

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET

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

IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors:

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

54. Apologies

None.

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

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

56. Updates from Portfolio Leaders

Leader

Boundary Commission Initial Proposals for New Parliamentary Constituencies

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

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

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

Crime and Partnerships

Staffordshire Police Chief Constable

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

Housing

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

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

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

57. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 22 September, 2016

RESOLVED:

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

58. Forward Plan

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

RESOLVED:

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

59. Recommendations of Scrutiny Committees

None received.

60. Housing Services 2015-16 Annual Report

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

RESOLVED:

That:

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

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

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

Reasons for Decisions

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

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

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

61. Public Spaces Protection Order (Gating) Consultation

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

RESOLVED:

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

Reasons for Decision

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

RESOLVED:

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

Reasons for Decision

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

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

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

The meeting closed at 4:20 p.m.

LEADER

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET

HELD ON THURSDAY, 17 NOVEMBER, 2016 AT 4:00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors:

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

63. Apologies

None.

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

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

65. Updates from Portfolio Leaders

Leader and Managing Director

Armed Services Career Transition Partnership Award

The Managing Director advised that he was to attend a presentation to receive an award on behalf of the Council for its contribution to assisting former Armed Forces personnel transitioning to civilian life through workplace experience.

Crime and Partnerships

The Portfolio Leader reported that he had recently attended Police briefings covering the use of Tasers; counter-terrorism; and hate crime, which had proven very enlightening.

The Portfolio Leader had asked that a Police representative attend the Council's Community Safety Scrutiny Committee at its meeting on 13 December, 2016, to give a presentation on the subject of counter-terrorism.

Culture and Sport

Bradbury Lane ATP

The Portfolio Leader advised that she and the Leader had recently visited the site to check on progress. The pitch had been in the process of being laid and the structure of the changing rooms etc. was in place and awaiting the installation of services, fixtures and fittings etc. It was hoped that the facility would be open for use early in the new year.

Environment

Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Joint Waste Management Board (SSJWMB)

The Portfolio Leader reported that earlier that day he had attended a meeting of the SSJWMB. This had included a discussion on the introduction of charging for non-household waste at household waste recycling centres, which had been implemented with effect from 1 November, 2016.

The meeting had also received a presentation on chargeable garden waste collections, and there had been discussion concerning a potential Staffordshire wide waste collection service. The Managing Director advised that a Chargeable Garden Waste Working Group had been established on an opt-in basis, and Cannock Chase was not involved. With regard to the potential Staffordshire wide waste collection service, the Managing Director advised that it was unlikely to happen as it would require the establishment of a merged joint body to which all the authorities would need to subscribe, and a number had declared that they were not supportive of the idea.

66. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 20 October, 2016

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 October, 2016, be approved as a correct record and signed.

67. Forward Plan

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period November, 2016 to January, 2017 (Item 5.1 – 5.2 of the Official Minutes of the Council) was considered.

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period November, 2016 to January, 2017 be noted.

68. Recommendations of Scrutiny Committees

None received.

69. Town Centre Business Rates Discount Scheme and Discretionary Rates Relief Support for Businesses

Consideration was given to the Joint Report of the Managing Director and the Head of Finance (Item 7.1 – 7.19 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The amended Discretionary Rates Relief Policy as set out in Appendix 1 of the report be approved for implementation.
- (B) The S.151 Officer be authorised, in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the relevant Portfolio Leaders, to undertake any future amendments to the Discretionary Rates Relief Policy to ensure that it remains consistent with the business support policy objectives of the Council.

Reasons for Decisions

In October, 2014 the new National Non-Domestic Rates (NNDR) Discretionary Rate Relief Scheme was approved by Cabinet and launched in December, 2014.

It had since become necessary to amend the current policy to tighten up on key criteria so as to avoid misinterpretation. This included applicants providing a case that demonstrated financial need for the relief in addition to the need to demonstrate benefit to the District under the Business Growth/Inward Investment scheme. The level of support within this part of the scheme would be determined by affordability considerations.

To date, a total of 8 businesses had received assistance since the scheme was revised of which 4 were Town Centre related and 4 Business Growth/Inward Investment related. Circa 43 jobs had been created by the businesses supported with an estimated £3m+ invested by the businesses to date.

All of the businesses supported to date were still trading, including those where the Council's support had now ceased.

70. Strategic Risk Register

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 8.1 – 8.16 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Strategic Risk Register be approved and progress made in the identification and management of the strategic risks be noted.

Reasons for Decision

All strategic risks and associated actions plans had been reviewed and the Council's risk profile was summarised as per the table below:

Risk Colour	Number of Risks at 1 Apr 2016	Number of Risks at 1 Oct 2016
Red	2	2
Amber	3	3
Green	2	2
TOTAL	7	7

The number of strategic risks remained unchanged at 7. No risks had been deleted, though progress had been made in managing the risks, and no new risks had been added.

The meeting closed at 4:25 p.m.



LEADER

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY 2 NOVEMBER, 2016 AT 3.00 P.M.

IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (Chairman)
Pearson, A. (Vice Chairman)

Cooper, Miss J.	Hoare, M.W.A.
Dean, A.	Preece, J.P.T.L.
Dudson, Miss M.	Snape, P.
Freeman, Miss M.	Sutherland, M.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Witton, P.
Grocott, M.	

46. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G. Burnett, C.I. Lea and D.J. Snape (Councillor C.I. Lea's substitute for the meeting).

