.
Fisher, P.A.	

Cannock Chase Council Officers:

M. Edmonds	Head of Commissioning
S. Partridge	Democratic Services Manager

Representatives from the following organisations:

Staffordshire County Council	M. Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager
Staffordshire County Council	SCC Cllr. A. Dudson*
Rugeley Town Council	Various
Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council	Various
The Landor Society	Mrs. M. Kettle

Local Residents

Approximately 6

**1. Appointment of Chairman and Vice Chairman**

Councillor M.R. Grocott was elected as Chairman and Councillor C. Bennett as Vice Chairman for the current Municipal Year.

## **2. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from CCDC Councillors J.P. Johnson; and A. Lovell.

Apologies were also submitted on behalf of SCC Councillor G. Martin; the Ven. Simon Baker; and a number of Town / Parish Councillors.

## **3. Declarations of Interest**

Cllr. Mrs. A. Allt advised that she worked for the NHS.

## **4. Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 10 March, 2014 were accepted as a correct record.

## **5. Matters Arising (Not Otherwise Covered on the Agenda)**

Cllr. R. Jones requested an update in respect of the condition of pedestrianised areas in Rugeley town centre. Mr. Keeling advised that the area was on the County's monthly inspection route and any identified issues would be resolved within a 2 – 4 week period, unless they were considered dangerous, in which case they would be resolved within a couple of days.

Cllr. Jones said that he and other Western Springs members would welcome the opportunity to walk the inspection route with the inspector in order to get a better understanding of how the defects were rated, as he considered a number of them to be more serious than it appeared the inspection team did. Mr. Keeling agreed to ask that he be contacted.

## **6. Questions for Staffordshire Police**

No questions had been submitted in advance, and no Police representatives were present. No matters were raised from the floor to be fed back.

## **7. Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services**

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting for the Fire and Rescue Services, consequently no representative had been sent to the meeting.

At the last forum, a resident raised concerns at the potential fire risk associated with the build up of waste tyres at a unit (unnamed) on the Towers Business Park. The Fire and Rescue Service had visited the site and provided the following feedback:

'The premises is called Alloy Based Tyres and is located at Unit 1, Arcadia Park, Towers Business Park, Rugeley.

There were a number of tyres stacked up alongside the building. The occupiers present were advised of the potential arson risk, but assured the Fire Service that the cul-de-sac where the unit is located is secured outside of business hours with a large gate across the entrance, thereby minimising the risk.'

No other matters were raised from the floor to be fed back.

## **8. Staffordshire County Council Highways**

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting for the County Highways Department, however, a number of items were addressed in items raised elsewhere on the agenda. M. Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager, was present and agreed to receive items from the floor.

Cllr. P. Fisher advised that he wished to place on record his thanks to the Highways Department for their assistance to the people of Brereton when the area had recently suffered from flash flooding.

A number of concerns were raised in respect of overgrown vegetation and low hanging branches. Examples given included:

- The bottom of Green Lane
- Top of Plover's Rise
- Lodge Road
- Bottom end of Beechmere Rise

Concerns were also raised in respect of the unadopted road at the bottom of Lockside View, which was prone to flooding; and parts of Sheepfair, where development was taking place and the road surfaces were very uneven.

Mr. Keeling said he would note the concerns and liaise with the relevant teams at the County and District Councils.

## **9. Questions Submitted by Cllr. Paul Fisher, 55, Birch Lane, Brereton**

Cllr. Fisher had submitted the following question to the Head of Environmental Health:

"Twelve months ago illegal fly-tipping on a large scale took place in Brereton. The flies are now starting to swarm over Brereton again. Can you tell us what is happening and when the site will be cleared?"

Cllr. C. Bennett, Environment Portfolio Leader, provided the following update to the Forum:

"The Environment Agency's (EA) Notice expired on 13 June, 2014 and they expect to visit thereafter to confirm that it has not been complied with before considering the next step to secure its removal and disposal.

The EAs investigation into the serious organised crime aspect of the incident is continuing, but they remain reluctant to share any details so as not to compromise any the further investigations and legal action.

An Officer from Environmental Health had visited Redbrook Lane earlier that day. No odour was detected or flies seen on the approach down Redbrook Lane past the industrial units to the former AMI Blaymires site. No odour was

detected on the AMI Blaymires site, and only a small number of flies were seen at the side of the premises but nothing unusual and certainly not in quantities to be considered problematic. No odour was detected or flies were seen in Birch Lane where the complaints had originated last year.

The Officer had spoken with one of the managers at MGF who complained last year. He advised they had a bit of a problem with flies a number of weeks ago but no problems recently. MGF's yard looks directly over the waste at the former Blaymires site and they are the most likely premises to be affected should there be a problem, therefore, they have been asked to contact the Council in the event of any problems.

The situation will continue to be monitored and the services of a pest control contractor will again be engaged to treat the fly problem should it arise."

**10. Question Submitted by Mr. Graham Burnett, 48 Station Road, Hednesford, for all Community Forums**

Mr. Burnett raised the following questions:

**“Are the current Council Community Forums format the most effect means of communicating with the residents of the district on matters that concern them?”**

What do they cost the Council to host and are they an effective use of Police and Council officer's time, and other resources, in answering questions that appear often to be raised only by Councillors for their own benefit when they have access to information from Council Officers through their normal duties?

Could the expense and resource spent on Community Forums be used more effectively elsewhere for better value to the local community?

Can the Council prove forums are effective given that only Councillors and other officials are recorded as attending in the minutes .How can the all-important levels of local resident participation and attendance b be monitored effectively as there is no apparent means of recording these beyond a vague head count?

