

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE

CABINET

HELD ON THURSDAY, 20 MARCH, 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

138. Apologies

None.

139. 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.

140. Updates from Portfolio Leaders

Culture and Sport

Hednesford Park – Heritage Lottery Funded Works

The Portfolio Leader advised that work continued on Hednesford Park with some tree works and planting being carried out before the next phase of the construction works starts. Structural surveys had been undertaken on the pavilion, and tenders received from Architects to complete the detailed design and specification for the building works, which were anticipated to start during the first half of next financial year.

A communication event was being held that day (20 March, 2014) between 11.00 am and 8.00 pm, which included the proposals and a virtual walk through

of the site showing the proposed works, together with pictures of before and after as well as details about the trees on site. Information could also be accessed from the Council's website at:

http://www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/info/200073/parks_and_open_spaces/1352/hednesford_park_and_memorial/4

Hednesford Park – Signal Box

The Portfolio Leader reported that the Signal Box was now in situ in Hednesford Park. The move took place during the early hours of Sunday, 16 February and thanks were given to the Parks and Open Spaces Team, together with Network Rail and their contractors who had worked through the night and over the weekend to safely move the structure. The next phase of the works to repair the building (new windows) would start in the coming months, after which the building it would be used as a base for local events in the park and as a classroom for educational purposes.

Museum of Cannock Chase – Heritage Lottery Funded Works

The Portfolio Leader advised that work on the new interactive mining gallery which had started in December had an anticipated completion date of the end of March / early April and an Easter opening.

Stadium

The Portfolio Leader advised that work was being finalised on 3 costed design options for the Stadium site based on the previous consultation undertaken and discussions with Members of Cabinet held during October last year. Options would be presented to the Cabinet in early April.

Housing

Moss Road Estate Reema Flats Redevelopment Scheme

The Portfolio Leader advised that Keepmoat Homes had been selected as the Council's development partner for the Moss Road Estate Reema Flats Redevelopment Scheme. Details of the proposed scheme would be submitted for consideration by Cabinet on 10 July 2014, when scheme approval would be sought.

The Portfolio Leader referred to the Leader's budget speech, when he had stated that a highlight of 2014-15 would be the start of building the first new Council houses in Cannock Chase for over 25 years.

Changes to the Right to Buy

The Portfolio Leader advised that the Government had announced their intention to make changes to the Right to Buy (RTB) Scheme. As a result, the maximum RTB percentage discount for houses was to be increased from 60% to 70%, in line with the maximum discount for flats. No changes were proposed in relation

to the minimum discount which remained at 35% after five years tenancy and the 1% rate of increase in subsequent years. The maximum discount cap of £75,000 would also be increased in accordance with the Consumer Price index.

The changes were expected to come into effect by May 2014, subject to Parliamentary approval. Tenants would be advised of the changes in a future edition of Hometalk.

Deputy Leader and Crime and Partnerships

“Lifting the Lid on Partnerships”

The Portfolio Leader advised that a Partnership Multi-Agency Event was being held in the Civic Centre Ballroom on Friday, 21 March, 2014, to provide an opportunity to celebrate successful partnership work during 2013/14 within the District and recognise the hard work and commitment of practitioners and ‘front line’ staff within partner organisations which made that success possible. The event would also provide an opportunity to engage with a broader audience of interested stakeholders to gain further insight into the work of the LSP locally and identify opportunities to further improve partnership working within Cannock Chase.

141. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 30 January, 2014

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 30 January, 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed.

142. Forward Plan

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period March to May, 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 March to May, 2014 be noted.

143. 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) Environment – 24 October, 2013
- (ii) Town Centre Regeneration – 3 December, 2013

Recommendation from the Environment Policy Development Committee of 22 January, 2014

Consideration was given to the recommendation received from the Environment Policy Development Committee held on 22 January, 2014, in respect of:

Refresh of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy

“That Cabinet, at its meeting to be held on 20 March 2014, is recommended to approve the refresh of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (2007-2020).”

RESOLVED:

That the refresh of the Joint Municipal Waste Management Strategy (2007-2020) be approved.

144. Performance Review of Staffordshire South West Citizens' Advice Bureau – 1 April, 2013 to 31 December, 2013

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Commissioning (item 7.1 – 7.8, plus Appendices)

RESOLVED:

That the Staffordshire South West Citizens' Advice Bureau (SSWAB) performance in providing advice in line with the Service Level Agreement for the period 1 April, 2013 to 31 December, 2013, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

The performance review was an integral part of the Council's monitoring arrangements with SSWCAB, enabling the Council to review the Bureau's performance against performance measures/indicators as set out in the Service Level Agreement.

Appendix 1 to the report provided a summary of SSWCAB's performance for the period 1 April, 2013 to 31 December, 2013 in respect of the Service Level Agreement.

During the period there had been a number of key highlights:-

- The Bureau delivered its advice service from 2 main offices and dealt with over 17,000 contacts and over 11,000 issues from clients requiring advice and assistance;
- Clients benefited from over £1.5 million in financial gain as a result of the Bureau's involvement in their case;
- Only 1 formal complaint has been received;
- The Bureau provided its advice services with the help and assistance of 29

staff and up to 47 volunteers; and

- In July, 2013 the Bureau had installed a new case recording system, and performance information was now being produced on a ward basis.

However, the aim of the report was to present a balanced picture of achievements and performance, including where performance needed to be improved.

145. Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief Policy from 2014

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 8.1 – 8.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The contents of the report be noted.
- (B) The decision of the Head of Finance, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, to approve the addendum to the Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief Policy, given at Appendix A to the report, to be applied with effect from 1 April 2014, be confirmed.
- (C) Subject to there being no additional policy changes or cost implications arising from Government prescribed and funded “Discretionary Relief”, the Head of Finance, in Consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to amend the policy and put in place arrangements to award discretionary rate relief as soon as practically possible.
- (D) The matter be exempt from the call-in process as a result of the timescales involved.

Reasons for Decisions

On 21 November, 2013, Cabinet approved the Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief Policy, to be effective from 1 April, 2014. Since that time, new forms of discretionary rate relief had been prescribed by Government. The first of these was announced in the Chancellor’s Autumn Statement and had since been confirmed by the Department for Communities and Local Government. The most recent was announced on 17 February, 2014 and had yet to be confirmed.

Relief under the new schemes would attract full Government funding for the two years from 1 April, 2014 to 31 March, 2016. In order to implement the scheme with effect from 1 April, 2014 or as soon as practically possible thereafter, the Leader of the Council approved the addendum to the Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief Policy on the 28 February, 2014.

146. Discretionary Housing Payments

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 9.1 – 9.14 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) The content of the report be noted.
- (B) The decision of Head of Finance, in conjunction with the Leader of Council, that tenants affected by the impact of Social Sector Size, who are actively seeking a transfer to a compliant property, be given DHP payment equivalent to the restriction in their Housing Benefit, from 1 April 2013, be confirmed.
- (C) The decision of the Head of Finance, in conjunction with the Leader of Council to adopt the Discretionary Housing Payment Policy, given at Appendix A to the report, with effect from 1 April 2014, be confirmed.
- (D) Subject to there being no additional policy changes or cost implications arising from Government funding of Discretionary Housing Payments, the Head of Finance in consultation with the Leader of the Council, will amend this policy as necessary, from time to time, to ensure that Discretionary Housing Payments are made in appropriate circumstances, as soon as practically possible.
- (E) The matter be exempt from the call-in process as a result of the timescales involved.

Reasons for Decisions

The social sector size criteria was implemented on 1 April, 2013 and has adversely impacted on current rent arrears, transfer and mutual exchange requests and the number of void properties.

At its inception date of 1 April, some 723 claimants were affected by the Housing Benefit restrictions. The figure reduced to 532 over the course of the financial year and continued to reduce as officers of the Housing Department and Benefit Section worked with local residents.

On 19 September, 2013 Cabinet agreed amendments to the Housing Allocation Policy to permit social housing tenants with arrears to move to smaller accommodation through a transfer or mutual exchange with arrears, so as to avoid the “catch 22” situation whereby they could not afford their rent payments but were prohibited from moving.

At the same time, the Council’s DHP Policy was amended to facilitate a “passporting” of DHP payments, equivalent to the amount of the rent restriction

from 7 October, 2013 to 31 March, 2014, to tenants affected by the restrictions and actively seeking a transfer or mutual exchange.

Based on the best information available at that time, it was expected that the proposed extension to the DHP Policy could not have been accommodated within the Government Allocation of £114,555 and so Council was asked to approve a supplementary estimate in order to increase the 2013-14 amount available for DHPs to the Government set ceiling of £286,388.

Extensive work was carried out by the Housing Department and the Benefit Section to engage with all affected tenants with a view to inviting applications for transfer or mutual exchange. As a consequence, 94 tenants had secured moves to smaller accommodation and 89 awaited appropriate offers.

Following individual discussions with affected tenants, fewer than expected had elected to request moves. DHP, resulting from size criteria restrictions, had been paid to 68 Council Tenants, of which 30 were a direct result of the passporting. 3 housing association tenants had also benefited.

147. Review of Allocations Policy

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 10.1 – 10.14 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) The proposed amendments to the Council's Allocations Policy, as set out in Appendix 2 to the report, be agreed and implemented from 14 April, 2014.
- (B) The action of the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, in extending the property eligibility criteria in respect of a three bedroom house in Broomhill be confirmed.
- (C) Further consideration be given to the following issues as part of a further review of the Council's Allocations Policy:-
 - (i) Local association criteria in relation to households who wish to move to the District for employment reasons.
 - (ii) The property eligibility criteria for three bedroom properties.

Reasons for Decisions

Revised statutory Social Housing Guidance was issued by the Department for Communities and Local Government regarding qualification for the Housing Register. The Council was required to take account of this guidance within its Allocations Policy.

The Council's agreed eligibility criteria for the Housing Register (as set out in Appendix 1 to the report) had, therefore, been reviewed in the light of the revised statutory guidance. As a result, it was proposed that:-

- (i) A 12 month continuous residency requirement be introduced as part of the eligibility criteria for the Housing Register.
- (ii) The residency requirement be applied to all applicants with the exception of:-
 - (a) Applicants living outside the District who require sheltered accommodation and support from a close relative, provided that the relative currently lives in the District and has done so for the last 12 months.
 - (b) Armed Forces applicants who will continue to be considered in accordance with current policy.
 - (c) Existing social housing tenants who live in the Cannock Chase District.
 - (d) Homeless households who are temporarily accommodated outside the District and households who are required to "move on" from supported accommodation.

No proposed amendments had been made at this stage for applicants (including existing social housing tenants) who wished to move to the District for employment reasons. This would be considered as part of a further review of the Council's Allocations Policy, following the receipt of further statutory guidance on a proposed "Right to Move".

The Social Sector Size Criteria had reduced the demand for three bedroom houses and was being reflected in requests for houses on certain less popular estates. Further research was, however, required before any significant change was made and it was, therefore, proposed that the issue be addressed as part of the aforementioned further Allocations Policy review.

However, as an interim measure, it was suggested that the Head of Housing and Waste Management be authorised to extend the existing property eligibility criteria in respect of three bedroom properties to additional households where there have been no qualifying expressions of interest after one advertisement.

As this situation occurred with regard to a three bedroom house in Broomhill during the week commencing 17 February, 2014, the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, extended the property eligibility criteria to households who would normally be eligible for a two bedroom dwelling. Confirmation of action was, therefore, sought.

Proposed amendments to the Council's Allocations Policy were set out in Appendix 2 to the report.

148. Provision of Photovoltaic (Solar) Panels to Further Council Owned Properties

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 11.1 – 11.11 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) A scheme to provide photovoltaic panels to up to 300 Council properties, through a community share issue be undertaken by Southern Staffordshire Community Energy, in accordance with a “roof lease” scheme
- (B) Subject to the agreement of appropriate terms and conditions, the Head of Planning and Regeneration, following consultation with the Head of Housing and Waste Management, be authorised to enter into the necessary Agreements with Southern Staffordshire Community Energy.
- (C) The Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, be authorised to determine the properties included in the scheme.
- (D) A further report be received in due course regarding the evaluation of the scheme.

Reasons for Decisions

The Housing Policy Development Committee on 20 January, 2014 considered proposals from Southern Staffordshire Community Energy (SSCE) to provide Photovoltaic (PV) panels to further Council owned dwellings, through a community share issue. The Committee supported the principle of the proposed scheme and agreed that following further development, a report be submitted for consideration by Cabinet.

SSCE could potentially install PV panels to up to 300 Council properties, subject to raising the necessary capital funding through a community share issue and procuring the PV panels in the region of £2,500 per dwelling. The panels would be owned and installed by SSCE in accordance with a “roof lease” from the Council, the principles of which would be similar to those already adopted for the Norton Canes PV panel pilot scheme. Subject to the necessary approvals, the PV panels could be installed during 2014-15.

As a result of the reduction in “feed in tariffs”, the “PV energy provider market” had contracted substantially due to the “rate of return”. The rate of return required by the SSCE scheme was, however, less than that generally expected by the “PV energy provider market” and was therefore considered to be viable at current “feed in tariff” levels.

Whilst SSCE believe the scheme to be deliverable, it was, ultimately, subject both to SSCE being able to procure the panels at a sufficiently attractive rate to be viable and to being able to raise the funds through a share issue.

Tenants would benefit from up to 30% savings in their electricity costs, whilst it was also hoped to be able to establish a small “community fund” for reinvestment in other projects within the Cannock Chase area.

It was, therefore, proposed that the SSCE scheme be undertaken and that the Head of Planning and Regeneration following consultation with the Head of Housing and Waste Management, be authorised to agree terms and conditions. It was further proposed that properties be selected by the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the housing Portfolio Leader in accordance with the selection criteria detailed within the report.

The proposed scheme would be subject to evaluation, the results of which would be the subject of a future report.

149. Berwick Drive Garage Site, Cannock

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 12.1 – 12.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The tenancies of the occupied garages at the Berwick Drive garage site, Cannock be terminated with the existing garage tenants given priority for the allocation of a garage on an alternative site.
- (B) The site (as shown on the plan attached as Appendix 1 to the report) is utilised for the provision of 5 two bedroom Council houses for social rent.
- (C) Scheme approval and permission to spend is granted for the design of a proposed scheme.
- (D) Following the completion of the design works and the receipt of planning consent, Cabinet receive a further report on a proposed new build scheme for the Berwick Drive site.

Reasons for Decisions

The agreed three year HRA Capital Programme included budgetary provision for 7 additional Council dwellings where proposals had not yet been identified.

It was proposed that 5 of the dwellings should be provided (in the form of two bedroom houses) on the Council’s garage site at Berwick Drive, Cannock where 27 of the 35 garages were vacant. As a consequence, the tenancies of the 8 occupied garages would need to be terminated.

In order to progress the design of a proposed scheme, it was necessary to

appoint an architect and scheme approval and permission to spend in respect of this was requested.

Following the completion of the design work, a further report would be submitted to Cabinet regarding a detailed scheme and the programming of its implementation.

150. Cannock Chase Local Plan – Statement of Community Involvement

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration (Item 13.1 – 13.34 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) The Statement of Community Involvement (attached as Appendix 1 to the report) be adopted.
- (B) The supporting user guide (attached as Appendix 2 to the report) be adopted.
- (C) The Head of Planning and Regeneration, in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader, be authorised to make any non-substantive changes considered necessary to the documents.

Reasons for Decisions

The Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act, 2004 requires the Council to produce a 'Statement of Community Involvement' (SCI) that set out how the Council intended to achieve continuous community involvement in the preparation of plans and decision making for planning applications. The current SCI was adopted by Cabinet in June, 2006 under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations, 2004. At that time the SCI was identified as a development plan document in the same way as the Local Plan and therefore subject to independent examination.

Amendments to the regulations in 2008 no longer identified the SCI as a development plan document, thereby removing a requirement for independent examination. It was, therefore, possible to update an SCI more easily. Whilst the process for producing an updated SCI was no longer set out by regulation it was considered good practice to hold a period of public consultation (6 weeks) on a draft SCI update prior to consideration of representations and subsequent adoption by Cabinet.

A report was presented to Cabinet on 17 January, 2013 where a six week period of public consultation was agreed for an updated draft Statement of Community Involvement. The consultation period ran concurrently with the period for the Local Plan Publication document between 14 February and 28 March, 2013. No

representations were received. The version of the SCI presented for adoption had been simplified from the draft version issued for consultation and aimed to present the specific steps that the Council would take to achieve community involvement with greater clarity. The SCI did not propose new planning policy or identify new development sites, but primarily considered how best to involve different sectors of the community in plan preparation and in determining planning applications. The SCI had been updated to reflect the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, the Localism Act 2011 and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2012.

The SCI set out how all sections of the community, from individual members of the public through to representative organisations, had better opportunities to participate in planning in the District. It dealt with community involvement in the preparation of the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD) and in the determination of planning applications as well as community involvement in recently introduced planning procedures such as the community infrastructure levy (CIL) and neighbourhood planning.

151. Quarter 3 Performance Report 2013-14

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Executive (Item 14.1 – 14.76 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The performance information and the case studies relating to Priority Delivery Plans, as detailed in Appendices 1-8 to the report, be noted.
- (B) The actions and indicators rated Red or Amber be noted, and the remedial action or rescheduled delivery stated to address the problem be noted.
- (C) The General Fund financial performance against budget for the third quarter, detailed at Appendix 9 to the report, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

Information for performance actions, indicators and case studies 2013/14 is included for relevant items in Appendices 1 to 8. The overall rankings for each Portfolio area are detailed in Section 5 below, indicating that 76.5% of targets have been achieved during the third quarter of 2013/14. The recommendations reflect that this performance and any subsequent rescheduling are noted.

152. Quarter 3 Performance Review of Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust 2013-14

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Commissioning (Item 15.1 – 15.64 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 October to 31 December, 2013 and year to date be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

The 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 third quarter of this financial year, 1 October to 31 December 2013 and year to date.

During the quarter there had been a number of key highlights as detailed in the report, and of a total of 65 performance measures and targets WLCT had met or exceeded performance in 49 (75%) of its targets; and not met target in 16 (25%), albeit that 2 (3%) were within the 5% tolerance threshold. The other 14 (22%) were considered red.

The aim of the report was also to present a balanced picture of achievements and performance against the targets set, including where performance needed to be improved, and key issues had been identified in this regard.

153. Floral Display and General Planting Schemes

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Commissioning (Item 16.1 – 16.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Council should continue with the current level of floral displays and planting schemes and supplement the existing contribution from the contingency budget of £9,770 with a further £7,200 (Business Rates) by using the operational contingency budget within the Parks and Open Spaces Team. (Total Cost £16,970).

(It was noted that the reduction of the contingency budget may have a potential impact upon the operation of the Parks and Open Spaces service in the future, given that budgets were still being allocated appropriately following the previous external contractor (Fountains Plc) going into administration in January, 2012 and following Cabinet's decision on 18 April, 2013 to provide the service in-house for a period of 5 years.)

Reasons for Decisions

The Council had for a number of years operated a traffic island sponsorship scheme to raise additional income to support the provision of the existing floral displays and general planting arrangements across the district. The sponsorship

scheme had worked well in providing additional income, which after paying for the plants on specific traffic islands, contributed around £1,100 towards the cost of other floral displays across the district. The remaining cost of maintaining floral displays and general planting schemes was met from the variation order provision within the former contract and more recently from the Street Scene contingency budget.

However, the Council had been informed by the Valuation Office Agency (Executive Agency of HM Revenues and Customs) that the advertising rights in respect of the sponsored display notices were subject to the payment of Non-Domestic Rates (NDR). The Council's Local Taxation and Benefits Section would, therefore, have to issue rates bills in accordance with the Rating List.

The decision would have a direct impact upon the current floral display and planting arrangements across the district. The NDR (2014-15) for an island amounted to just over £282 and hence the ongoing cost ranged from £5,086 (18 islands rated to date) to £9 043 for all 32 sponsored islands. The impact of the change was that the additional income received from sponsorship and used to support the planting of other floral displays across the district had been eroded and there were insufficient budgets to continue with the existing planting schemes.

The current arrangements were being analysed and reassessed with a view to retaining only those where there was a clear business case. Similarly the option to pass on the rates liability via increased sponsorship fees would be considered although it was likely to be prohibitive in the current financial climate.

In light of the financial difficulties the Council would face in the future, a review of the current service provision was considered necessary. To maintain the current service would require additional resources of between £4,000 and £7,200 (reflecting the 20% of the additional business rates to be retained by the Council). Whereas a discontinuation of the service would save the Council £21,263 assuming hanging baskets and housing planting budgets are retained.

Consequently, Cabinet was requested to consider the options set out in the report and to determine which was appropriate for the provision of floral displays and general planting schemes across the district in the future.

154. 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 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, 20 MARCH, 2014 AT 4:00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

155. S.106 ASDA – Deed of Variation

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Corporate Director (Item 18.1 – 18.4, plus Appendices, of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The Deed of Variation with McLagan Investments Limited (attached as Appendix 1 to the report), be approved.
- (B) Agree that the matter is urgent and should not be subject to call-in because the Council's interests would be likely to be seriously affected by any delay caused by the Call-In procedure due to the need to comply with the deadline of 31 March, 2014 to return the interest payment to ASDA.

Reasons for Decisions

The Council received the sum of £527,500 from ASDA Stores Limited (ASDA) on 4 May, 2005 to construct an ATP on the Stadium site and to improve football facilities at Newlands Lane, Heath Hayes. The original S106 agreement had a payback clause after 5 years if funds were not spent in full by 4 May, 2010.

Agreement was reached in principle with ASDA in 2006 to vary the requirements of the original S106 to enable the ATP to be constructed elsewhere. In 2008 the Council put forward Cardinal Griffin RC High School as a site for the ATP and ASDA then agreed as follows:

- location of ATP to be at Cardinal Griffin RC High School or within a 5 mile radius of Avon Rd ASDA store to be approved by ASDA
- remove requirement to improve football facilities at Newlands Lane
- extension of time to spend funds from 4 May 2010 to 4 May 2012.

The wording of a Deed of Variation which set out the changes to the original S106 was agreed between the Council and ASDA by June, 2009 and relying on this the Council proceed to arrange for the construction of the ATP at Cardinal Griffin RC High School. However, the ASDA Board subsequently refused to approve this Deed of Variation in January, 2010.

The Council remain in possession of the original sum plus interest because it used gap funding to bridge the funding gap to enable the ATP to be constructed pending resolution of the dispute with ASDA. Despite numerous attempts over the past four years, no resolution of these matters could be achieved.

Following a new set of negotiations with ASDA representatives from late 2013, an option existed to resolve this whereby the Council retained the original sum of £527,500 for investment in sports facilities in the District (preferred option is the stadium site, Pye Green Road) in return for paying back all interest on this sum to ASDA, which has been estimated as not less than £116,647.72p, plus acknowledge the role of ASDA as funder in publicity materials issued by the Council. The £527,500 would have to be spent by 2020 (within six years) and if not, any unspent funds would then have to be automatically returned to ASDA, with interest.

156. Civil Parking Enforcement

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 19.1 – 19.11 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) The Council ceases to undertake Civil Parking Enforcement on behalf of Staffordshire County Council with effect from 31 March 2015.
- (B) Staffordshire County Council and the Council's three shared service partners (Lichfield, South Staffordshire and Tamworth) are informed of the Council's decision.
- (C) The Head of Housing and Waste Management be authorised to procure alternative arrangements for income collection and "off-street" enforcement action in respect of the Council's charged car parks and enter into the required agreements.

Reasons for Decisions

Civil Parking Enforcement (CPE) is delivered throughout Staffordshire by the District Councils in accordance with Partnership Agreements with Staffordshire County Council. CPE is a County Council responsibility and under the terms of the Partnership Agreements any deficit is met by the County Council.

In Cannock Chase, frontline enforcement is undertaken through a shared service Agreement with Lichfield, South Staffordshire and Tamworth, which provides for a single enforcement contract (held by APCOA Parking UK Limited) held by Cannock Chase Council.

Following a review of CPE in Staffordshire, the County Council had decided to seek new arrangements for its delivery and are to serve a 12 month notice on District Councils (including Cannock Chase) to terminate the current Partnership Agreements with effect from 31 March, 2015.

The County Council were considering five alternative options, details of which were set out in the report. These included the negotiation of new Agreements with District Councils, a shared service for “on and off street parking” and direct provision by the Council.

Discussions had been held with County Council officers regarding the continued delivery of CPE by the Council. However, CPE operated at a deficit in all District Councils with an estimated 2013-14 deficit of £28,500 for Cannock Chase and the County Council were seeking to transfer some of the financial risk to a partner agency. Whilst the mechanism for achieving this was not stated, it was assumed that this would be through the provision of a “fixed fee” for CPE enforcements.

Whilst there were some advantages in relation to the Council continuing to deliver CPE, it was considered that these were “outweighed” by the potential financial risks and the need to focus on activities which were the direct responsibility of the District Council. It was, therefore, proposed that the Council cease to deliver CPE with effect from 31 March, 2015 and that the County Council and the Council’s shared service partners be informed accordingly.

The Council was, however, directly responsible for “off-street” enforcement action in respect of its “charged” car parks. This was also undertaken (together with income collection) as part of the APCOA contract with consequent economies of scale. Subject to a decision to cease the delivery of CPE, it was proposed that the Head of Housing and Waste Management be authorised to procure alternative arrangements. This was likely to be part of a County Council contract for delivering CPE or through a shared contract with other District Councils.

The meeting closed at 4.50 pm

LEADER

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

HELD ON THURSDAY 13 FEBRUARY 2014 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:

Councillors

Dixon, D.I. (Chairman)
Todd, R. (Vice-Chairman)

Freeman, Miss M.A	Morgan, C.W.J.
Grocott, M.R.	Pearson, A.
Kraujalis, J.T.	Rowley, J.

20. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors J.D. Bernard, D.N. Davies, Mrs. D. Grice, Ms J.L. Jones and Mrs. A Spicer.

21. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restrictions on Voting by Members and Party Whip Declarations

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>	<u>Type</u>
M. Grocott	Agenda Item 4. – ‘Achieving Excellence for Young People – Briefing.’	Personal

Wife is a teacher at a high school in the area.

22. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 10 December 2013 be approved as a correct record and signed.

23. Achieving Excellence for Young People - Briefing

Staffordshire County Councillor M. Sutton, Cabinet Support Member for Public Health & Community Safety and the District Commissioning Lead – Cannock Chase, were in attendance for this item.

County Councillor Sutton informed the Committee that briefings were taking place at Cabinet and Scrutiny meetings of all borough/district authorities

within the County and that an engagement process had been undertaken with young people in late 2013. Final proposals for the future of young peoples' services would be developed once all feedback had been received from interested parties.

The District Commissioning Lead then delivered a presentation to the Committee, covering the following:

- The case for change;
- Total investment in 13-19 year olds across Staffordshire;
- What does the County Council know about its young people?;
- Different types/levels of support provided;
- Stakeholder engagement exercise priority themes;
- Work of other local authorities;
- Consideration of current provision;
- How is current approach working?;
- How could things be done differently?;
- Young person's pathway;
- Proposed commissioning model;
- Staffordshire Council for Voluntary Youth Services (SCVYS)
- Moving forward

County Councillor Sutton advised that the purpose of the consultation was to ensure that Staffordshire was a place where young people could be independent, resilient and fulfil their potential, with appropriate support in place to meet their needs, but also establish that future funding and resources would be targeted to the right areas to ensure value for money.

Councillor Dixon queried how much money would be saved from the Youth Services budget through the proposed changes?

County Councillor Sutton replied that the current budget was approximately £6m per year, with £3m to be saved in the first year.

Councillor Grocott queried why there was no mention of Cannock youth involvement with County services in the presentation.

The District Commissioning Lead replied that in the consultation document, it detailed that 17% of young people from the Cannock Chase area were currently involved.

Councillor Grocott then queried why Cannock Chase Council was the last authority to receive the briefing?

County Councillor Sutton replied that the briefings had to be arranged to fit in with already scheduled dates of Cabinet and Scrutiny meetings at each authority, but the closing date of the consultation could not be altered.

Councillor B. Todd commented that it was the wrong attitude to focus on using the private and voluntary sector to provide services that the County

Council no longer could, citing closure of youth clubs as an example.

County Councillor Sutton replied as follows:

- There were no references in the consultation document/proposals to close buildings or youth clubs;
- Where children came under the 'vulnerable' category, the plan was to increase support for them, not reduce it;
- Confident that the voluntary sector can pick up extra work, as this was already happening in many areas;
- Some voluntary organisations were supported by the SCVYS, who provided strong support and value for money;
- There was a need to ensure all young people were catered for;
- Although there was pressures on finances, it was important to have an efficient and effect Youth Service in place;

Councillor Kraujalis commented that he could see what was trying to be achieved, however the reality was that big funding cuts were going to happen as a result of wider budget cuts by the County Council, so there was concern about some of the services being targeted.

County Councillor Sutton replied there was a duty to look at what was being provided to ensure best value for people across the County, and that young people had already been clear about what they wanted, particularly support/guidance and increased employment opportunities.

Councillor Pearson raised that organisations such as the Cubs, Guides and Cadets relied on funding from parents in order to continue operating and as the voluntary sector also required funding to survive, the County Council should not expect the sector to do everything instead. Furthermore, due to a lack of places for young people to go, there had been an increase in anti-social behaviour.

County Councillor Sutton replied as follows:

- Aiming to increase the number of places that young people can go to, however this won't be easy to achieve;
- SCVYS can provide grant funding to clubs;
- £50,000 of funding was available through the District Commissioning Lead, however more direct funding for projects can be available as funding can be targeted;

Councillor Freeman raised concern that the consultation and funding were not reaching the right people, and that the County Council were not listening to what was being said, as had also happened with the consultation of Day Centres.

County Councillor Sutton replied that working with the uniformed services could be looked into as a way of increasing engagement, and that a lot of work had been undertaken for the consultation through speaking to many groups and people to help promote it.

Councillor Kraujalis advised of a youth club which was originally based in Wimblebury but was moved to Heath Hayes to increase its success, but this had not happened as the wrong types of young people were attending.

County Councillor Sutton replied that one of the aims of the review was to target projects towards the right groups of young people to increase engagement and involvement.

Councillor Grocott commented that young people in Rugeley were made to feel unwelcome at certain types of youth clubs as the wrong events/projects were being put on, and it appeared the consultation was not getting through to the right young people; those not already involved in youth activities.

County Councillor Sutton replied as follows:

- Getting those young people involved was a challenge, but as part of this consultation the views of young people had to be sought legally, so the County Council had been meeting with schools and going out to find the right sort of young people;
- SCVYS had also reported a lack of interest from young people in structured events/clubs, and there was a need to be more flexible;
- There was a need to follow up on this work by looking at what could be done to engage and support such young people.

Councillor Grocott advised that the District Council's consultation and communications teams had been out on Friday and Saturday nights across the district to speak directly to those young people who felt excluded, and this was something the County Council should also do.

Councillor Morgan queried how young people could be defined as 'vulnerable'?

County Councillor Sutton replied that those which fell into the following categories would be defined as such:

- Resilient families;
- Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEETs);
- Non attendance at school;
- Children with disabilities;
- Involvement with anti-social behaviour
- Victims of or perpetrators of crime.
- Also need to look on the fringes of these areas to identify young people who may end up falling into one of the above categories.

Councillor B. Todd raised that the County Council was negating its responsibilities by hiving off services to other organisations.

County Councillor Sutton disagreed it was the County Council's responsibility to provide all services, instead it was primarily parental responsibility, but the County acknowledged support should be provided for the most vulnerable.

Councillor Freeman raised that young people were in fact interested in

events/clubs which provided structure, discipline and organisation, as the Cubs and Guides etc. had waiting lists for new members.

County Councillor Sutton replied that such organisations would have been written to requesting that their members respond to the consultation.

The Chairman then thanked the District Commissioning Lead and County Councillor Sutton for their attendance. They then left the meeting.

Councillor Grocott raised concern that the response from the Leader of the Council to the consultation appeared to be on behalf of the whole Council, and stated that Scrutiny should have met before Cabinet in order to feed into the final response.

The Corporate Director replied that the response sent from the Leader was on behalf of Cabinet only, and that the Scrutiny Committee was welcome to reply separately if it so wished. This had only happened due to the limited availability of when the County representatives could attend.

24. Scrutiny Work Programme and Working Groups – Update

Air Quality and Industrial Emissions Working Group

Councillor Kraujalis introduced the interim report of the Working Group (Item 5.1 – 5.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council), noting that the original report produced last year was not wide enough in its scope, so thanked the Environmental Protection Manager helping to pull together the interim report.

Scrutiny Review Task & Finish Group

Councillor Pearson reported there was no update in respect of the Group's work, as due to other matters he had been unable to attend a meeting of the County Council's Scrutiny Committee in January.

Anti-Social Behaviour Working Group

Councillor Freeman advised there was no update.

Perception of Crime Working Group

No update provided as apologies had been received from Councillor J. Bernard, Chairman of the Working Group.

The Chairman raised that following discussions with the Corporate Director and Executive & Civic Support Manager, it was proposed to hold an additional meeting of the Scrutiny Committee on Thursday, 10 April 2014, to consider the final reports of the four working groups.

The Chairman then proposed that for 2014/15 the Committee should focus on one main topic rather than four different topics, suggesting educational attainment in Staffordshire as a topic, so that time could be used more

effectively to conduct a review, but noted that this would be a decision for the new Committee to take.

Councillor Grocott noted that in relation to the previous agenda item, a lot of work had already been undertaken by the Culture & Sport Policy Development Committee regarding children and young people, so this was a topic Scrutiny could revisit.

The Corporate Director replied that whilst a lot of work had been undertaken, it had now been two or three years since then, so the work covered may no longer be relevant.

Councillor Rowley commented that Staffordshire Fire & Rescue undertook a lot of work around youth support.

Councillor Kraujalis raised that it may be better for the Committee to look at a topical piece of work Cabinet were planning to consider next year and scrutinise that instead.

Members then raised concern about a lack of dedicated officer support available to the Committee in order to carry out its work.

The Corporate Director replied that although there was no dedicated Scrutiny officer in place, the Committee received officer support from a variety of areas across the Council, and it should also be considered that the workload of the four working groups was too large to manage effectively.

RESOLVED:

That an additional meeting of the Scrutiny Committee be held on Thursday 10 April to consider the final reports of each of the four working groups.

25. Date of Next Meeting

Thursday 10 April 2014, 4:00pm

The meeting closed at 5:35pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, 26 MARCH, 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)

Anslow, C.	Rowley, J.
Ball, G.D.	Sutherland, M.
Fisher, P.A.	Todd, Mrs. D.
Freeman, Miss M.	Todd, R.
Pearson, A.	Whitehouse, Mrs. L.M.

(The Chairman advised that the order of the agenda would be amended so as to accommodate the speaker).

114. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Councillor F.W.C. Allen.

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

The following declarations were made in addition to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members Interests:

Member	Interest	Type
Kraujalis, J.T.	Application CH/14/0014, 34 North Street, Bridgtown, Cannock – change of use from shop (A1) to café (A3) – Member is a Bridgtown Parish Councillor	Personal
Freeman, Miss M	Application CH/14/0014, 34 North Street, Bridgtown, Cannock – change of use from shop (A1) to café (A3) – Member is a Bridgtown Parish Councillor	Personal
Anslow, C.	Application CH/14/0051, Beau Desert Golf Club, Rugeley Road, Hazel Slade, Cannock – retrospective application:- part change of use to containerised biomass system to power	Personal

Golf club – Member is a member of the Beau Desert Golf club

Whitehouse, Mrs. L. Application CH/14/0051, Beau Desert Golf Club, Rugeley Road, Hazel Slade, Cannock – retrospective application:- part change of use to containerised biomass system to power Golf club – Member attends professional networking events held at the Golf club Personal

116. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillor J.T. Kraujalis declared that he had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/14/0014, 34 North Street, Bridgtown, Cannock – change of use from shop (A1) to café (A3).

117. Minutes

A Member made reference to Minute No. 113 which stated that application CH/13/0132 would be deferred to this meeting and asked why it was not on the agenda. The Officer apologised but advised that it had not been possible to set up a meeting with the applicant until next week. Once the meeting had taken place the application would come back to the Committee for determination.

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 5 March, 2014 be approved as a correct record.

118. Members' requests for site visits

No requests were made.

119. Application CH/12/0345, 110 Mill Street, Cannock – Amended scheme – residential development: demolition of existing redundant tyre depot and erection of 10 no. 2 and 3 bedroom houses with associated parking

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.19 – 6.36 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that on Enclosure 6.30, paragraph 1.3 the figure for indoor sports facilities should read £16,380 (not £13,380). He then explained the background to the application advising that the Committee had previously granted consent subject to a s106 contribution and conditions. However, the applicant had commissioned and submitted a viability assessment indicating that the development would not yield the expected 20% profit and was not, as it stands, viable. The viability assessment had been independently checked which confirmed that the suggested s106 contributions were not viable.

The applicant had indicated that they would be willing to contribute £5,500 for open space, sport and recreation and the compulsory £4,500 for the SAC mitigation. Officers considered that it would be favourable to support the development with the reduced s106 contribution subject to the implementation period for the proposal being reduced from three years to two years.

Members raised concern regarding the reduced s106 contribution. However, the Officer confirmed that the National Planning Framework states that to ensure viability, the costs of any requirements likely to be applied to development, such as requirements for affordable housing, standards, infrastructure contributions or other requirements should, when taking account of the normal cost of development and mitigation, provide competitive returns to a willing land owner and willing developer to enable the development to be deliverable.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Sam Wall who was speaking on behalf of the applicant.

RESOLVED:

- A) That the applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 to secure a financial contribution of £5,500 for open space, sport and recreation and £4500 for mitigation of the impact of the development on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation;
- B) That on completion of the Agreement the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.
- C) That the implementation period for the proposal be reduced from three years to two years.