Has this Council done any work in assessing the Forums effectiveness and considering other any means of engaging with a wider audience of residents on the issues discussed at Forums?

The election of Forum Chair and Vice Chair is restricted to only Councillors from the local wards and voting is restricted to themselves How can this process be justified as a democratic one when the Forums claim to represent the local residents and yet they allow no permanent representation on them?

Can we be assured that these forums are an effective means of influencing Council policy by residents and not simply a box tick exercise to fulfil a criteria set simply to impress external auditors or verifiers of the Councils own processes.?"

**The following response has been provided to Mr. Burnett**

*The Council would like to thank Mr. Burnett for raising concerns about the effectiveness of its four Community Forums as a means of communicating and engaging with local residents. The Council itself has identified the need to review the Community Forums, and has included it in the Transformation Priority Delivery Plan for 2014-15, and will be undertaking a consultation / review exercise later in the year. The issues raised will be included as part of this consultation.*

*The forums, which were initially set up a number of years ago, meet on a quarterly basis in each of the four main population areas within the district, i.e. Cannock; Heath Hayes, Norton Canes and Rawsley; Hednesford; and Rugeley and Brereton, and form part of the Council's annual Calendar of Meetings. They are intended as a means of discussion on any matters of local concern, i.e. relating to the relevant Wards therein, which may be raised by members of the public or the relevant Ward Members; they are also intended as a means of consultation on, for example, planning or budgetary matters.*

*In order to ensure that appropriate Officers can be in attendance, if required, i.e. as opposed to having a number of representatives present 'just in case', we ask that questions be submitted in advance. This is particularly the case if questions are of a technical nature or relate to an area that is not the Council's responsibility, such as highways or Police matters; or any other potential invitees, such as the Fire and Rescue Service or local Health Trust.*

*The Police; relevant County Councillors; and local Parish / Town Councillors, plus representatives from local Health Authority / Trust; local Voluntary Organisations; local Residents' Associations; and local business organisations, where known, are all invited to attend, as is the local MP, and members all are given advance notice of the meetings and asked to publicise them on notice boards etc to encourage public attendance. However, it is recognised that public attendance / participation is limited. This could be for a number of reasons, including those referred to.*

*Finally, the Council would like to give an assurance that the forums are not simply a tick box exercise; however, as previously mentioned, it shares the concerns about their ongoing effectiveness and plans to undertake a consultation / review exercise later in the year.*

The Democratic Services Manager advised that the Council would welcome the views of any attendees and others, and that these could be submitted by e-mail or on the "Form for Questions", attached to the agenda. Any comments received would be considered in due course as part of the consultation.

Amongst those present, there was generally positive feedback for the forums. It was pointed out that, while the numbers in attendance might be relatively small, in many cases one or two people present might be representatives of larger groups. For example, Mr. and Mrs. Brookes represented the Friends of Etching Hill; while others brought items forward from / provided feedback to their neighbours.

It was agreed that the meetings could, perhaps, be better publicised, but acknowledgement that there may be costs associated with this, and even then, not all media was available to all residents, e.g. local free papers did not go to all areas. Members acknowledged that they also had a part to play in promoting the forums.

#### **11. The Old Chancel, St. Augustine's Church, Rugeley**

Standing Item. Nothing further to report.

#### **12. Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust**

The Chairman read out the update provided by the Deputy Chief Executive, Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust:

*“Our Directors have concluded that, as the Trust continues to be going through the Trust Special Administration (TSA) process, it would not be appropriate for them to attend the Community Forums at this time. The Directors would like to assure local people that services at both Cannock Chase and Stafford Hospitals continue as usual and would encourage people to continue to use them as appropriate.*

*If there are any specific questions on the day-to-day business of the hospitals, we would be very pleased to email you answers/updates from the Directors.*

*If you have any questions around the TSA process and future of services, these would need to be addressed to the Trust Special Administrators.”*

The TSA can be contacted at: [www.tsa-msft.org.uk/contact-us](http://www.tsa-msft.org.uk/contact-us) or for confidential matters at: [TSApublic@MidStaffs.nhs.uk](mailto:TSApublic@MidStaffs.nhs.uk)

Members commented that it was unfortunate that Stafford Hospital, in particular, was struggling to shake off the negative publicity it had previously attracted, and they would like to see the media treating it fairly. It was considered unlikely that any of the Directors would attend until after the hospital had transferred to their respective new Trusts – Cannock to Royal Wolverhampton; Stafford to North Staffs University.

#### **13. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings**

Brereton Millions – Although a suggestion was made that the Chairman of the Brereton Millions Committee be invited to attend to discuss how the money was to be spent, local Councillors advised that the money had not yet been received, so this would be premature.

#### **14. Any Other Business**

Community Litter Picks on Etching Hill – Geoff Brookes, Chair of Friends of Etching Hill, advised that the Group was having problems getting permission from the Trustees (of the Charity for the Provision of a Recreation Ground for Inhabitants of the Ancient Parish of Rugeley) to carry our litter picks, in spite of having done so for the past 3 years. The Group believed that the Council was

entitled to nominate 3 representatives to sit on the Board of Trustees, and asked if it would be possible to consider appointing a nominee from the Friends of Etching Hill.

Concern was expressed that the Board were not particularly inclusive and the Council's nominees were only invited to attend the AGM. The Chairman suggested that the Etching Hill and the Heath Ward Councillors should take up the matter with the Board of Trustees on behalf of the Friends.

The Democratic Services Manager advised that, in the meantime, he would also seek further clarification from the Charity Commission and the Secretary to the Board of Trustees.

**15. Next Meeting**

Tuesday, 9 September, 2014. Venue: Rugeley Council Chamber.

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm.

---

CHAIRMAN