120. Application CH/14/0051, Beau Desert Golf Club, Rugeley Road, Hazel Slade, Cannock – Part change of use to containerised biomass system to power golf club

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that on Enclosure 6.4 the reference to Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council was incorrect and should have read Brindley Heath Parish Council. He confirmed they had no objections. He also commented that an issue was raised at the site visit and he confirmed that the containerised biomass system would generate heat (not electricity). He explained that the applicant had also provided an explanation as to why they were seeking retrospective permission and this was explained to the Committee.

RESOLVED:

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

121. Application CH/14/0014, 34 North Street, Cannock – Change of use from shop (A1) to café (A3)

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.10 – 6.18 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

A Member asked whether Environmental Health Officers would monitor the fumes to ensure they had no effect on the flats above. The Development Control Manager confirmed that this issue was covered by condition.

RESOLVED:

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

The meeting finished at 3.35pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, 16 APRIL, 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.	Pearson, A.
Ball, G.D.	Rowley, J.
Fisher, P.A.	Todd, Mrs. D.
Freeman, Miss M.	Todd, R.
Grocott, M.R.	Whitehouse, Mrs. L.M.

122. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C. Anslow and M. Sutherland.

123. 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.

124. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillors J.T. Kraujalis, Miss M. Freeman and R. Todd declared they had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/13/0430, Residential development – demolition of Ivy House and erection of six 2 bedroom houses, six 3 bedroom houses and four 1 bedroom flats; with access from Wolverhampton Road and Oakwoods, amended layout and design – Ivy House at junction of Wolverhampton Road and Oakwoods, Cannock

125. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 26 March, 2014 be approved as a correct record.

126. Members' requests for site visits

No requests were made.

127. Application CH/13/0430, Residential development – demolition of Ivy House and erection of six 2 bedroom houses, six 3 bedroom houses and four 1 bedroom flats; with access from Wolverhampton Road and Oakwoods, amended layout and design – Ivy House at junction of Wolverhampton Road and Oakwoods, Cannock

Following a site visit consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.22 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager provided Members with the following update:

“The description of the application should read twelve 3 bedroom houses and four 1 bedroom flats – there were no 2 bedroom houses.

Enclosure 6.10

Council Ecologist’s comments – *“From the information submitted it appears unlikely that the granting of planning consent would result in a significant adverse impact on species that are legally protected or of principle conservation importance. Therefore I have no objection to the proposals”*

Environmental Services (Landscaping) comments regarding encroachment onto open space – The Councils Estates Officer has looked into this and has advised as follows – *“.....the proposed development as drawn on revised drawing no. 2239-1001-J encroaches onto land owned by CCDC by approximately 300mm. The development site has clearly been extended beyond the legal boundary between CCDC owned land and the site of Ivy House. Under normal circumstances I would be seeking payment from the developer on the basis that the Council is entitled to a share of the development value of the plot of which the Council’s land forms part. You have confirmed however that the proposed development is made up entirely of affordable housing. Therefore, in recognition of the Council’s support for the development of affordable housing in the District, the Council does not intend to take any action in respect of this encroachment”*.

S106 Contributions

A letter has been received from the applicant “The Wrekin Housing Trust” today, which in summary states that:

The current situation is that the scheme is unviable without incurring the additional £66,320 (S106 contribution) cost, which is as a consequence of build costs increasing and costs of other survey work;

The scheme provides 12 family homes and 4 x 1 bed flats for people with learning difficulties; the Trust is happy to enter into a nominations agreement and agree a letting plan so that the proposed affordable

dwellings are let to people who are currently living in Cannock and its surrounding areas;

The applicant states that they have liaised with the Council's Housing Team who supported the bid for the grant funding for the proposed schemes and the type of dwellings proposed are needed in the district;

The proposed scheme proposes sufficient open space in the form of rear gardens and other open space on adjoining "Langbourn" site. Also, refer to financial contribution for loss of existing play area;

For the above reasons the applicant is requesting that the s106 requirements are removed.

Affordable Housing

In addition to the s106 requirements set out in the report Officers also request that any subsequent s106 Agreement includes a requirement to secure the proposed "affordable housing" in perpetuity.

The Development Control Manager advised that professional valuers would need to consider the applicant's request to remove the s106 contributions due to viability.

He confirmed that the development, as proposed, was needed in the district and the suggestion to enter into a nominations agreement was supported. He also advised that the SAC financial contribution of £7,200 was non-negotiable as it is a requirement under Habitat Regulations. With regards to the other elements of the s106 contribution he commented that the applicant would have to demonstrate via a viability assessment that the scheme was unviable.

He suggested that if the Committee was minded to approve the application, Officers be given delegated authority to assess any viability assessment to support the suggestion that the scheme was unviable with the requested s106 contributions. He confirmed that the recommendation as set out in the report would remain unchanged as the viability of the scheme had not yet been independently assessed.

He also commented that Condition 21 would be reworded for clarity should the application be approved.

Members raised concern regarding the applicants request to remove the suggested s106 contributions and it was suggested that the application should be deferred to allow further investigations.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to allow further investigations to take place with regard to the applicant's request to remove the s106 contributions.

128. Application CH/13/0132, Residential development – 5 pairs of 2 storey 3 bedroom houses (with rooms in roof space), 3 detached 2 storey 4 bedroom houses and 1 detached 3 bedroom bungalow – amended plans – Hednesford Court Office, Anglesey Street, Hednesford

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.23 – 6.42 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that at the meeting of the Committee on 5 March Members raised concern regarding the applicant's viability assessment indicating that the development would be unviable and their request for a substantially reduced s106 contribution. Officers were asked to liaise with the applicant to renegotiate the s106 contribution. Officers had now met with the applicant and his agent and the applicant's surveyor has re-assessed the scheme. The latest assessment (which had been verified by an independent valuer) indicates that without any S106 contribution the developer will be making a 2% profit on the scheme. The developer was questioned over why the scheme would be going ahead given this situation and his response was contained in paragraph 5.18 of the report.

The Officer advised that this was a genuine case and the Committee's role was not to question the process that had been followed. It was considered that the reduced s106 contributions were acceptable.

Members raised concerns regarding the reduced s106 contributions. The Officer commented that, whilst he understood the concerns being raised, an independent professional valuer had analysed the viability assessment and confirmed that the site was unlikely to be viable with any form of contribution.

Following a lengthy debate Councillor Pearson moved approval of the application and this was seconded by Councillor Kraujalis.

Following a vote the motion was not carried.

Councillors M. Grocott and J. Rowley requested their names be recorded as having abstained from voting.

Councillor J. Kraujalis then moved that the application be deferred to enable Members to receive further information regarding the viability assessment. This was seconded by Councillor M. Grocott.

Following a vote the motion was carried.

Councillor F.W.C. Allen left the meeting prior to the vote being taken.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to enable Members to be provided with further information regarding the viability assessment.

The meeting finished at 3.55pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE

PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY, 7 MAY APRIL, 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.	Grocott, M.R.
Anslow, C.	Pearson, A.
Ball, G.D.	Rowley, J.
Fisher, P.A.	Snape, P. (substituting for Sutherland, M)
Freeman, Miss M.	Whitehouse, Mrs. L.M.

129. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor M. Sutherland, Mrs. D.M. Todd and R. Todd.

Councillor P. Snape was in attendance as Councillor M. Sutherland's nominated substitute.

130. 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.

131. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillors J.T. Kraujalis and Miss M. Freeman declared they had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/13/0430, Residential development – demolition of Ivy House and erection of six 2 bedroom houses, six 3 bedroom houses and four 1 bedroom flats; with access from Wolverhampton Road and Oakwoods, amended layout and design – Ivy House at junction of Wolverhampton Road and Oakwoods, Cannock

132. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 16 April, 2014 be approved as a correct record.

133. Members' requests for site visits

RESOLVED:

That a site visit be undertaken in respect of ****Application CH/14/0132 – Resubmission of planning application CH/13/0270: Change of use from paddock to touring caravan site. The smallholding, Kingsley Wood Road, Rugeley** in order to assess the access and egress to the site.

134. Application CH/13/0430, Residential development – demolition of Ivy House and erection of six 2 bedroom houses, six 3 bedroom houses and four 1 bedroom flats; with access from Wolverhampton Road and Oakwoods, amended layout and design – Ivy House at junction of Wolverhampton Road and Oakwoods, Cannock

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.17 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager made reference to Enclosure 6.7 – Emerging Development Plan and advised that CP3 (Chase Shaping and Design) would be added should permission be granted. He then read out a letter of objection that had been received from Councillor Janos Toth.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mrs. Price (an objector), Staffordshire County Councillor Mrs. Alison Spicer (objector) and Heather Sutton (Applicant's agent in support of the application).

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:

1. The proposed development would result in the loss of a non-designated heritage asset (Ivy House) to provide a new residential development. On balance, it is considered that the benefits of the new development do not outweigh the harm, which would result as a consequence of the total loss of a non-designated heritage asset, which is of significant local architectural and historic value. As such, the proposal is contrary to the aims of the NPPF and CP15 of the Emerging Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1), which seek to safeguard and conserve the historic environment.

2. The proposed development results in an 'over-developed' site, which, as a consequence of its layout fails to meet minimum amenity standards, results in the loss of mature landscaping and provides limited open space. Consequently, the proposed development would result in a poor quality development and would have an adverse impact on the character and appearance of the street scene and visual amenity of the wider area. As such, the proposal conflicts with saved Cannock Chase Local Plan Policies B8, H3, H4, DCP6; Residential Extensions Design Guide (SPG); Policy CP3 of the Emerging Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1) and the NPPF.

135. Application CH/13/0132, Residential development – 5 pairs of 2 storey 3 bedroom houses (with rooms in roof space), 3 detached 2 storey 4 bedroom houses and 1 detached 3 bedroom bungalow – amended plans – Hednesford Court Office, Anglesey Street, Hednesford

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.18 – 6.20 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that part of the Officers report was missing from the agenda and this was circulated to Members at the meeting. He explained that this was the same report as was considered at the last meeting; however, any updates had been highlighted in yellow. He led Members through the report outlining the highlighted points, as follows:

“The application was presented previously at Planning Control Committee (16/4/14, 5/3/14, 4/12/13 and 13/11/13) where consent was granted subject to a section 106 obligation. The s106 was to include a £33,093 education contribution, £29,405.25 towards open space and £6300 SAC mitigation payment.

The applicant had subsequently commissioned and submitted a viability assessment indicating that the development as it stands would be unviable. The applicant had stated that they were willing to contribute £11,031 for a single education placed and the compulsory £6300 for the SAC. At the last Committee the proposed reduced s106 contribution was considered unacceptable. Members requested that Officers liaise with the applicant to further investigate the viability assessment in the aim of renegotiating the s106 contribution.

The proposed s106 contribution has been considered and outlined in paragraphs 5.13 to 5.25 of the report.

The planning obligations for developers are set out within the SPD. It outlines the thresholds and contributions required in respect of various contributions that can be applied where triggered by a proposal.

The SPD also recognises the impact obligations can have on the viability of schemes. It states that in cases where there are concerns over viability “Negotiations will be undertaken between the Council and the developer in order to establish what level of contributions are feasible and if the scheme can still be considered acceptable”.

The developer is keen to carry out the development as they already own the land and would rather make a small profit on the build than none whatsoever. Their intention is to build the site over a period of approximately 18 months. The developer has stated to the Council that they have no intention of selling the site on as it is opposite his home and therefore has a personal interest in seeing the site developed. Furthermore the developer will use a local building firm and local suppliers ensuring that there is an immediate economic benefit to the local area through the construction phase. On top of this there will be additional economic benefits to the Council as a result of New Homes Bonus and the

ongoing Council Tax contributions upon occupation.

The majority of the outstanding contribution is for open space improvements. In this instance given the large sums of money recently allotted to the Council through the Heritage Lottery Fund for works to Hednesford Park, and planning obligations from the Tesco development, there is sufficient funding available for local open space improvements and provision in the immediate vicinity of the application site”.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Andy Wilkes (Applicant) and Philip McChonnachie (Chartered Surveyor) who were in attendance to answer Members concerns regarding the reduced s106 contributions and the viability assessment.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 to secure a contribution of £11,031 to provide 1 primary school place and £6,300 for Cannock Chase SAC mitigation.
- (B) That on completion of the Agreement the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

136. Application CH/14/0078, Two externally illuminated free standing signs, White Hart, 57 Wolverhampton Road, Cannock

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.21 – 6.24 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Punter (an objector).

RESOLVED:

- (A) That sign 1 be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.
- (B) That sign 2 be refused for the following reason:
The siting, scale and design of sign 2 in front of the flank wall of the adjacent club results in visual clutter of signage to the detriment of the visual amenity of the area. Consequently, the sign conflicts with Local Plan Policy DCP2: Poster Displays and Hoardings, and the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting finished at 4:35pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY, 28 MAY 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.	Grocott, M.R.
Ball, G.D.	Pearson, A.
Bernard, J. (UKIP substitute)	Snape, P. (Conservative substitute)
Fisher, P.A.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Freeman, Miss M.	Todd, R.

137. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors C. Anslow and Mrs. P.Z. Stretton.

Councillors M. Sutherland and Mrs. L. Whitehouse were not re-elected at the District Council Elections on 22 May 2014. Councillor P. Snape was in attendance to take the Conservative seat on the Committee and Councillor J. Bernard was in attendance to take the UKIP seat on the Committee.

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

The following declarations were made in addition to those already confirmed by Members in the Register of Members Interests:-

Member	Interest	Type
A. Pearson	Application CH/14/0026, Residential development: Erection of a terrace of 3 No. 3 bedroom dwellings (reserved matters, appearance, landscaping and scale) amended plans: Land to rear of Asda, Surrey Close, Cannock – Member knows the speaker objecting to the application	Personal
Miss Freeman	Application CH/14/0026, Residential development: Erection of a terrace of 3 No. 3 bedroom dwellings (reserved	Personal

Matters, appearance, landscaping and scale) amended plans: Land to rear of Asda, Surrey Close, Cannock – Member knows the speaker objecting to the application

139. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

None disclosed.

140. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 7 May, 2014 be approved as a correct record.

141. Members' requests for site visits

RESOLVED:

That a site visit be undertaken in respect of Application CH/14/0158 – Demolition of existing club and erection of 4 no. 2 bedroom houses – the British Legion, Bow Street, Rugeley

Reason: To assess impact of over-development, the access and road network.

142. Application CH/13/0397, Removal of condition 9 of planning permission CH/88/673, to allow unfettered occupation of Larkholme as a dwellinghouse, Larkholme, Shooting Butts Road, Rugeley

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that the recommendation to approve the application subject to the completion of a Section 106 Agreement and conditions was incorrect. There was an existing Section 52 Agreement which would need to be varied should permission be granted.

RESOLVED:

That following the completion of a Deed of Release of Covenant pursuant to an Agreement under Section 52 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1971 the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

143. Application CH/13/0282, Change of use from office (B1) to public house (A4) single storey side extension and installation of plant equipment to rear elevation, Anglesey Lodge, Anglesey Street, Hednesford

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.10 – 6.35 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that additional Highway conditions and two additional landscape conditions would be added should the application be approved.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. F. Pritchard (the Applicant).

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein and to the following additional conditions and informative:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein and to the following additional conditions and informative:

1) Notwithstanding the details shown on the approved Proposed Site Plan AP01 Rev D prior to the first use of the development the new access to the site from Anglesey Street shall be completed as a “dropped kerb” within the limits of the public highway with the existing bus stop flag sign relocated in accordance with details first to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority prior to the commencement of development.

Reason: In order to comply with Para. 32 of the NPPF.

2) Notwithstanding the details shown on the submitted Proposed Site Plan AP01 – Rev D no development shall be commenced until revised details are submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority indicating the gates to the service access opening away from the public highway. Any gates to the access shall thereafter be installed and retained in accordance with the approved details.

Reason: In order to comply with Para. 32 of the NPPF.

3) The development hereby permitted shall not be commenced until the existing site access to Anglesey Street which shall include the access crossing between the site and the carriageway edge made redundant as a consequence of the development hereby permitted is closed and reinstated as footway/verge in accordance with details first to be submitted to and approved in writing by the local Planning Authority.

Reason: In order to comply with Para. 32 of the NPPF.

4) The approved landscape works shown on the drawing to be provided shall be carried out in the first planting and seeding season following the occupation of any buildings or the completion of the development

whichever is the sooner and retained for the life of the development (pursuant to Condition 10 above).

Reason: In the interest of visual amenity of the area. In accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

5) Any trees or plants which within a period of five years from the date of planting die, are removed or become seriously damaged or diseased, shall be replaced in the following planting season with others of similar size and species unless the Local Planning Authority gives written consent to any variation.

Reason: In the interests of visual amenity of the area. In accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

Informative Note(s) to be included on Decision Notice

Please note that prior to the access being constructed you require Section 184 Notice of Approval from Staffordshire County Council. The link below provides a further link to “Vehicle dropped crossings information pack” and an application form for a dropped crossing. Please complete and send to the address indicated on the application form which is Staffordshire County Council, Network Management Unit, c/o Wedgwood Building, Tipping Street, Stafford ST16 2LP or email nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk

Please note that prior to the commencement of work to reinstate the existing site access you require a Permit to Dig. Please contact Staffordshire County Council Network Management Unit, c/o Wedgwood Building, Tipping Street, Stafford, ST16 2LP or email nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk

144. Application CH/14/0061, Change of use from 3 bedroom dwelling to 2 bedroom flat (first floor) with training room (D1) on ground floor and associated single storey rear extension (amended plans), 64 Stafford Street, Cannock

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.36 – 6.45 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by 2 objectors (Mr. Birch and Mrs. Luke) and Councillor Mrs. Spicer (the Ward Councillor).

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the reasons outlined in the report.

145. Application CH/14/0026, Residential development – erection of a terrace of 3 No. 3 bedroom dwellings (reserved matters: appearance, landscaping and scale) – amended plans, Land to the rear of Asda,

Surrey Close, Cannock

Following a site visit, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.46 – 6.57 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Wilkes (an objector) and Miranda Steadman (representing the Applicant).

Arising from the representations Mr. Wilkes questioned whether he had been consulted on the amended plans as the drawing he had differed to the one shown in the report. The Development Control Manager advised that the only difference in the drawing was that an extra line had been added to show the sight line for the benefit of officers.

In the interest of fairness Members agreed to adjourn the meeting to allow Officers the opportunity to check the plans.

The meeting re-convened and the Development Control Manager confirmed that neighbours had been consulted on the revised levels as shown on the plan within the report – these had not changed. The only amendment to the drawing was to include an additional line to show there was no impact on neighbours. As the levels had not changed in the drawing there was no need to consult neighbours on this amendment and the application would be approved on the basis of the levels drawing consulted on.

RESOLVED:

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

146. Application CH/13/0149, Residential development – erection of two 3 storey 4 bedroom detached houses and one detached 3 bedroom bungalow, outline including access and layout (revision of CH/11/0085), 19 Eskrett Street, Hednesford, Cannock

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.58 – 6.76 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that Environmental Health were aware of the history of the site in relation to asbestos and had recommended a site investigation be carried out should the application be approved. Should there be a need for any remedial works to be undertaken this would be carried out before the development commenced.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Roskell (an objector) and John Reynolds (the Agent representing the Applicant).

RESOLVED:

(A) That the applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990, to secure a financial contribution of £1350 towards mitigating the impact of the proposed development on the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation.

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

147. Application CH/14/0116, Temporary consent for occupational workers' dwelling in association with stables, extension of consent granted under planning permission CH/11/0101, Stafford Brook Stables, Rugeley

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.77 – 6.86 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved for at temporary period of 3 years subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein.

(The meeting finished at 5.30pm).

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 01 APRIL, 2014 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Ball, G.D. (Chairman)
Bottomer, B. (Vice-Chairman)

Gamble, B. Molineux, G.

Also Present Grant Patterson, Director – Grant Thornton (External Auditors)
Andrew Reid, Senior Manager – Grant Thornton (External Auditors)

33. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillor J. Johnson

34. Declaration 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.

35. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 November 2013 be approved as a correct record and signed.

36. Annual Governance Statement – Quarter 3 Progress Report

Consideration was given to Report of Head of Governance (Item 4.1 – 4.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Governance provided the following update:

- The actions and progress detailed were up to the end of February 2014 rather than December 2013;
- Any actions not completed as at 1 April 2014 would be carried over to 2014-15;
- Contract Procedure Rules – in the process of being reviewed and

- updated in conjunction with Stafford Borough Council;
- Code of Governance – officer titles need to be updated to reflect changes to the senior management structure and responsibility for specific duties within the framework;
- Review of Employee Code of Conduct – the review of the Council's Values was nearly complete, so work to review the Employee Code will commence afterwards;
- Member training and development survey – this will now take place after the post elections councillor induction programme in May 2014;
- ICT Security Policies – these have now been approved and issued to employees. They will be issued to councillors as part of the induction programme.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

37. Strategic Risk Register

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 5.1 – 5.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Governance provided the following update:

- Five risks have not changed status since the last update, and one has been revised from red to amber status;
- Risk no. 17 – rating status has changed due to the completion of the annual budget process;
- Risk no. 15 – Expect this risk to be revised or removed from the register by the time of the next review as work on the Local Plan was well underway;
- Risk no. 4 – status of this risk had been discussed with the Corporate Director and Head of Commissioning. Need to determine whether it will be encompassed within the wider financial risks, or refined and refocused.

RESOLVED:

That the report be noted.

38. Internal Audit – Quarter 3 Report 2013-14

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Internal Auditor (Item 6.1 – 6.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chief Internal Auditor provided the following update:

- By the end of Q3, 14 out of 22 planned audits had been completed, however it was expected that all audits planned audits would be completed by the end of 2013/14, with the exception of the fleet management audit which was being deferred to 2014/15.

- Culture & Leisure Services Contract Monitoring audit – the working relationship with Wigan Leisure & Culture Trust (WLCT) will continue to be monitored, at distance, following acceptance by Council management of the level of risks involved in the current processes.
- Central Control audit – following the original audit undertaken in April 2013, management have been working to address the issues raised, but some require further time to fully address them, so the classification for the service has been revised from ‘Needs Fundamental Change’ to ‘Requiring Some Improvement’;
- Housing Benefit Fraud Investigation Team audit – one issue identified had recently been resolved so the audit classification would be revised to ‘Effective’ .
- General Ledger (IT Audit) 2nd Follow-up – Whilst remaining “Requiring Some Improvement” at the time of the follow-up it is not recommended that the Audit Committee should take action at this time to question the lack of progress as it is expected that most of the outstanding issues should have been rectified by a software update which took place in February 2014, although no audit work has yet been undertaken to address this it will be verified as part of the main General Ledger audit in quarter 4..

Councillor Gamble queried if the Audit team were satisfied that where items had been identified as requiring improvements then the necessary changes would be achieved. The Chief Internal Auditor replied that this was the case for all audits apart from the Culture & Leisure Services Contract Monitoring as management had not offered up any improvements to the risks identified.

The Chairman asked what was happening in respect of the Streetscene – Street Cleansing Function audit, as this was still identified as ‘Needs Fundamental Change’.

The Chief Internal Auditor replied that this had been discussed at previous meeting of the Committee, but work was still ongoing to address issues raised. Due to the manager of this area being on long term sickness, the audit would be subjected to follow-up in 2014-15.

RESOLVED:

That the progress during the third quarter of 2013-14 be noted.

39. Internal Audit Plan for 2014-15

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Internal Auditor (Item 7.1 – 7.6 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chief Internal Auditor asked the Committee to give consideration to omitting the Leisure Contract Monitoring Arrangements from the proposed 2014-15 Audit Plan despite it being identified as high risk status. Internal Audit had classified this area as “Requiring Some Improvement” in 2013-14. Management have accepted the findings but are not looking to address the

issues identified. Due to the good working relationship with WCLT they are happy to accept the level of risk identified in the report. As such it would be more beneficial to use Internal Audit's resources on other services rather than make the same recommendations in 2014-15. .

In respect of audits where recommendations for improvement had been identified, Councillor Gamble queried how much time services were given to implement the recommendations before a follow-up audit was conducted.

The Chief Internal Auditor indicated that follow-ups are normally carried out 6 months after a final audit report has been issued. Although it is accepted that some actions may not have fully completed at that time. If sufficient progress has not been made a second follow-up will be scheduled after a further 6 months.

RESOLVED:

That;

(A) The Audit Plan for 2014-15 be approved

(B) The Leisure Contract Monitoring Arrangements be omitted from the Audit Plan for 2014-15.

40. Confidential Reporting, Anti-Fraud & Bribery and Anti-Money Laundering Frameworks

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Internal Auditor (Item 8.1 – 8.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Councillor Gamble queried how often the Confidential Reporting Policy had been used since it was first adopted.

The Chief Internal Auditor replied that an average of 1 to 2 issues were raised annually via the Policy, and were either resolved immediately as not being relevant concerns to raise or were fully investigated.

The Chief Internal Auditor then advised that training was going to be arranged for Wider Management Team on the policies, and information included in the Core Brief. Information will also be circulate to Members in due course.

Councillor Bottomer queried what happened once an issue was reported using one of these policies. The Chief Internal Auditor replied that reports were referred to specific named officers with records held on a central file stored separately from the complaints files.

The Head of Governance advised that when issues were reported over the telephone, it was advisable to also send an email to ensure a paper trail was in place.

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet, at its meeting to be held on 17 April, 2014, be recommended to adopt the Anti-Fraud & Bribery Framework; the revised Confidential Reporting Framework and the Anti-Money Laundering Framework.

Reasons for Decisions

The Council has existing Anti-Fraud and Confidential reporting frameworks which were last approved in 2009. Since that time there have been a number of changes in legislation and best practice including the introduction of the Bribery Act and changes to the law surrounding protection to employees for Whistleblowing. The policies have been updated to reflect these changes.

The Council has not previously adopted a Money Laundering framework or offered direct guidance and support to its employees on the identification and reporting of suspected money laundering since the Proceeds of Crime Act was introduced. Although the Council is not part of the Regulated Sector which are required to have detailed formal procedures in place it is seen as best practice to have a policy in place. The attached Anti-Money Laundering Framework has therefore produced to provide a reporting mechanism as well as support to employees.

The Confidential Reporting Framework provides a clear, documented route by which anyone, whether internal or external to the Council, can report concerns about illegal, improper or dangerous activities and provides protection where it is available against harassment and victimisation for doing so. It sits as a front-end process which can provide a route to raise concerns in confidence into a number of Council policies and processes.

The Anti-fraud and Bribery Framework provides information relating to the Council's stance on fraud and bribery and set-out the processes that will be used to investigate and where necessary prosecute any fraud or bribery identified. It also sets-out the proactive work undertaken to minimise the Council's chances of falling victim to fraud or bribery.

The Anti-Money Laundering Framework sets out the actions the Council will take to minimise its exposure to money-laundering as well as providing a route by which suspicious activity can be reported. The framework also sets-out the actions the Council will take when money-laundering activity is identified to ensure compliance with the necessary legislation.

41. Cannock Chase District Council Audit Plan 2013-14

Consideration was given to the Report of the External Auditors (Item 9.1 – 9.16 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Grant Patterson advised that as the Council had not yet commenced a review of its S106 reserves as recommended in the previous year, progress on completing this recommendation would be followed up with relevant Officers.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the External Auditors be noted.

42. Informing the Audit Risk Assessment for Cannock Chase District Council

Consideration was given to the Report of the External Auditors (Item 10.1 – 10.21 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Andrew Reid advised that on the basis of responses received from Officers, the Auditors were happy that the Council did not have any significant weaknesses, and that there was adequate and appropriate structures in place to manage risk.

Councillor Gamble queried the change of accounting method for property plant & equipment valuations.

Andrew Reid replied that the guidance had changed, which meant that councils now had to have valuations in place for all council owned assets. In respect of Cannock, the Auditors were satisfied with the arrangements in place to support valuations taking place, although they were not strictly in line with CIPFA requirements.

Councillor Gamble then queried if the responses from Officers gave the Auditors assurances that the Council was on the right track.

Grant Patterson replied that this was the case, but the purpose of the presenting the assessment to the Committee was to allow for Members to ask questions and determine if the right framework was in place, but developing Members' understanding could form part of the Committee's training programme.

The Head of Governance advised that a questionnaire was to be distributed to Members, Officers and the Auditors in order to help conduct a review of the Audit Committee, and identify any specific training requirements.

Andrew Reid also advised that a document had been produced for Audit Committee members on understanding local authority accounts, which would be circulated to Members via the Senior Committee Officer.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the External Auditors be noted.

The meeting closed at 5:30pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 25 FEBRUARY 2014, 4:00PM
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors:

Gamble, B. (Chairman)
Ball, G. (Vice-Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S. M. Rowley, J.
Fisher, P.A. Sutton, Mrs. H.M
Freeman, Miss M.A.

Staffordshire County Council Co-opted Member – SCC Mrs. C. Mitchell
Independent Co-opted Member – Hester Parsons (HealthWatch)

44. Apologies

There were no apologies

45. Declarations of Interests of Members in Contracts and Other Matters and Restrictions on Voting by Members

There were no interests declared.

46. Minutes

AGREED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 3 February, 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed by the Chairman subject.

47. Briefing regarding the Future of Day Services at Great Wyrley Day Centre

The District Lead Commissioner presented an update on the future of day services at Great Wyrley. A month long consultation had been conducted with users, carers and staff regarding the options available.

The District Lead Commissioner gave the background to Great Wyrley Day Centre and how when it was first opened and up to capacity there were 110 people attending a day and a further forty people attending the day unit at Cannock Hospital

Currently at Great Wyrley there are on average 55 people using the service in total with an average of 23 people attending per day. This has been a considerable drop in attendance.

The demand has changed as have the needs of the people. There has been an increase in the need for dementia day care. In addition the increase in costs at Great Wyrley may have been prohibitive for some to continue.

There has been a decrease in the number of Cannock Chase residents using the Great Wyrley day centre which could be attributed to the alternative provision that is on offer in the Cannock Chase area.

For example there are the Homestead Centres that are in Heath Hayes and Armitage. These are open 2 days and 5 days respectively. Both of these facilities are running at nearly full capacity and are accessed through the direct payment model. School Court is another contracted service and this caters for people with medium care needs. Age UK have also been commissioned to provide a service for people with dementia and these operate in Cannock and Bridgtown.

Initially when people attended day centres this was all that was on offer as time and services have progressed this has meant more choice for service users.

Chase CSV cater for low level need and run 5 groups with a possibility of a further one being set up. These groups average 15-20 people per day.

Therefore, across the Cannock Chase area there is a three tier service. There are people with low level need which is serviced by Chase CSV, medium level need which are serviced by Homestead and high level need which is serviced by Age UK. All these factors can equate for a drop in the level of attendance at Great Wyrley.

Through working with Great Wyrley and the people who attend benefitting from assessments some of them have already decided on alternative services. The outcome of the consultation may well be that Great Wyrley day centre closes. If this is the case there is provision for South Staffs residents at the Roller Mill site. This may have an impact on Langley Voluntary day centre with the whole site potentially closing.

Cannock is fortunate that a lot of work has been undertaken and provision has been sourced already compared to other areas.

Age UK has reached capacity at Bridgtown and is in the process of looking to create more space. There is the possibility of extending opening hours to a Saturday or investigating additional bed space.

A number of Cannock Chase residents attend Roller Mill as this is a high dementia care centre. There are three contained rooms which people

move through. This is compared to Bridgtown which is very open and service users are encouraged to move around the building without feeling threatened.

Members commented that it was unfortunate that Great Wyrley may have to close as this had been an excellent day service for a number of years. They queried whether the respite unit would also close. The District Lead Commissioner reiterated that the centre was not used as much as it used to be. There is the potential possibility that the site will be used as a Centre of Excellence in dementia. This could possibly be in the guise of a nursing home with other day care facilities but would function to a specific level of quality. This would be a private provider.

Members questioned whether the real reason that Great Wyrley would close was down to funding cuts. The Officer reiterated that very few people accessed this service now due to other provision within the Cannock area.

Members asked for clarification on what was meant by a Centre of Excellence. The Officer explained that the model typically refers to high quality care in the same place i.e. on the same site. This means as the needs of the service user alter and change, the service user would remain on the same site but could be in a different part of the building or in another building on the site. Everything would in effect be 'under one roof' on one site.

The officer explained that the tendering process for commissioners for the Centre of Excellence had begun as it was a complex and time consuming exercise.

With regard to the cost of travel for services at the moment Members questioned whether this was incorporated in the cost of the service. The Officer explained that both Age UK and Homestead collected their service users and this was included in their fees. Chase CSV provided the service in the community and it was incumbent on the user to provide their own form of transport. Schools Court did not provide any transport; however, many of the service users lived on School Court site anyway.

The Officer made the offer to arrange two site visits:

- Stone Road Extra Care Scheme in Stafford which is a nursing home that will be used as a model to base the tender for the Centre of Excellence on.
- Madeley, near Crewe which is deemed a Centre of Excellence.

Members agreed to these two visits and the officer agreed to arrange this.

48. Review of Disabled Adaptations Summary Report

The Head of Environmental Health drew the Members attention to the recommendations at the front of the report and also to the attached extracts

of minutes highlighting the discussions that had taken place. One area that needed careful consideration was in relation to the Disabled Facilities Grant Funding due to the recent increase of cases (7) for the HIA. These adaptations could have a significant impact on the financial implications for the end of year. This would involve further work being undertaken to assess the financial impact.

Members agreed that there was a need to assess the financial impact and bring the findings back to the Committee.

RESOLVED

- 1) The Head of Environmental Health to present a report on the financial implications of the extra 7 cases.
- 2) Members to review all the information they have received and to come with some recommendations to the next meeting

49. Update – HealthWatch Staffordshire

The representative commented that the Carers Project was still on going with the survey on line on their website.

Work was being undertake with regard to dementia patients and there was a survey on line as well.

Healthwatch had been invited to send a representative to the Southern Dementia Networking Group which was meeting this week.

49. Items arising from the Staffordshire County Council's Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee

There were no items as the Committee had not met.

50. Work Programme

A report containing the findings of the meetings and emerging recommendations will be brought to a future meeting.

51. Date of Next Meeting

Members noted that the date of the next meeting was scheduled for 8 April, 2014, 4.00pm, Esperance Room.

The meeting closed at 5.00pm

CHAIRMAN

development of the Policy through extensive consultation. He informed Members that copies of the consultation responses were in the Licensing Unit if any of them wished to see them.

Through this newly updated Policy it would improve the administration, the committee workings and give the trade more assistance which had been an overriding factor.

The Government had tasked the Law Commission to review legislation on hackney carriage and private hire licensing. An interim statement had been issued. The Law Commission are due to issue a final report and produce a draft bill for parliament. Members raised the issue of training when the bill was produced. The Head of Environmental Health assured Members that training would be forthcoming as and when the bill was published.

Within in the revised Policy there were proposed changes:

Assessment of driver fitness and propriety (driving and medical records, past criminal history (if any), knowledge test, person conduct etc).

Under this area there were some important changes relating to the drivers' licences which used to be given for one year at a time, but would now be issued on a three yearly basis and still be reviewed at any time if there was any cause for concern. The driver would then come before the Committee.

During the consultation it was noted that the drivers were not satisfied with the location and costs of the medical assessments. If a driver was fit and well then the current service provided more than they needed. However, if the driver had complex medical issues then the current medical assessments were a benefit as the examiner would contact consultants and other medical professions to gather all the information regarding their health issues.

It was now proposed that there would be a two tier system:

The first option would be a medical examination available at a local provider. This would be a straightforward examination with a reduced fee. However, any additional enquiries would incur further cost. The second option would be as existing with a higher fee but which would include any further enquiries. The taxi drivers could choose which of these options they preferred.

Members raised the issue regarding the alcohol and drug testing for new applicants and when in the day this testing would take place. Members were concerned that if was later in the day the alcohol content may have reduced significantly. The Head of Environmental Health agreed to take these concerns on board when a provider was being sourced.

Members questioned what would happen if a driver failed the alcohol and drug test. The Head of Environmental Health explained that medical confirmation would be sought and they would be told that they were not fit and to come back at a later date.

A discussion ensued regarding how long after the initial failed test would a prospective driver have to wait. It was agreed that a six month period should elapse before the driver could reapply.

Members enquired as to whether random alcohol and drug tests would be undertaken on taxi drivers. The Head of Environmental Health explained that these tests would only happen if there was intelligence indicating that there may be issues with an individual. He explained that there had to be an element of trust as potentially owner drivers were putting their livelihoods at risk and operators would not want any of their drivers to jeopardise their business.

The Head of Environmental Health explained that there would be independent annual checks on the DVLA licences for taxi drivers. These were being introduced as drivers licences would now be issued for three years. Drivers licences will be checked via the DVLA to check if any of the drivers have received any points on their licence during this period.

With regard to the dress code in the policy it was now more clear as to what was and what was not acceptable.

Consultation had taken place regarding wheelchair accessibility for taxis. The existing policy states that only taxis that had access for side loading of wheelchairs were permitted. the new policy states that rear loaders will be permitted as well.

The Exceptional Vehicles criteria was removed from the new policy. The test for the vehicles under the new policy was against a VOSA approved vehicle standard that required a comprehensive assessment of the vehicle.

The Head of Environmental Health raised the issue that if Council agreed the Policy when would the committee want the changes implemented with immediate effect. He explained that some of the changes were quite easy to implement and would have a positive impact on the taxi drivers immediately other changes for example the fees and charges could not be brought in until 1 April 2014. Members were in favour of implementing the changes as soon as possible for each area if the Council agreed the Policy.

RESOLVED:

- 1) It was agreed that an amendment would be taken to Council on 15 January 2014 regarding the alcohol and drug testing. The Members were in agreement that if a new applicant failed an alcohol or drug test they would not be allowed to apply for a licence for six months. If an existing driver failed an alcohol or drug test then they would have their licence revoked for six months.
- 2) Councillor Bennett would move this amendment at Council on 15 January using agreed wording for the Policy which the Head of Environmental Health would draft.

- 3) It was agreed that if the new Policy was accepted at Council changes that could be made immediately would be done and the following changes would be implemented as and when other procedures had been agreed.

That the Briefing Note be noted.

43. Briefing Note – Home Office Consultation on Abolition of Personal Licences

Consideration was given to the Briefing Note of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 6.1 – 6.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Briefing Note be noted.

44. Briefing Note – Government Consultation on Proposals for Regulated Entertainment

Consideration was given to the Briefing Note of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 7.1 – 7.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Briefing Note be noted.

45. 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).

CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 14 JANUARY 2014 AT 9.30 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

46. Briefing Note – Outcome of a Recent Appeal to the Decision of the Committee

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Briefing Note of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 9.1 – 9.2 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Members agreed that the outcome of this hearing was good for the Council. That the Committee had been seen to be undertaking their duties and had acted accordingly.

The Head of Environmental Health explained that within the new policy the Exceptional Vehicle meetings would rarely be required as there was a new procedure in place which removed reliance on only the age and mileage of the vehicle. Members were in approval of this.

RESOLVED:

That the Briefing Note be noted.

The meeting closed at 10.35am

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 28 JANUARY 2014 AT 10.00 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Stretton, Mrs. P.Z. (Chairman)
Dudson, A. (Vice-Chairman)

Bernard, J.D. Sutherland, M.
Bottomer, B. Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Fisher, P.A.

47. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors F.W.C. Allen, C. Anslow and Mrs. D. Grice.

48. 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.

49. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Licensing Sub-Committee held on 07 January 2014 be approved as a correct record and signed.

50. 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 28 JANUARY 2014 AT 10.00 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 2

51. Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 5.1 – 5.18 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 of the Licensing Authority. No questions were asked by the Driver.

The Driver presented his case to the Committee.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority, Members of the Committee and the Legal Advisor to the Committee then put questions to the Driver.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Driver summed up their cases.

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 Advisor 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:

That, having regard to all the circumstances, relevant factors and representations made, the Committee considers the Driver to be a fit and proper person to hold a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence, notwithstanding his conviction for benefit fraud in September 2013. However, the Committee wishes to issue a warning as to his future conduct whilst he remains a licensed driver.

Reasons for the decision

It has been noted that the Driver notified the Council's Licensing Unit of his conviction the day after the court hearing.

The Driver is of previous good character, having no known previous convictions or record of dishonesty.

52. Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 6.1 – 6.26 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

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 of the Licensing Authority. No questions were asked by the Driver.

The Driver presented his case to the Committee.

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

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

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 Advisor and Secretary to the Committee.

Following deliberation, the Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Driver were requested to return to the meeting to seek clarification from the Officer as to whether the witnesses referred to in the report had been invited to attend the Hearing. The Officer of the Licensing Authority reported that the witnesses had not been invited to attend.

The Committee then determined that the meeting be adjourned in order that the witnesses be invited to attend, and the Hearing reconvened as soon as possible, excluding those Members who were not present today.

The meeting was adjourned at 11:35am

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE RECONVENED MEETING OF THE
LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MONDAY 10 FEBRUARY 2014 AT 10.00 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 2

PRESENT:
Councillors

Stretton, Mrs. P.Z. (Chairman)
Dudson, A. (Vice-Chairman)

Bottomer, B.
Sutherland, M.
Todd, Mrs. D.M.

53. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J. Bernard and P. Fisher.

54. Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 6.1 – 6.26 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chairman advised all parties present that the Hearing followed on from the adjourned Hearing held on 28 January 2014 to allow for witnesses to be invited before the Committee to present their respective cases.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority then recapped the Council's case by outlining the relevant issues for consideration as contained in the report.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority then presented two witnesses separately to the Committee, each witness putting forward their respective cases.

Members of the Committee and the Officer of the Licensing Authority put questions to both witnesses. Additionally, the Legal Advisor to the Committee put a question to the second witness.

The Driver was also afforded the opportunity to put questions to both witnesses. No questions were put forward.

Once all questions had been asked, each witness left the room and did not return.

The Driver was then offered an opportunity to present any additional

information to the Committee (other than had already been presented at the original Hearing). No additional information was presented.

The Officer of Licensing Authority advised the Committee that the third witness to the case had been invited, but had not attended.

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 Advisor 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:

That, having regard to all the circumstances, relevant factors and representations made, it was the unanimous decision of the Committee to revoke the Driver's Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence.

Reasons for the Decision

After hearing the evidence and representations of the two witnesses, the Committee was satisfied that on the balance of probabilities the incident of inappropriate touching of the customer did occur on the 24 September 2013.

The witnesses were credible and there was no reason to disbelieve their evidence.

The Committee had real concerns as to the Driver's general attitude and demeanour which was especially evident at the hearing on 28 January 2014.

For the above reasons the Committee was of the view that the Driver was not a fit and proper person to hold a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence.

The decision to revoke was made on public safety grounds.

The meeting closed at 10:58am

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE
MONDAY 7 APRIL 2014 AT 10.00 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Stretton, Mrs. P.Z. (Chairman)

Anslow, C. Fisher, P.A.
Bernard, J.D. Sutherland, M.
Bottomer, B. Todd, Mrs. D.M.

55. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors F.W.C. Allen and Mrs. D. Grice.

56. 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.

57. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meetings held on 14 and 28 January and 10 February, 2014, be approved as a correct record and signed.

58. Briefing Note – Government Consultation on Locally-set Licensing Fees

Consideration was given to the Briefing Note of the Head of Environmental Health (*presented by the Food & Safety Manager and Senior Licensing Officer*) (Item 4.1 – 4.53 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Food & Safety Manager raised the following points for Members' reference:

- Current regime in force since 2005, first time the regime has been reviewed since then.
- Current fees were based on rateable values and did not take account of size/types of premises.
- The Government was concerned that licensing authorities were not

recovering full costs of administering licensing functions, but have also made clear that applicants should only pay actual costs charged.

- The Council currently received approximately £70,000 per year in fees income, which was considered a comfortable amount for the service to be able to fulfil its statutory duties.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee's responses to the consultations questions as shown below be agreed:

Do you agree or disagree that the use of national non-domestic rateable value bands as a criterion for variable fee amounts should be abandoned?

- Agree.

Do you agree or disagree that the criterion of whether or not a premises is authorised to provide licensable activities to a late terminal hour is linked to costs?

- Agree – the potential for a premises to breach the licensing objectives increases along with the terminal hour. It would therefore seem appropriate to consider higher fees for those who might require more inspection/compliance/enforcement.

Do you agree or disagree that the criterion of whether or not a premises is authorised to provide licensable activities to a late terminal hour is sufficiently practical to implement?

- Agree.

Do you agree or disagree that the licensing authority should be able to determine the hours during which the higher fee is payable within boundaries of midnight to 6am?

- Agree.

Do you agree or disagree that licensing authorities that impose higher fees for premises that open later should have discretion to exclude premises that are authorised to open later only on certain nights per year?

- Agree – local discretion in fee setting is an important part of ensuring that costs can be fully recovered by the LA without the necessity to penalise those who simply wish to open later to celebrate high days and holidays. Such premises will not obviously add to the overall burden of administration or enforcement.

Do you agree or disagree that the criterion of whether or not a premises is used primarily for the sale of alcohol for consumption on the premises is linked to costs?

- Agree – the potential for a premises to breach the licensing objectives increases along with the terminal hour. It would therefore seem appropriate to consider higher fees for those who might require more inspection/compliance/enforcement. This is all the more important where premises sell alcohol on an exclusive or primary basis late at night.

Do you agree or disagree that the criterion of whether or not premises are exclusively or primarily used for the sale of alcohol consumption on the premises is sufficiently practical to implement?

- Agree.

Do you agree or disagree that there should be discretion to apply higher fee amounts only where both criteria apply in combination?

- Agree.

Do you agree or disagree that, if a licensing authority has determined that different fee amounts should apply, it should have discretion to exclude certain types of premises from that higher fee amount?

- Agree.

If discretion to exclude certain types of premises from a higher fee amount were available, what types of premises should be specified in the regulations as potentially excluded classes?

- Regulations should not dictate exclusion. This should be a matter for the LA to determine.

Are there alternative options that should be available to licensing authorities to apply different fee amounts in their area?

- None identified.

Do you agree or disagree that the following cap levels will enable your licensing authority to recover costs?

Function	Proposed Cap	Agree/ Disagree/ Don't Know
Application for the grant of a premises licence	£2,400	Agree
Application for a provisional statement	£2,400	Agree
Application to vary a premises licence	£2,400	Agree
Application to vary premises licence to specify designated premises supervisor	£105	Agree
Application to vary a premises licence to remove requirement for a designated premises supervisor	£105	Agree
Application for the transfer of a premises licence	£65	Agree
Interim authority notice	£114	Agree

Annual fee payable by premises licence holder	£740	Agree
Application for the grant of a certificate	£2,400	Agree
Application to vary a certificate	£2,400	Agree
Annual fee payable by club premises certificate holder	£720	Agree
Application for grant or renewal of a personal licence	£114	Agree
Application to replace stolen, lost etc. premises licence	£46	Agree
Notification of change of name or address of premises licence holder	£46	Agree
Application for minor variation of a licence	£244	Agree
Application to replace stolen, lost etc. certificate?	£46	Agree
Notification of change of name or change of rules of club	£46	Agree
Notification of change of address of club	£46	Agree
Application to replace stolen, lost etc. temporary event notice	£38	Agree
Application to replace stolen, lost etc. personal licence	£50	Agree
Notification of change of name or address of personal licence holder	£59	Agree
Notification of interest of freeholder etc. in premises	£59	Agree

Do you have any other comments on the proposed cap levels?

- Having a cap is unnecessary if all local authorities are only allowed to charge 'actual' costs and have a duty to publish how the fees have been calculated in relation to their costs.

The cap levels as proposed in the consultation documents are generally on the 'high' side. Although this means that there would be no problem in local authorities recovering their costs at the levels proposed, there is a danger that some authorities will be tempted to charge 'higher' rates than their 'actual' costs given the cap levels as proposed.

Do you agree or disagree that the proposed cap of £100 on the fee for a Temporary Event Notice will enable your licensing authority to recover costs?

- Agree – generally the £100 fee would cover most of the TENs however if the LA receives a lot of objections and needs to convene a large number of Licensing Sub-Committees it may not be sufficient in the long run. This is particularly important in light of the possibility of a decreasing number of TENs served if it becomes more expensive to do so.

Do you agree or disagree that licensing authorities be required, before locally-set fees are implemented, to:

- (i) Publish their proposed fee levels – agree.
- (ii) Publish the basis on which they have been calculated – disagree.

- (iii) Publish the measures they have taken to keep costs down – disagree.
- (iv) Invite comments from interested parties – agree.

What practical steps can licensing authorities take to secure efficiency?

- LAs are constantly under pressure to perform in an effective and efficient manner. Most licensing units have undergone some sort of cost recovery exercise which helps to secure that efficiency.

There are no obvious further mechanisms by which LAs might secure further efficiencies.

Do you agree or disagree that guidance should suggest that these areas present a particular risk of excessive costs or gold-plating?

- (i) Notification of residents individually of licensing applications in their area by letter (given that existing duties to advertise on the premises and on the licensing authorities' website enable the involvement of local residents, and that more cost efficient methods of further engagement may be available – agree.
- (ii) Central re-charges, such as payments from licensing budget to legal services or external communications. These should relate to costs actually incurred in the delivery of functions under the 2003 Act and not, for example, a standard percentage of central costs – agree.
- (iii) The costs of discharging the statutory functions of licensing authorities that arise under other legislation, such as the duties arising under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 – disagree.

Do you think there are any other activities that may present a particular risk of excessive costs or gold plating?

- Not at CCDC.

Do you agree or disagree that there should be a single national payment date for annual fees in England and Wales?

- Disagree.

59. Personal Licenses – Response by Government to the Recent Consultation

The Senior Licensing Officer reported the following:

- The Government agreed with the view of the Committee and licensed trade that the Personal Licence System should be retained.
- The current system worked for the traders as it meant they could determine on an individual basis who would or wouldn't be Personal Licence holders. The proposed changes would have meant all relevant staff needed to be trained by the Designated Premises Supervisor..
- Although the current system will going to be retained, any Personal Licences already held will not expire after ten years, even though an expiry date is shown.

60. The World Cup – Consultation on Licensing Hours

The Senior Licensing Officer reported that the Home Office had issued a short, two week consultation on World Cup licensing hours following complaints about its original decision not to extend hours. The consultation questions and Officer responses are detailed below.

There should be a national relaxation of licensing hours for all England games during the World Cup?

- Disagree.

Licensing hours during the World Cup should be a local decision using the existing TEN system?

- Agree.

Do you agree or disagree that a national relaxation of licensing hours would contravene one or more of the licensing objectives?

- Agree – would most likely effect; prevention of crime and disorder, public safety, prevention of public nuisance. Less likely to effect protection of children from harm.

If licensing hours were to be relaxed nationally during England's World Cup matches, do you think that this should be for: 3, 3½ or 4 hours after the scheduled kick off time?

- 3½ hours afterwards.

The Senior Licensing Officer then reported that the Government had since responded a blanket exemption would be in place till 1:00am for all England matches, so any premises whose licenses did not extend beyond this time would have to apply for a TEN for any additionally required licensing hours. The licensed trade had provided the majority of responses to the consultation, being in favour of a blanket exemption, whereas those responsible/relevant authorities who replied were in favour of using the TEN system.

The Meeting closed at 11:20am

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE
THURSDAY 1 MAY 2014 AT 2.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Dudson, A. (Vice-Chairman – in the Chair)

Allen, F.W.C. Fisher, P.A.

Anslow, C. Snape, P. (substituting for Sutherland, M.)

Bottomer, B. Todd, Mrs. D.M.

61. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. P.Z. Stretton (Chairman), J.D. Bernard and M. Sutherland.

Councillor P. Snape was in attendance as Councillor M. Sutherland's nominated substitute.

62. 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.

63. Minutes

RESOLVED:

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

64. Licensing Sub Committee

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Licensing Sub Committees held on 1 and 3 April, 2014 be noted.

65. 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
THURSDAY 1 MAY, 2014 AT 2.00PM
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

66. Application for Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Drivers' Licence

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication report of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 6.1 – 6.12 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Applicant did not attend the hearing. The Committee decided to hear the application in his absence.

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 Members of the Committee were then offered to opportunity to ask questions to the Officer of the Licensing Authority.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority was offered the opportunity to sum up his cases.

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

RESOLVED:

That the application for a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Driver's Licence be refused as the Committee was not satisfied that the applicant was a fit and proper person to hold a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Drivers' Licence in view of him being unsuccessful in passing the Knowledge Test on six separate occasions.

Reasons for the Decision

- 1 The Committee has carefully considered all relevant factors, issues and the report presented on behalf of the Head of Environmental Health. Due regard has also given to the provisions of Section 59 of the Local

Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 and to the Council's Taxi Licensing Policy.

- 2 The Committee is of the view that the Applicant's repeated failure to pass the Council's Knowledge Test shows that he has been unable to meet the minimum requirements to justify the granting of a licence. The Applicant was not present at the meeting to make any submissions as to why he ought to be licensed.
- 3 The Committee acknowledges that each case should be considered on its merits and that the Committee is able to exercise its discretion when considering new licence applications. However, there is no good reason in this instance for it to depart from the Council's Taxi Licensing Policy.

67. Application for a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Drivers' Licence

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication report of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 7.1 – 7.17 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Applicant along with his representative attended the hearing. 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 Council's Legal Adviser explained that, in accordance with the *Admanson v. Waveney District Council* case (1997) whereby Local Authorities can take into account convictions which are strictly relevant to the application being sought, he asked the Committee to consider whether they wished to see details of the Applicant's spent convictions and determine whether they were relevant.

The Committee decided that they wished to be informed of the applicant's spent convictions. Accordingly, the Officer of the Licensing Authority, the Applicant and his representative left the room in order that the Committee could be informed of the spent convictions.

Following deliberation, the Officer of the Licensing Authority, the Applicant and his representative returned to the meeting. The Committee decided that the spent convictions should be admitted as they were relevant to determining the application.

The Applicant and his representative were then offered the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer of the Licensing Authority.

The Members of the Committee were then offered to opportunity to ask questions of the Officer of the Licensing Authority.

The Applicant's representative then presented the Applicant's case to the

Committee.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and Members of the Committee were then offered the opportunity to ask questions to the Applicant and his representative.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Applicant's representative were offered the opportunity to sum up their cases.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority, the Applicant and his representative 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, the Applicant and his representative returned to the meeting, and the Chairman read out the decision of the Committee:

RESOLVED:

That the application for a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Drivers' Licence be refused as the Committee was not satisfied that the applicant was a fit and proper person to hold a Hackney Carriage/Private Hire Drivers' Licence.

Reasons for the Decision

- 1 The Committee has carefully considered all relevant factors, issues and the submissions made by the applicant and his legal representative. Due regard has also been given to the provisions of Section 59 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 and to the Council's Taxi Licensing Policy.
- 2 In reaching its decision the Committee decided to admit all of the applicant's spent convictions after having considered them in accordance with the test set down in the case of *Admanson v. Waveney District Council* (1997).
- 3 The Committee is not satisfied that the applicant is a fit and proper person as his honesty and integrity has been put into question due to:-
 - (i) The applicant failing to disclose on his application form that he had previous criminal convictions;
 - (ii) The previous convictions, whilst being spent, are relevant as they are for motoring offences;
 - (iii) The applicant has had his licence suspended in the past for plying for hire which indicates a disregard for public safety;
 - (iv) The applicant was seen to use crib notes whilst sitting one of the Council's Knowledge Tests.

The meeting closed at 4.00 pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL
FRIDAY 2 MAY 2014 AT 10.00 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Freeman, Miss M.A.
Jones, R.
Sutton, Mrs. H.M.

1. Appointment of Chairman

Councillor Miss M.A. Freeman was appointed Chairman for the meeting.

2. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs. Z.P. Stretton and Mrs D.M. Todd.

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 2 MAY 2014 AT 10.00 A.M.

IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

5. Appeal Against Exclusion from the Housing Register

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 5.1 – 5.19 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Appellant and his Representative were in attendance to present the Appellant's case.

The Chairman introduced the Members present and invited the Appellant, Appellant's Representative and Council Officers to introduce themselves, and then outlined the procedure for the Hearing.

The Officer presented the Council's case by taking the Panel through the report. The Appellant and Appellant's Representative and Members of the Panel were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer; no questions were asked.

The Appellant then presented his case to the Panel with support from his Representative. Officers and Members of the Panel then asked questions of the Appellant and Appellant's Representative.

All parties were given an opportunity to sum up their respective cases.

The Appellant, Appellant's Representative and the Officer then left the room to enable the Panel to deliberate 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:-

Decision

It was the unanimous decision of the Panel to dismiss the Appellant's appeal and to uphold the decision of the Housing Services Department to exclude him from the Housing Register.

Reasons for Decision

The Panel has carefully considered all relevant factors, issues and the representations made on behalf of the appellant.

The Panel has concerns over the appellant's criminal conviction for wounding with intent, for which he was given a significant custodial sentence. Such behaviour is

not acceptable and the decision to exclude him from the Housing Register was correct and proportionate in all the circumstances, and accords with the relevant legislation and guidance in force.

The Panel also considers that insufficient time has elapsed since the appellant's release from prison to show that he is suitable to be a tenant of the Council.

6. Housing Appeal

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 6.1 – 6.14 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Appellant was in attendance to present his case.

The Chairman introduced the Members present, and invited the Appellant and Council officers to introduce themselves, and then outlined the procedure for the Hearing.

The Officer presented the Council's case by taking the Panel through the report. The Appellant and Members of the Panel were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer; no questions were asked by the Appellant.

The Appellant then presented his case to the Panel. Officers and Members of the Panel then asked questions of the Appellant.

All parties were given an opportunity to sum up their respective cases.

The Appellant and the Officer then left the room to enable the Panel to deliberate 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:-

Decision

It was the unanimous decision of the Panel to allow the appeal insofar as the Appellant will be granted an Introductory Tenancy for the property concerned. However, this tenancy has not been granted to him by way of succession.

Reasons for Decision

The Panel has carefully considered all the evidence, relevant factors and representations made. Whilst acknowledging that the Appellant is not entitled in law to succeed the tenancy of the property concerned, the Panel feels that this is an exceptional case and it is sympathetic to his particular circumstances. Therefore on balance, it would be appropriate for the Appellant to remain at the property.

The meeting closed at 12.10pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL
TUESDAY 10 JUNE, 2014 AT 2.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Freeman, Miss. M.A. (Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S.

Sutton, Mrs. H.M.

1. Appointment of Chairman

Councillor Miss M.A. Freeman was appointed Chairman for the meeting.

2. Apologies

An apology for absence was received from Councillor C. Anslow.

The Chairman reported that Councillor C. Anslow had submitted an apology and therefore his place would be taken by Councillor Mrs. H.M. Sutton for the meeting today.

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

TUESDAY 10 JUNE, 2014 AT 2.00 P.M.

IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

5. Appeal against Exclusion from the Housing Register

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).

The Appellant and her Representative were in attendance to present the Appellant's case.

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

The Officer presented the Council's case by taking the Panel through the report. The Appellant, her Representative and Members of the Panel were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer. Questions were asked by Members of the Panel.

The Appellant and/or her Representative were then asked to put the Appellant's case. The Appellant and her Representative presented the Appellant's case to the Panel. The Officer then Members were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Appellant. Questions were asked by the Officer and Members.

All parties 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, having considered all the information submitted to it, the appeal be allowed.

Reasons for Decision

The Panel carefully considered all the relevant factors, issues and the representations made by, and on behalf of the Appellant.

Whilst the criminal conviction was a serious matter, the Panel was of the view that in

the long term, it would be in the best interests of the Appellant and her family that she be afforded the opportunity of being re-housed in larger accommodation.

(The meeting concluded at 3.10 p.m.).

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
JOINT PARKING COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 28 JANUARY 2014 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT : District and County Councillors:-

S.C.C. Spicer, Mrs. A. (Chairman)
S.C.C. Adamson, G. (Vice-Chairman)

Bennett, C. Fisher, P.A.
Dixon, D.I. Rowley, J.
S.C.C. Dudson, A.

Cannock Chase Council Officers:

- Tennant, I. (Head of Housing and Waste Management)
- Thomas, C. (Parking Services Manager)
- Schofield, S. (Senior Technical Officer)
- Rowe, Mrs. W. (Senior Committee Officer)

Staffordshire County Council Officer:

- Keeling, M. (Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager)
- Gear, Ms. D. (Community Traffic Management Officer)

15. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Staffordshire County Councillor G. Martin and David Walters (Regulation and Governance Manager, S.C.C.)

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

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

17. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 October 2013 be approved

as a correct record subject to Minute 13 (E)(i) being amended to read "Beecroft Road, Cannock, outside Sorting Office".

18. Civil Parking Enforcement Progress Report for the Period October to December 2013

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 4.1 – 4.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Senior Technical Officer advised that there had been a reduction in the number of PCN's issued in quarter three. The number of CEO's leaving combined with sickness levels had led to a reduced number of deployed hours and this has impacted on the number of PCN's issued.

He also commented that at the last meeting on 22 October, 2013 Members were advised that the County Council had been undertaking a review of Civil Parking Enforcement in Staffordshire. New arrangements for the delivery of CPE would be in place from 1 April, 2015. Work was ongoing and a number of options were being considered. A report would be presented to Cabinet on 20 March, 2014 and an update would be provided at the next meeting of this Committee in April, 2014.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the report be noted.

19. Civil Parking Enforcement - Review

Consideration was given to the Report of Staffordshire County Council's Deputy Chief Executive and Director for Place (Item 5.1 – 5.20 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager explained that there were a number of broad options that can be considered for Staffordshire and these were outlined at 18 (a) – (e) Enclosure 5.8.

He also made reference to the proposed timetable as detailed at 37 on Enclosure 5.10.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the Committee note the content of the report to the Staffordshire County Council Cabinet on 16 October 2013 and decisions taken in relation to the future of Civil Parking Enforcement in Staffordshire.

(B) That the Committee note the content of the report (Appendix A) taken to the Joint Staffordshire Parking Board on 16 December 2013 outlining the future outcomes for the service and a timetable for the development of new arrangements to the period ending 31 March 2015.

(C) That the Committee note the future arrangements for the delivery of Civil Parking Enforcement in Staffordshire against the required outcomes and timetable.

20. Prioritisation of Parking Related Traffic Regulation Orders

Consideration was given to the Report of the County Council's Corporate Director for Development Services (Enclosure 6.1 – 6.15 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager talked Members through each of the requests received since the previous meeting for the creation of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) within the District and provided an update on TROs currently in progress.

With regard to Hamelin Street, Cannock Members noted that new restrictions had been installed along Brunswick Road. However, double parking along Hamelin Street and the top of Brunswick Road was taking place and this was causing an issue for buses to get through. Members supported the recommendation to provide limited parking restrictions along one side of Hamelin Street and the top end of Brunswick Road to prevent hospital staff and patients from double parking and causing an obstruction and ensuring buses can travel freely and safely. The Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager commented that this request would be added to the priority list which would be discussed later on in the agenda.

Members noted the request in relation to Chadsfield Road, Rugeley. A resident had raised concern about parking taking place along Chadsfield Road during school drop off and pick up times. Members considered that parking outside schools was an ongoing issue; however, parked vehicles acted as a traffic calming measure as vehicle speeds were reduced. Members agreed that no further action be taken.

Members then discussed the request relating to Cannock Road, Hednesford where a resident had requested that the double yellow lines outside his mother's property be removed. He considered that the lack of parked vehicles causes the traffic to speed outside his mother's house. Following consideration of the request Members agreed that no further action be taken.

With regard to the current Traffic Regulation Orders in progress (as detailed on Enclosure 6.10) the Officer commented that the Post Office

Lane, Slitting Mill order had now been completed (and not in progress as stated in the report).

With regard to Sheep Fair/Lion Street, Rugeley he advised that objections from businesses in the area had been received who considered they were being penalised and therefore the TRO had been amended. Consultation was due to end on 13 February and an update would be provided at the April meeting. Members made reference to the proposed development of the British Legion premises and the former Comrades Club. Members considered parking would need to be made available when these premises were developed. The Officer noted the comments made and advised that the Planning Department would consider this as part of the planning process.

The Officer commented that the Mill Street, Cannock order was being progressed and consultation had commenced on 20 January, 2014. The Committee would be kept informed of the progress.

A Member thanked the Community Infrastructure and Liaison Manager and his team for the speed in which the Traffic Regulation Order in relation to Market Street, Hednesford had been implemented.

The Community Infrastructure and Liaison Manager made reference to the current priorities list for 2013/14 as detailed on Enclosure 6.14. He commented that Members had agreed to support the request for a Traffic Regulation Order in respect of Hamelin Street, Cannock and as the 2014/15 programme was full this would need to be built into the programme for 2015/16. This would be discussed at the meeting in April when the list would be reviewed.

With regard to Anglesey Street, Hednesford Members were advised that only a small amendment was required to the traffic order but this would be resource dependent. He confirmed that it was unlikely to be carried out this financial year. However, this could be discussed at the April meeting when the priority list was reviewed.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the request in relation to Hamelin Street, Cannock be supported and added to the priority list.
- (B) That no action be taken with regards to the requests in relation to Chadsfield Road, Rugeley and Cannock Road, Hednesford.

21. Prioritisation of Parking Related Traffic Regulation Orders

Consideration was given to the Report of the County Council's Deputy Chief Executive and Director for Place (Item 7.1 – 7.14 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Community Infrastructure and Liaison Manager led Members through the report and explained that it was proposed to develop a process to make it easier for Local Authorities across the County to prioritise requests for Traffic Regulation Orders. It was being suggested that a matrix of requests be provided in future reports in addition to what was currently included. An example of the matrix being suggested had been included at Enclosure 6.14 of the previous report so show Members what could be expected. The matrix would score all the requests and give a recommendation of high, medium or low.

A Member asked whether requests that had scored low could be overturned by the Committee. The Officer confirmed that the matrix would just provide a guideline for Members. He noted that Members were best placed to be aware of the issues and concerns in relation to requests. However, some authorities had a backlog of outstanding requests and the matrix would assist them in prioritising these requests. However, this was not a particular problem within Cannock Chase as only a minor backlog existed.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the Committee note the content of the report (Appendix A) taken to the Joint Staffordshire Parking Board on 16 December 2013 outlining the introduction of the prioritisation of Parking Related Traffic Regulation Orders and the recommendation from the Board that the new way of working is adopted by the eight District Local Parking Committees.
- (B) That, in the period January to March of each year, the Committee identify/review a two year forward programme. This will be based on a rolling programme of four parking related orders currently funded by the County Council and, any additional parking related orders funded by the District CPE account where there is no deficit and the scheme is in surplus sufficient to pay for the proposal after consideration of any reserve.
- (C) That to enable the effective use of resources, those four schemes identified in the first year of the programme remain fixed for the forthcoming year.
- (D) That the programme for the second year is subject to change pending any requests for parking related orders that are received which the Committee considers to have a higher priority than those already identified.

- (E) That a list of requests that score more than 50% of the available marks i.e. 10 points is maintained beyond the two year programme. Those requests that receive less than 10 point via the initial assessment process as modified by the Committee are considered a low priority and the applicant informed of the decision of the Committee.
- (F) That, at six monthly intervals, the Committee receives a list of new requests assessed against the assessment matrix and is able to reconsider priorities of schemes beyond the current year of the programme.

22. Residents Parking Zones – Local Champion and Prioritisation

Consideration was given to the Report of Staffordshire County Council's Deputy Chief Executive and Director of Place (Item 8.1 – 8.35 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Community Liaison Infrastructure Manager led Members through the report. He explained that the report identified that Residents Parking Zones were complex and difficult to implement. A Local Champion would take responsibility for undertaking research and providing evidence in respect of the need for a Residents Parking Zone in a particular area. This would assist in filtering out the realistic applications from the ones that were not worth pursuing.

The Officer confirmed that a local resident was keen to take on the role of Local Champion in respect of Newhall Street, Cannock. It was therefore proposed to trial this process for the RPZ in Newhall Street. Some of the work had already been undertaken and there was a positive attitude for the scheme. An update on the progress would be reported to the April Committee.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the Committee note the content of the report (Appendix A) taken to the Joint Staffordshire Parking Board on 16 December 2013 outlining the introduction of the Local Champion role to support the development of Residents Parking Zones and the recommendation from the Board that the new way of working is adopted by the eight District Local Parking Committees.
- (B) That the Committee note the draft guidelines that have been produced to support the Local Champion role and the opportunity to make comments to the Chair of the Board for inclusion in the final version.

- (C) That the applicants for the Residents Parking Scheme currently under consideration in the District of Cannock Chase are informed of the role of the Local Champion and are asked if they wish to continue with the application, to identify a Local Champion and, to commence the new process.
- (D) That, following receipt of the information from the Local Champion, the Local Parking Committee considers the request and, either agrees to keep the scheme as the next priority or, where the location is not considered suitable or, there is insufficient support, the process is repeated for the next scheme on the current list.
- (E) That the Committee agree to the use of an initial assessment matrix for residents parking zone requests to assist the Local Parking Committees in the prioritisation of such requests.

23. Date of Next Meeting

Members noted that the next meeting of the Joint Parking Committee was scheduled for Tuesday 29 April, 2014 at 4.00pm.

The meeting closed at 4.40pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
RATE RELIEF COMMITTEE
TUESDAY, 4 FEBRUARY, 2014 AT 4.00 PM
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Pearson, A. (Chairman)

Alcott, G. Bottomer, B.

11. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor J.T. Kraujalis and Mrs. A. Bernard.

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

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

13. Minutes

Reference was made to Minute No. 10 relating to large organisations. The Local Taxation and Benefits Manager confirmed that the wording in paragraph 4 of Minute No. 10 was correct and under the new system (as from 1 April, 2014) the Portfolio Leader would consider requests for Rate Relief. Although there was an approved framework for considering applications there would also be an element of discretion.

Reference was also made to Community facilities being block booked for Nurseries (paragraph 7 of Minute No. 10). The Local Taxation and Benefits Manager confirmed that if usage by a Nursery exceeded the availability for community use, under the new system, this would be a matter for the Portfolio Leader to consider.

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 September, 2013 be approved as a correct record.

14. Business Rates Relief Applications

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item No. 4.1 – 4.25 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

(A) That the action of the Head of Finance in awarding Mandatory Rate Relief as set out below be noted and that the amount of Discretionary Relief be awarded as follows:-

(i) Staffordshire South West CAB, 48 Allport Road, Cannock and 7 Brook Square, Rugeley

The Local Taxation and Benefits Manager advised that the application for Discretionary Rate Relief had been deferred at the last meeting to enable Officers to request further information from the CAB in order to establish whether the service being offered was complying with the current Service Level Agreement (SLA). The Committee was advised that the Head of Commissioning managed the SLA with the CAB. A grant of £136,000 was paid to the CAB for the delivery of services in two half yearly payments. The first half year having already been paid and the second half year being due now. Members were advised that if the CAB were not complying with the SLA they could be penalised through the withdrawal of some of the £136,000 grant.

Members noted that concerns had been raised at Cabinet regarding whether the service being offered was complying with the SLA and that representatives from the CAB had attended a Cabinet meeting so that Cabinet Members could question them.

The Chairman noted the concerns raised but commented that Members were being asked to make a decision on the application for Discretionary Rate Relief from the CAB and not to address whether they were complying with the SLA.

RESOLVED:

That the 80% Mandatory Rate Relief previously awarded be noted and that 5% Discretionary Rate Relief be granted in respect of the above premises for one year with effect from 1 April, 2013.

(ii) The Air Ambulance Service (Trading) Ltd., Units 2-3 adjacent to The Glassworks, Brewery Street, Rugeley

That 80% Mandatory Rate Relief and 5% Discretionary Rate Relief be granted in respect of the above premises for the period 23 July, 2012 to 31 March, 2013 and for one year with effect from 1 April, 2013.

(iii) Staffordshire Women's Aid, 29-31 Park Road, Cannock

That 80% Mandatory Rate Relief and 5% Discretionary Rate Relief be granted in respect of the above premises for the period 9 September, 2013 to 31 March, 2014.

(Members were of the opinion that the premises were no longer occupied by Staffordshire Women's Aid. The Local Taxation and Benefits Manager confirmed that Rate Relief would only be granted for the period occupied by the organisation).

- (iv) Age UK South Staffordshire, Ground Floor, 258 Walsall Road, Bridgtown, Cannock

That 80% Mandatory Rate Relief and 5% Discretionary Rate Relief be granted in respect of the above premises for the period 19 August, 2013 to 31 March, 2014.

- (v) Acorn's Children's Hospice Trust, 50 Market Street, Hednesford, Cannock

That 80% Mandatory Rate Relief and 5% Discretionary Rate Relief be granted in respect of the above premises for the period 18 October, 2013 to 31 March, 2014.

- (vi) New Life Trading Ltd, Unit 1 and Unit 2 Ranton Park, Martindale, Cannock

That the Committee note that 80% Mandatory Rate Relief had been awarded to the above premises for the period 19 June, 2013 to 18 December, 2013 (Unit 1) and 19 July, 2013 to 19 December, 2013 (Unit 2).

CHAIRMAN

(The meeting closed at 4.30pm)

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CANNOCK COMMUNITY FORUM
TUESDAY 4 MARCH, 2014 AT 7.00 P.M.
AT CIVIC CENTRE, CANNOCK

PRESENT: District Councillors:

Alcott, G. (Chairman)
Allen, F.W.C. (Vice-Chairman)

Anslow, C. Dixon, D.I.
Davis, Mrs. M.A. Sutton, Mrs. H.M.

Cannock Chase Council Officers:

Mr. S. Shilvock, Head of Environmental Health
Mrs. W. Rowe, Senior Committee Officer

Also Present

Mike Calverley, Locality Public Health Partnership and Commissioning
Lead
Inspector Paul Cooke, Staffordshire Police
Kelly McCulloch, Community Safety Officer (Staffordshire Fire and
Rescue Services)
Local Residents (approximately 10)

37. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Stephen Brown (Chief Executive), District Councillors J. Kraujalis, Miss M. Freeman, C. Mitchell, P. Snape and J. Toth and County Councillor Mrs. A. Spicer.

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

There were no interests declared.

39. Notes

The notes of the meeting held on 17 December, 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

40. Questions for Staffordshire Police

Although no questions had been submitted in advance Inspector Paul Cooke

was present to take questions from the meeting.

A local resident commented that the impact of the recent parking restrictions that had been implemented along Brunswick Road had resulted in vehicles parking further down towards Hamelin Street/Georgian Place. The parked vehicles were causing issues as Brunswick Road was a bus route and buses were having difficulty passing. Additionally, there was also an access issue for refuse collection vehicles and ambulances.

The Inspector was not aware of any increased issues in this area and there had been no feedback from other agencies. He would liaise with the PCSO's, Arriva and Staffordshire County Council Highways Team and ascertain whether there had been any complaints and report back to the resident concerned. He commented that PCSO's now carried video cameras which would be useful in getting a real understanding of any problem areas.

Another resident explained that he had raised the issue of drug problems at the last Forum but had received no feedback. The Inspector commented that there was room for improvement in providing complaints/victims with feedback. This was something the Police were working on. The Inspector explained that there was a competing demand for Police resources and restructuring was currently taking place with the aim of becoming more efficient. He asked the resident to advise the Clerk of the area where he was concerned about and he would provide an update on the position for the Clerk to pass on.

The resident also raised an issue regarding the turning head at the bottom of Cardinal Way where vehicles were driving against the flow of traffic when using the facilities at the school. This happened on a Saturday afternoon at around 4pm. The Inspector advised that there were a number of tactics that could be deployed to resolve the issue including the enforcement/education route. However, he would ask an unmarked car to survey the area to assess how big the problem was.

41. Questions for Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service

The Chairman welcomed Kelly McCulloch, Community Safety Officer from Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services (Prevention Team) to the meeting.

Kelly McCulloch gave a presentation on fire safety in the home, which covered the following areas:

Smoke Alarms – one alarm on each level of your home which should be tested weekly. A home fire risk check could be arranged by calling 0800 0241 999.

Kitchen Safety – never leave pans unattended, take care with tea towels, turn appliances off and avoid using chip pans.

Electrics – Do not use block adaptors, avoid overloading extension leads, do not leave appliances unattended, store electric blankets safely.

Smoking – Never smoke in bed, use a proper ashtray and don't leave cigarettes unattended. Take extra care if you've been drinking or on prescription drugs.

Candles – use ceramic/glass holders for tea lights, put candles out completely and keep away from curtains and pets.

Make an Escape Plan – keep keys where you can find them, have a mobile phone and torch handy and keep doors closed.

What to do if there is a fire – Keep calm, don't tackle the fire yourself, get out of the house and call 999.

What to do if your escape route is blocked – Keep doors closed, put bedding against bottom of door, open windows and shout FIRE.

Bed time checklist – Close doors, turn off appliances, ensure candles/cigarettes are out, keep exits clear and keep door/window keys handy.

Following the presentation there was an opportunity to ask questions. A resident asked whether there was a law on the fitting of opening lights in windows as some only have a small opening at the top which could not be used as a means of escape in the event of a fire. The Community Safety Officer was not aware of any specific law – it was down to personal choice.

A resident asked if there was any legislation on the fitting of spot lights in bungalows. The wiring for down lighters was located under the loft insulation in bungalows and he considered there was a fire safety risk if they were not fitted with fire guards. The Officer was not aware of any legislation but would look into the matter.

The Chairman asked whether the Fire Service still tested electric blankets free of charge. The Officer confirmed that due to service cuts the Fire Service no longer tested electric blankets. She advised that a selection of fire safety leaflets would be available at the end of the meeting.

The Chairman thanked the officer for attending the Forum and for providing those present with the presentation.

42. Question for Staffordshire County Council Highways – submitted in advance

No questions had been submitted in advance.

43. Questions for Cannock Chase District Council – submitted in advance

Question from Mr. P. Haywood, local resident:

Amendment to street trading policy:-

The reason a Street Trading policy was introduced was to ensure that proper procedures were followed and everything properly regulated. More than anything else it was to ensure the Health and Safety of the public. We are concerned that this has now been compromised as this amendment withdraws the policy from Council owned land.

1. *Under this amendment what requirements have been removed from the Policy?*
2. *How do you now ensure the necessary public protection safeguards?*
3. *As the amendment applies to Council land only is this creating a two tier system where some must conform to stronger regulation than others?*
4. *Isn't it the role of the Council to ensure Public Health and Safety regardless of how much administration there is?*

The Head of Environmental Health explained that last summer there had been a number of carnivals and fetes where prospective stall holders had to satisfy the requirements of up to 3 separate departments in order to take part in an event. They were required to obtain a street trading permit from the Licensing Unit in addition to obtaining permission from the Parks and Open Spaces Manager due to the event being on Council owned land, and possibly also the organiser of the event. It became apparent that work was being duplicated and therefore the street trading policy was amended and carnivals and fetes on Council controlled land were removed from the scope of the policy. Therefore traders wishing to trade on Council owned land (such as Cannock Park) only have to apply to the Parks and Open Spaces Manager for permission.

A resident, who had attended a Friends of Cannock Park meeting on Friday where these issues had been discussed, raised concern that as a street trading permit was no longer being issued in these circumstances an umbrella of protection had been removed. The Head of Environmental Health confirmed that whilst the policy had been amended the same safeguards and public protection remained. It was the administrative duplication that had been removed. He further explained that at the removal of Cannock Park from the scope of the street trading policy had not reduced the controls the Council had in place. Anyone trading without consent would be breaking the law. He confirmed that the street trading policy (as written) was excessive and not fit for purpose in regulating events and trading on Council owned land. The Council wanted to encourage events in order to stimulate the economy and, as the policy was stifling those who wished to trade, it had been amended.

A District Councillor explained that she had received a number of complaints from organisations/charities wishing to trade at carnivals who considered there was too much red tape for a one day event. She had therefore asked for the policy to be reviewed as events in the Park should be encouraged.

The Head of Environmental Health confirmed that a two tier system had not been created by amending the street trading policy. The difference was that a trader applied to either the Licensing Unit or the Parks and Open Spaces Manager, depending on where the event was being held. He also commented that charities were not exempt from the regulations however; there was discretion on whether to charge them. He also explained that the amendment had made the process less onerous for the Council and it cost less money to carry out the function; it was also less onerous for those wishing to apply.

A resident made reference to street traders who were trading in Cannock town centre on Fridays. She had concern that they were not complying with street trading consent with regards to disabled access. The Head of Environmental

Health advised that this was actually a street market which was being trialled for 6 months. Street trading permits had been issued at the commencement of the trial; however, he would liaise with the Head of Planning and Regeneration who was overseeing the trial with respect to these concerns.

The Chairman commented that he had been asked to look at the Friday street markets and did not consider there to be a problem with access.

A resident asked the Head of Environmental Health to clarify that the Premises Licence for Cannock Park was still in force. He confirmed that the Premises Licence granted under the Licensing Act 2003 was still in place for Cannock Park and this imposed controls in respect of the sale of alcohol and the provision of regulated entertainment.

44. Public Health Presentation

The Chairman welcomed Mike Calverley, Locality Public Health Partnership and Commissioning Lead to the meeting who was in attendance to provide a presentation on public health and provide information on the Cannock Chase Health Profile. He circulated a copy of the presentation together with the Health Profile 2013.

Mike Calverley provided the Forum with a presentation which covered the following areas:

- **The Public Health Budget**
- **Mandatory responsibilities** – sexual health, physical activity/healthy weight, NHS health check programme, public health advice and health protection
- **Discretionary (needs based) responsibilities** – Children’s public health (ages 5-19), public mental health, drug misuse, tobacco control, reducing and preventing birth defects, health at work, dental public health and seasonal mortality
- **The way ahead** – central support, local action
 - commitments to joint commissioning
 - finding a way to create opportunities for some SCC PH monies to be used at locality level to commission local activity
 - mechanisms being worked out
 - key focus on outcomes and governance
- **Public Health England health profiles** – published Sept 2013, Public Health outcome framework, all data and graphs shown are from Public Health observatories website
- **Overall picture** – 32 indicators, 27 with updated data in 2013
- **Overall compared to England average** – 6 significantly better, 17 not significantly different and 9 significantly worse
- **Health summary for Cannock Chase showing the indicators and their position in comparison to the England average**
- **Areas of good performance (compared to England average)**
 1. Proportion of children in poverty
 2. Statutory homelessness
 3. New cases of TB

4. Excess winter deaths
 5. Road injuries and deaths
- **Areas for major improvement (compared to England average)**
 1. Starting breast feeding
 2. GCSE achieved 5x A*-C (inc Maths and English)
 3. Obese children (Year 6)
 4. U18 Teenage pregnancy
 5. U18 Alcohol specific hospital stays
 6. (Violent crime)
 7. Healthy eating adults
 8. People diagnosed with diabetes
 9. Obese adults
 - **Changes over time** – within Cannock, compared with previous data for the same indicators – 20 improved, 1 similar and 6 worse
 - **Priorities in Cannock (highlighted in the PHE Health Profile)** – Reduce smoking, reduce obesity and reduce early deaths from cancer

He then asked Forum Members to consider a number of questions:-

- Are you surprised by the overall picture in Cannock?
- What do you think should be the priorities?
- How can we as residents start to change some of this?
- What can the public do to raise awareness?
- What responsibility as individuals do we have to lead healthier lifestyles?
- How would you like to engage with us on this in the future?

The Head of Environmental Health advised that the Chief Executive was keen to seek ideas on how to engage with the public on this in the future. Would a public health event be an appropriate way of debating this matter and where should it be held and at what time? Anyone who had any suggestions should contact the Council to offer their thoughts and ideas.

Those present at the Forum suggested that any event that was arranged should be held in a welcoming venue so as to attract attendance. The Chamber was considered to be an intimidating venue and not suitable for such an event. A local Councillor, who was the Chair of the Commissioning Partnership, commented that this was the first time the public had seen these figures. She sought feedback on whether to roll this presentation out to the other three District Forum meetings. She considered that it was useful to know what the public considered to be important so as to ensure the right priorities were set.

The Chairman advised that alternative venues had been used for the Forums in the past but he considered that the Chamber was the most suitable venue to hold the Community Forum meetings.

It was suggested that a “Health Day” could be organised with three presentations spread out throughout the day – one in the morning, one in the afternoon and one in the evening. It was considered that the event should not be a formal event and would have to be welcoming to the public. However, it was noted that it was difficult to generate the interest of the public in such events as could be seen by the low public attendance at Community Forums meetings.

45. Mid Staffs NHS Foundation Trust - Update

The Head of Environmental Health advised that Deborah Neal, Head of Communications, Mid-Staffs NHS Foundation Trust, had provided an update which was detailed on the agenda. However, this information was only appropriate at the time the agenda was despatched and a further updated had been provided, as follows:-

“On 26 February 2014 the Secretary of State for Health approved the Trust Special Administrators’ principal recommendation, to dissolve Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust.

The TSAs have been working closely with Maggie Oldham, Chief Executive of the Trust, Mark Hackett, Chief Executive of University Hospital of North Staffordshire NHS Trust and David Loughton CBE, Chief Executive of The Royal Wolverhampton Hospitals NHS Trust to ensure that they would be prepared to implement the dissolution of the Trust as quickly as possible, should the Secretary of State approve it. The announcement of his decision means their joint working will intensify over the coming months as the TSA process moves into the next phase.

It is important to note that the Trust is not yet dissolved. Both Cannock Chase and Stafford Hospitals are operating as usual and patient services continue to be provided in the normal manner.

The TSAs remain in charge of the Trust at this time, as required by the TSA process”.

A local Councillor advised that there was a public meeting of the CCG this Thursday 6 March between 2.00pm – 4.00pm at the Aquarius should anyone wish to attend.

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

Steve Shilvock, Head of Environmental Health advised that a proposal to resolve the dispute had been under active discussion since late 2013. A legal document was being drafted which, if agreed and approved by both the Council and ASDA, should resolve this dispute. It was anticipated that the position would be clear by 31 March 2014.

47. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings

The Chairman explained that a form was available for any issues to be discussed at future meetings of the Forum. Appropriate representatives would be invited to attend and debate the issues and answer any questions.

48. Date of Future Meetings

The Forum noted that the next meeting of Cannock Community Forum had been arranged for Wednesday 25 June, 2014. Additional meetings had been arranged for 16 September, 2014, 9 December, 2014 and 3 March, 2015.

The Chairman thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 8.50pm.

CHAIRMAN

[Type text]

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HEATH HAYES, NORTON CANES AND RAWNSLEY COMMUNITY
FORUM

TUESDAY 24 MARCH, 2014 AT 7.00PM

AT NORTON CANES HIGH SCHOOL, NORTON CANES

PRESENT: Councillors:

Rowley, J (In the Chair)

Holder, M.J.	Todd, D
Spicer, A	Todd, R
Sutherland, M	

Other Councillors present:

Bottomer, B.	Toth, J
--------------	---------

Officers:

T. McGovern, Corporate Director
D. Cook, Senior Committee Officer

Also present:

Staffordshire Police	Insp. P. Cook Chief Insp. S. Morrey
Heath Hayes P.C. Norton Canes P.C. Approximately 3 local residents	L, Bullock, J. Preece

Apologies had been received from both the Chairman and Vice Chairman, and therefore nominations were sought for Chairman for this meeting.

It was agreed that Councillor Rowley would be Chairman for the meeting.

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J.D. Bernard, and Mrs. A.F. Bernard.

[Type text]

2. Declarations of Interest

There were no interests declared.

3. Notes

The Notes of the meeting held on 12 September, 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

The following update was provided by the Corporate Director relating to the request for information regarding comparative pothole repair data:

Expenditure on reactive carriageway repairs is not allocated on a geographical basis it is driven by Highway Safety Inspections and investigatory criteria.

In terms of the cost to carry out a repair this is hugely variable dependant on numerous factors, for example; travel in relation to time, fuel cost, traffic management, size and depth of repair, equipment type utilised to carry out the work etc.

We are repairing around 1,500 potholes a month following the very wet winter we have had.

In addition to our own inspections we would encourage Residents, Councillors, Parish Councils to report Potholes directly to Highways on 0300 111 8000 or via email highways@staffordshire.gov.uk

In terms of structural maintenance over a million pounds has been spent this last financial year in the Cannock area including the sites below:

Carriageway and footway resurfacing at Hednesford Road/Cannock Road Completed 12 February 2014. Estimated cost £600,000
Carriageway and footway resurfacing at U5043 Poplar Street, Norton Canes. Completed May 2013, estimated cost £70,000
Footway resurfacing at U5043 School Road and School Close, Norton Canes Completed April 2013, estimated cost £105,000
Carriageway and footway resurfacing at A460 Eastern Way Island, Cannock. Completed March 2013, estimated cost £130,000
Footpath improvements for [John Street](#)], Chadsmoor February 2014. Estimated cost £191,000.

Further information and comparative data can be found on the website – www.staffordshire.gov.uk

4. Questions for Staffordshire Police

A discussion took place regarding a public right of way; and who had jurisdiction over moving vehicles and how they could be prevented from

[Type text]

parking there. It was agreed that the Police would attend a meeting on site with the relevant Councillors and the Highways Department. A response would be sent with an explanation of what could be done and by whom.

The Chief Inspector explained that he would be in this position for the next two years and was keen to learn the area as was getting the balance right for neighbourhood policing.

Safety within Cannock Town Centre was discussed following recent incidents. The police reassured the forum that Cannock Town Centre was safe and the incidents referred to were specific and not usual to the area. There had been more police presence in the town following this and would continue for the short term. There is still the 'safer nights' patrol in operation where police officers work in the town centre till 4am, checking door staff, speaking to owners and revellers. Where the police are aware of any trends and patterns then these will be assessed and addressed.

Drinking within Cannock Town Centre was raised as an issue. The police explained that they were reliant on CCTV to monitor the situation along with two police officers who were responsible for policing the town centre. Due to absence and shift patterns this had been difficult. However, where there is shown to be a need the local policing team regularly patrol the town centre. If anyone is caught drinking on the streets the alcohol is removed from them and they can be served with a notice. It was explained that the CCTV cameras in Cannock Town Centre were linked to the Council and where anti-social behaviour (including drinking in the street) was seen Officers of the Council would talk to the people through the speaker system advising them of their unacceptable behaviour. If the people do not move on then the police will be called. In addition, through the licensing unit work had been undertaken with off licences within the town centre where they had been issued with photos of known individuals who were drinking and causing a nuisance in the town. The off licences had then refused to serve these individuals and this had proven to have a positive effect on the town centre.

An explanation was requested regarding the 'displacement order' that had been granted to the police to move 'boy racers' on from areas around Cannock. The police explained that the dispersement notice meant that a warning had been published in the area giving them the power then to issue a warning and move the vehicles on. If they then returned they could potentially seize the vehicle. The injunction is there as a visible deterrent.

Reference was made to the speed of traffic travelling along Devon Road in excess of 30mph. The police explained that they had a Road Safety Plan which target hot spots and they would put Devon Road on there.

[Type text]

A discussion regarding the quality of images used from CCTV to assist in convictions ensued. It had been reported that some of the CCTV images were of too poor quality for the police to use when going to court. The Officer responded that the quality of the CCTV within the town centre was good and extensive footage regarding the recent incidents in the town centre had been given to the police to assist with their enquiries. There are times where the CCTV may be obscured which could mean that the images were not as clear as they could be. However, on the most recent occasion the footage was of a high quality.

5. Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust

A response had been received and put on the agenda following the consultation and the outcome.

The forum was concerned about what would be happening to Cannock Hospital and the services that it provides. They were also concerned about A&E and if a crisis in the district meant that the surrounding hospitals were full and could not take anymore patients.

6. Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting for the Fire and Rescue Services.

7. Questions for Staffordshire County Council (Highways)

No questions had been submitted. Discussion took place regarding areas of concern which were to be raised with Highways.

Potholes in various locations within the District including John Street. Some repairs had been made to John Street and the forum was informed that these repairs would continue.

Resurfacing of Wimblebury Road would be undertaken next financial year.

A question was raised regarding the number of highways inspectors that they County had to inspect the work carried out on the highways by contractors.

It was reported that at the height of the bad weather over 400 potholes were being reported a day and the County had not recovered from this.

A comparative analysis was requested regarding monies spent on potholes/highways against the surrounding boroughs and districts.

Assurances were sought on the quality of repairs on the highways carried out by the inspectors.

[Type text]

It was requested that a Highways Officer be present at each forum meeting. In addition it was requested that questions be sent in prior to the meetings regarding any issues that the forum may have.

8. Dates of future Meetings

The Chairman confirmed the upcoming date of the next meeting of the Heath Hayes, Norton Canes and Rawsley Community Forum:-

30 June, 2014

9. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings

The following questions would form part of the next Agenda:

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.

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.

A proposal was put forward that Prospect Village Hall, Rawsley be considered as a possible venue for the next meeting.

CHAIRMAN

(The meeting concluded at 8.10pm.)

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HEDNESFORD COMMUNITY FORUM
MONDAY 03 MARCH 2014 AT 7.00 P.M.

HELD AT THE AQUARIUS, VICTORIA STREET, HEDNESFORD

PRESENT:

District Councillors:

Adamson, G. (Chairman)
Pearson, A. (Vice-Chairman)

Ball, G.D
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.
Gamble, B.

Other District
Councillors:

Mrs. L. Whitehouse (Rawnsley Ward)

County
Councillors:

Mrs C. Mitchell (Hednesford Division)

District
Officers:

T. McGovern, Corporate Director
G. Watson, Planning & Economic Development Services Manager
M. Berry, Senior Committee Officer
Ms. K. Miles, Communications Officer

Also present:

Local residents x 5
Chief Inspector C. Ratcliffe, Staffordshire Police
PC G. Arries, Staffordshire Police
PC J. Taylor, Staffordshire Police
D. Ballett, Brindley Heath Parish Council
and Friends of Hednesford Park
Mrs. B. Yates, Chair, Hednesford Traders' Association
D. Wisehall, Heart of Hednesford Restoration Project
M. Allsopp, The Aquarius
Ms. C. Lilley, Express and Star

1. Apologies

Apologies were received from Councillors Mrs. D. Grice and B. Todd.

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

There were no interests declared.

3. Notes

The Notes of the meeting held on 11 December 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

Minute No. 7 – Road Safety Issue, Victoria Street/Rugeley Road

Councillor Gamble raised that since the last Forum meeting there had been continued road safety issues along Victoria Street which needed addressing urgently.

Councillors Adamson and Cartwright both reported they had received complaints from residents about these issues.

Councillor Pearson and County Councillor Mrs. Mitchell reported they had brought the issues to the attention of M. Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager for the County Council, but no update had been received.

G. Watson advised that he would contact M. Keeling and arrange a meeting to discuss such issues. He suggested that they should have been picked up as part of the County Council's safety audit.

The Chairman advised he would also contact M. Keeling to report the concerns raised by the Forum.

4. Questions for Staffordshire Police

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting; however Chief Inspector Ratcliffe, PC Arries and PC Taylor were in attendance to take questions from the floor.

Councillor G. Ball – What was being done to tackle the continued problem of drug taking/dealing on premises within the town centre?

PC Arries replied that such issues would be looked into if reported, and dealt with where possible; also advising that reporting could be done anonymously via Crimestoppers.

Councillor G. Ball – What was being doing to alleviate parking issues around the Hednesford Raceway?

PC Arries replied that the provision of additional parking was being looked into on racedays, which included liaising with Kingsmead school about opening their car park for a small fee.

M. Allsopp – Have suffered problems recently of anti-social behaviour, criminal damage and burglary in The Aquarius which were recorded on the CCTV and reported to the Police; however the police officer involved determined that they should only be addressed as anti-social behaviour issues rather than reported as crimes.

Chief Inspector Ratcliffe apologised for the response received from the Police, as the right customer service had clearly not been provided. Stills of the CCTV footage would be circulated amongst the local policing teams as the perpetrators may already been known in the area. Will speak to the Inspector at Cannock Police Station and ask him to report back directly.

Councillor Whitehouse – As one of the business owners in the town centre, have seen an increase in drugs problems and suffered abuse from youths in the area in recent months. Also know there has been an increase in thefts from local businesses, which has resulted in at least 3 owners looking to move out of the town.

Chief Inspector Ratcliffe replied that PC Arries, PC Taylor and PC Trupp were all working regularly in Hednesford, so the area was well served, but it may be necessary to look at alternative courses of action under legislation, such as injunctions and banning orders, to be able to better deal with the problems reported. The Police were also waiting for legislation to be passed which would give greater scope for tackling anti-social behaviour.

D. Wisehall stated that more could be done by the traders to help protect the area, such as the introduction of 'Shopwatch', which so far only had a low take up.

Chief Inspector Ratcliffe replied that a 'Business Crime Partnership' was in place with Stafford Borough with the aim of reducing business crime and providing support to the day and night time economies in across the two districts. In respect of the 'Shopwatch' scheme, aware of the financial constraints businesses which may restrict traders from joining the scheme, however the cost of membership should be weighed up against any potential losses/costs suffered as a result of criminal activity.

D. Wisehall reported that in the first of the scheme a membership discount was offered through S106 funding, however no traders took up the offer.

B. Yates raised that the traders were looking to work more closely together and liaise better with the local police to report crime and support the town.

The Chairman thanked the Police for the hard work they have done to improve the safety of Hednesford, making clear that all parties had to work together to keep this going.

5. Questions for Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Services

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting.

6. Questions for Staffordshire County Council Highways Department

No questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting.

7. Questions for Cannock Chase District Council

Bev Yates, Chair, Hednesford Traders' Association

“There are a number of signposts in the town that direct people/traffic to Market Street. Whilst we appreciate that this is the main street in Hednesford, there are no signs for the town centre or shops.

Would it be possible to amend the signs to read ‘Town Centre’ or ‘Shops’?”

G. Watson, Planning and Economic Development Services Manager replied that the directional signage had referred to ‘Town Centre’ when they were first erected by the County Council. However, as the signs were already located in the town centre, the County Council were asked to amend the signage and ‘Market Street’ replaced ‘Town Centre’ on the signs. In order for the signage to be amended, the County Council would have to be contacted as it was their responsibility.

Councillor G. Ball – Update on Hednesford Town Centre Regeneration

G. Watson, Planning and Economic Development Services Manager, provided the following update:

- *Pure Gym had recently opened in the unit underneath The Aquarius;*
- *There were still some units at the top end of Market Street which were vacant, but regular liaison was happening with the agents to try and get the units filled;*
- *An additional unit was going to be created on the Victoria Shopping Park, next door to Card Factory;*
- *Hednesford had bucked the national trend in respect of town centre issues, as the development scheme had been successfully delivered through a sustained period of recession.*
- *The restrictions at Rugeley Road car park scheme had been in place since the end of 2013, and Aldi may consider implementing further restrictions on their side of the car park. It has been noticed that the number of spaces available on the car park over weekday lunchtimes had been tight.*

Resident – car park had been a nightmare recently, particularly on Saturday afternoons. Vehicles used by the Meat Market on site were regularly obstructing the pathway and road access around the car park.

G. Watson replied that the Council were aware of the issues caused by the Meat Market, and wanted the County Council to take strong action against the owners to resolve the problems. In respect of general problems with the car park, these were exacerbated by the closure of the railway bridge, so hopefully traffic flow would be less of an issue once the bridge reopened. Have also the County Council to look at installation of a box junction on Victoria Street outside the car park to help vehicle movements.

The Chairman advised that a meeting would be arranged with M. Keeling, G. Watson and County Councillor Mr Mitchell to address the concerns raised.

Councillor Pearson – Could Cardigan Place be used an alternative access road in/out of the car park?

G. Watson replied he would be reluctant for this to happen, as it could create problems in the long term and would need to be agreed by Aldi.

M. Allsopp – Could the traffic wardens operating in the area issue parking tickets for highways obstructions?

G. Watson replied that this had been discussed with colleagues, however current Parking Order did not cover issues of loading/unloading and waiting, so a new Order would have to be created.

Councillor G. Ball – Update on Hednesford Park

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

- *The Hednesford Signal Box had now been installed in the Park, but it needed to be renovated before it could be brought into public use. This work was scheduled to happen over the next 6 to 8 weeks;*
- *Once the works had been completed, the Box would become an education centre for the Park;*
- *The Education Officer and Landscaping Officer had both been recruited and recently commenced employment;*
- *Drainage survey had also been completed. The Council was now engaged with Severn Trent Water to see how to fix any problems raised;*
- *An extensive tree-planting programme had commenced, including the planting of a 'Queen's Oak'. These Oaks had been produced for the Queen's Diamond Jubilee, and the Council were successful in receiving one.*
- *Contracts were being secured to complete the next phase of the project, which included installation of fencing around the park, and refreshing the fencing around the War Memorial; Work to the Memorial fencing would be scheduled to ensure it did not clash with planned Remembrance Day events;*
- *The redevelopment of the park was a long term project, with a*

timeframe of completion of 3 to 5 years.

Councillor Pearson – Where there were trees being cut down, need to be aware of when bird nesting happened, so as not to disrupt wildlife.

T. McGovern replied that the trees referred to were on the opposite side of Rugeley Road and contractors had been secured to crown/prune/fell the trees as necessary. A public information event was planned to take place to explain why the tree cutting was happening.

Resident – Can a car park be installed at the main entrance to the Park to allow families to park inside it, thus avoiding having to cross over the busy road outside?

T. McGovern replied that there was also provision for a car park, which was situated at the Rugeley Road entrance to the Park. As the children's play area was going to be moved, the existing car park was going to be enhanced, but this was unlikely to happen until 2015.

D. Wisehall commented that the Tesco car park was a long stay, public car park, which had gated access to the Park.

Resident – gated access had been closed recently, so families still had to cross over the busy road to access the Park.

G. Watson replied that once all the redevelopment work had finished there would be three different access points to the Park from the town centre.

8. Mid-Staffs NHS Foundation Trust Update

In place of the Trust update which had been included on the Forum Agenda, the Chairman read out a new update (detailed below) which had been supplied by Deborah Neal, Head of Communications at the Trust:

“On 26 February 2014 the Secretary of State for Health approved the Trust Special Administrators’ (TSAs) principal recommendation, to dissolve Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust.

The TSAs have been working closely with Maggie Oldham, Chief Executive of the Trust, Mark Hackett, Chief Executive of University Hospital of North Staffordshire NHS Trust and David Loughton CBE, Chief Executive of The Royal Wolverhampton Hospitals NHS Trust to ensure that they would be prepared to implement the dissolution of the Trust as quickly as possible, should the Secretary of State approve it. The announcement of his decision means their joint working will intensify over the coming months as the TSA process moves into the next phase.

It is important to note that the Trust is not yet dissolved. Both Cannock Chase and Stafford Hospitals are operating as usual and patient services continue to be provided in the normal manner.

The TSAs remain in charge of the Trust at this time, as required by the TSA process.”

The Chairman then raised the following additional points:

- *Announcement was good news for Cannock Hospital, as it would see usage increase from approximately 40% at present to over 80% once the changes had been finalised;*
- *Still expected that shuttle buses would run between New Cross and Cannock Hospitals and vice-versa;*
- *Announcement was less positive for Stafford Hospital, however provision of maternity services were still under review;*
- *Important to remember that services at both hospitals were still being provided as normal whilst the TSA process continues.*

Resident – local newspaper has reported that New Cross Hospital can expect to receive £14m for providing support to Cannock patients.

D. Ballett – Do the changes proposed mean that Cannock residents won't be able to use Stafford Hospital in future?

The Chairman replied that this was not the case, as patient choice was still in place as to which hospital people wanted to use.

D. Ballett – Would specialists currently based at Cannock also have to provide services at Wolverhampton and Stafford and would patients have to travel elsewhere once Cannock Hospital becomes part of the Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust?

T. McGovern replied that where GPs referred patients to Cannock Hospital, it would be unlikely to have to then go to Stafford as it would no longer be part of the same NHS Trust.

Councillor Gamble commented that once the TSA process had been completed, it would be important for clear information and signposting about locations of services to be given to residents to avoid confusion.

9. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings

The Chairman reported that the next Forum was scheduled for Tuesday 01 July 2014 and advised that any questions would need to be submitted on the forms supplied.

10. Dates of Meetings for 2014/15

The Chairman confirmed the meeting dates of the Hednesford Community Forum for 2014/15 as follows (all starting at 7:00pm):

- Tuesday 01 July, 2014

- Wednesday 17 September, 2014
- Tuesday 02 December, 2014
- Monday 16 March, 2015

The venue for the July 2014 meeting would be confirmed in due course.

The meeting closed at 8:00pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
RUGELEY AND BRERETON COMMUNITY FORUM
MONDAY, 10 MARCH, 2014 AT 7.00PM
COUNCIL CHAMBER, RUGELEY TOWN COUNCIL OFFICES,
TAYLOR'S LANE, RUGELEY

PRESENT: Cannock Chase Councillors:

Grocott, M.R. (Chairman)

Bottomer, B.H.	Jones, R.
Dudson, A.*	Molineux, G.N.
Fisher, P.A.	

Other District Councillor(s):

J. Rowley

Cannock Chase Council Officers:

Mrs. J. Aupers	Head of Governance
S. Partridge	Democratic Services Manager

Representatives from the following organisations:

Staffordshire Police	(Sgt. Caroline Higgins and PCSO Laura Sandy)
Staffordshire County Council	(M. Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager)
Staffordshire County Council	(SCC Cllr. A. Dudson*)
Neighbourhood Watch	(Vicki Singleton)
Rugeley Town Council	(Various)
Brereton and Ravenhill Parish Council	(Various)
Rugeley Traders Association	
The Landor Society	(Mrs. M. Kettle)

Approximately 8 local residents

1. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from CCDC Councillors Mrs. A. Allt; C. Bennett; D.N. Davies; J.P. Johnson; and A. Lovell.

Apologies were also submitted on behalf of SCC Councillor G. Martin and a number of Town / Parish Councillors.

2. Declarations of Interest

None.

3. Notes

The notes of the meeting held on 9 December, 2013 were accepted as a correct record.

4. Matters Arising (Not Otherwise Covered on the Agenda)

Mr. G. Grant advised that, in respect of Item 9 (p.3), nobody from the Council had contacted him. The Democratic Services advised that he had passed on Mr. Grant's details to the departments concerned and had left the matter with them.

6. Questions for Staffordshire Police

No questions had been submitted in advance, but Sgt. Higgins invited questions from the floor.

A Member enquired as to the legal position of vehicles using the pedestrianised areas of the town; particularly when this was done at speed with no apparent regard for pedestrian safety. The Member was particularly interested if the Sergeant was aware of a bye law limiting the times at which vehicles could access the area.

The Sergeant advised that she had heard reference to some form of regulation, but was struggling to find a copy. Mark Keeling, SCC Highways, advised that he believed there was a Traffic Regulation Order in place, but it included provision for traders to receive deliveries and access for some other vehicles, including emergency; street cleansing; and security vehicles, which made it very difficult to police effectively.

The discussion became more wide-ranging to encompass other issues broadly related to "policing" of traffic in the area in question, including monitoring of CCTV and the question of whether or not parking tickets / on the spot fines were ever issued. Mr. Keeling offered to make himself available to the Sergeant for further discussions.

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.

A resident raised concerns at the potential fire risk associated with the build up of waste tyres at a unit on the Towers Business Park. No other

matters were raised for referral back to the Fire and Rescue Service.

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.

9. Questions Submitted by Mr. Chett Tanna, 66, Church Street, Rugeley

Mr. Tanna raised the following concern:

“As you will see from the e mail's I have sent to Messrs Grocott, Martin & Bennett below we have a REAL shortage and issue with parking at the top end of Church Street. (Mr. Tanna also provided a number of photographs with his e-mail supporting his concerns.)

At this end, the residents of No's 62, 64 & 66 in particular do not have any specific parking available to them. This is a block of terraced properties with double yellow lines outside the properties. The car park used by the residents, over tens of years, by the residents has been the Council owned free parking in front of the Elmore flats) off Church Street. This car park contains 7 spaces and these are increasingly being used up lately - and more so now with non residential vans. We are now in a situation where we cannot use this car park for our parking and are reduced to parking on the double yellows outside our properties in the evening and on weekends.

In the last year more housing has gone up in this area and further housing is to go up at the former pub (Prince of Wales) across the road from these houses. These increases of housing is contributing to our problems with parking.

We would like the Council to help us by taking off the double yellow lines outside our houses and installing parking bays restricted for parking to only the residents of these houses.

So the item on the agenda that I would like to be added is:

Parking issues for the residents of No's 62, 64 & 66 Church Street.

The question I would like to be answered is:

Will the Council help the residents of these properties by taking off the double yellow lines outside our houses and installing parking bays restricted for parking to only the residents of these houses and if so, when can this be operational by?”

The Chairman read out a response that had been provided by the

County Council, as follows:

“This matter was investigated last year and a consultation with residents took place, the idea was to remove some of the existing restrictions to enable additional parking on street.

We consulted with 33 residents of which 27 replied (a good response), however 11 supported and 16 opposed. (For info: Of the three houses in question, 1 resident did not respond; 1 opposed the proposal; and 1 gave it conditional support.)

Such was the opposition to this plan that some residents visited the area offices to enforce their objection, and the local MP was also involved.

At the 23 April, 2013 meeting of CCDC / SCC Joint Parking Committee it was decided due to objections not to proceed with the plans to make changes to the traffic order on Church Street. As the matter has been investigated and closed inside a 12month period we would be unable to re-visit this enquiry in terms of TRO adjustments. (For info: CCDC / SCC Cllrs representing the Rugeley area present at the meeting included Cllrs. D.N. Davies; G. Martin; and J. Rowley.)

In terms of a request for a Residents Parking Zone this is an entirely different matter and requires a lot of support and investigation. It also requires for residents to contribute to costs and pay for parking permits.

We would require a substantial amount of resident support before any formal investigation can go ahead, however if residents wish to apply we can send out information to those who wish champion a potential scheme.”

Mark Keeling, SCC Highways, who had drafted the response, was present and elaborated on some of the points made. For information, the Democratic Services Manager advised Mr. Tanna that he had been informed that, while the Council owned the freehold of the area that was used for car parking it had been occupied under a licence by Three Spires Shared Ownership Housing Society Ltd since 1973, and any management responsibility for the site fell to the Society. There followed a wide ranging discussion about a variety of related matters.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Keeling for attending the meeting, listening to the complaints, and noting the matters to follow up on.

10. Question Submitted by Cllr. Ray Jones on Behalf of Rugeley Town Traders

Cllr. Jones raised the following questions:

Condition of Rugeley Town Centre pedestrian areas

“The Town traders have said that over the last few months there have been a number of Slips, Trips and Falls which have caused injury to people using the town centre. These problems are being caused by the uneven surfaces, potholes, tree roots creating undulations in the surface around the trees and a general poor walking surface.

The traders are now saying that the poor surfaces are having an adverse affect on their businesses because people are avoiding going into the town centre.”

The Chairman read out a response that had been provided by the County Council, as follows:

“The County Council in conjunction with CCDC Town Centre Improvement Group invested over £3,000 to tackle the issue of loose and damaged blocks in Rugeley Town Centre last year. However, we do understand there is more to be done.

At this time there are no large schemes planned to remove/ replace block paving in the town however we are responding to defects reported by members of the public and carrying out monthly walked inspections.

As the town still has some vehicular use blocks can become loose/dislodged, wet conditions can wash away sand / cement etc

This is an ongoing matter as will be actioned via our operational inspection regime.”

There followed a wide ranging discussion about a variety of current footpath and pedestrianised roadway areas in the town centre.

The Chairman again thanked Mr. Keeling for attending the meeting, listening to the complaints, and noting the matters to follow up on.

11. The Old Chancel, St. Augustine’s Church, Rugeley

Standing Item

The Chairman read out an update from The Reverend Prebendary Michael J. Newman, M.A.:

“I will not be attending the (next) meeting but please reassure the members that the procedures to close the Old Chancel for Public Worship are underway.

It is possible that some people at the meeting may have been consulted as "interested parties" and we would ask them to return comments as soon as possible because if this is not done it does hold up matters. Once the Diocese has undertaken the local consultation the Church

Commissioners will undertake a further public consultation which includes advertising in the press. I am not sure how long this will take, probably six months but please reassure people that the process, although slow, is clearly underway.

Once closure is in sight then the setting up of a local trust fund becomes possible.”

12. Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust

Deborah Neal, Head of Communications, Mid-Staffs NHS Foundation Trust, has provided the following update:

“On 26 February 2014 the Secretary of State for Health approved the Trust Special Administrators’ principal recommendation, to dissolve Mid Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust.

The TSAs have been working closely with Maggie Oldham, Chief Executive of the Trust, Mark Hackett, Chief Executive of University Hospital of North Staffordshire NHS Trust and David Loughton CBE, Chief Executive of The Royal Wolverhampton Hospitals NHS Trust to ensure that they would be prepared to implement the dissolution of the Trust as quickly as possible, should the Secretary of State approve it. The announcement of his decision means their joint working will intensify over the coming months as the TSA process moves into the next phase.

It is important to note that the Trust is not yet dissolved. Both Cannock Chase and Stafford Hospitals are operating as usual and patient services continue to be provided in the normal manner.

The TSAs remain in charge of the Trust at this time, as required by the TSA process.”

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

13. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings

Members of the public are invited to raise items at this point on the agenda or to take away and complete and return the forms provided for this purpose. Submission of written questions in advance will ensure that appropriate representatives can be invited to attend meetings to debate the issues and answer any specific questions.

14. Any Other Business

None.

15. Next Meeting

Monday, 23 June, 2014. Venue: Rugeley Council Chamber.

The meeting closed at 8.10 pm.

CHAIRMAN