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

Member	Interest	Type
Preece, J.P.T.L.	Application CH/16/239, <i>Land at Coulthwaite Way, Rugeley</i> , Erection of 6 no. two bedroom semi-detached dwellings – Member of the Cabinet that considered and approved the scheme.	Predetermination
Preece, J.P.T.L.	Application CH/16/240, <i>Land at Woodland Close, Pye Green</i> , Residential development – demolition of garage court buildings and erection of 2 no. two bedroom semi-detached houses and 2 no two bedroom bungalows – Member of the Cabinet that considered and approved the scheme.	Predetermination

48. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillor Mrs. S.M. Cartwright declared that she had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/16/240, *Land at Woodland Close, Pye Green*, Residential development – demolition of garage court buildings and erection of 2 no. two bedroom semi-detached houses and 2 no two bedroom bungalows.

49. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 October, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

50. Members' Requests for Site Visits

None.

51. Application CH/16/313, Land adjacent to 4 West Butts Road, Rugeley, Residential development: Proposed erection of a detached dormer bungalow

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

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by David Williams (an objector) and Mr. Fletcher (the applicant speaking in support of the application).

The Development Control Manager advised that there was a missing word in recommendation 2. The third line of recommendation 2 should read “.....the proposal would have an adverse impact on *the* character and appearance.....”

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the reasons stated therein.

52. Application CH/16/239, Land at Coulthwaite Way, Rugeley, Residential development: Erection of 6 no. two bedroom semi-detached dwellings

Having declared that he had predetermined the application Councillor J.P.T.L. Preece left the meeting and did not take part in the decision making process.

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

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Heather Sutton, the applicant's architect, speaking in support of the application.

The Development Control Manager advised that Staffordshire County Council Highways had objected to the application. However, the proposals had been amended and they had now withdrawn their objection subject to conditions being added.

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 requested by Staffordshire County Council Highways:-

Prior to the commencement of the development a Construction Vehicle Management Plan including details of site compound, types of vehicles, provision for parking of vehicles for site operatives and visitors, loading and unloading of plant and materials and storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development has been submitted and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall therefore be implemented prior to any works commencing on site.

Reason

To comply with para. 32 of the NPPF. In the interest of highway safety.

The developments hereby permitted shall not be brought into use until the parking areas have been provided in accordance with drawing entitled "Proposed Site Layout and Site Section" drawing number 2375/02/05 Revision D and thereafter retained for the lifetime of the developments.

Reason

To comply with para. 32 of the NPPF. In the interest of highway safety.

Before any of the dwellings hereby approved are first occupied, the new accesses to the site, as illustrated on plan reference 2375/02/05 Revision D, shall be completed within the limits of the public highway and 1.5 m by 1.5 m pedestrian visibility splays shall be provided to either side of the vehicle accesses with nothing placed or retained forward of the splays exceeding 600 mm in height above the adjacent carriageway level and thereafter retained free of any such obstruction for the life of the development.

Reason

To comply with para. 32 of the NPPF. In the interest of highway safety.

Prior to first use of the developments the redundant access crossing adjacent to plot no. 6 shall be permanently closed and reinstated as footway.

Reason

To comply with para. 32 of the NPPF. In the interest of highway safety.

53. **Application CH/16/240, Land at Woodland Close, Pye Green, Cannock, Residential development: Demolition of garage court buildings and erection of 2 no. two bedroom semi-detached houses and 2 no. two bed bungalows**

Having declared that he had predetermined the application Councillor J.P.T.L. Preece left the meeting and did not take part in the decision making process.

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.42 – 6.62 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Karen Hancox (an objector) and Heather Sutton, the applicant's architect, speaking in favour of the application.

The Development Control Manager advised that Staffordshire County Council Highways had objected to the application. However, they were now happy with the reconfiguration of Plot 4 and had withdrawn their objection subject to conditions being added. He outlined these conditions for the benefit of the Committee.

Concern was expressed regarding the location of the bin collection point. Should the Committee be minded to approve the application the Officer advised that, as the applicant was the District Council he would have a discussion with the necessary Officer in order to resolve this matter.

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 requested by Staffordshire County Council Highways:-

Prior to the developments first use the parking and turning areas for the dwellings shall be provided, as per the submitted plan and thereafter retained for those purposes only for the life of the development.

Reason

In order to comply with Para 32 of the NPPF.

Prior to the commencement of the development, a system of surface water drainage shall be installed on the site to prevent surface water discharging onto or off the public highway. The system shall then be maintained in an operational manner thereafter.

Reason

In order to comply with Para 32 of the NPPF.

No development hereby approved shall be commenced until a Construction Method Statement comprising details of site compound, provision for parking of vehicles for site operatives and visitors, loading and unloading of plant and materials, timing of deliveries and storage of plant and materials used in constructing the development has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The approved scheme shall thereafter be implemented prior to any work commencing on site.

Reason

In order to comply with Para 32 of the NPPF.

Prior to the commencement of the development, a system of surface water drainage shall be installed on the site to prevent surface water discharging onto or off the public highway. The system shall then be maintained in an operational manner thereafter.

Reason

In order to comply with Para 32 of the NPPF.

(Councillor J.P.T.L. Preece was present for the consideration and determination of the remainder of the applications).

54. Application CH/16/153, Land off Ashleigh Croft, Cannock, Residential development: Erection of 7 no. dwellings

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.63 – 6.77 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Concern was expressed regarding the location of the bin collection point. Should the Committee be minded to approve the application the Officer advised that an additional condition could be added to the approval which would resolve this matter.

RESOLVED:

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

Notwithstanding the details of the approved plans, the development shall not be brought into use until a scheme detailing a waste collection facility has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the works comprising the approved scheme implemented in full.

The scheme shall include, but not necessarily restricted to, details of the capacity of the facility to accommodate the refuse containers required by the development, the surface treatment, screening and location.

Reason

To ensure that there is an appropriate waste collection facility in the interest of protecting the amenity of both existing and future residents in accordance with Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan and Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

55. Application CH/16/338, 69 Chenet Way, Cannock, Proposed single storey and two storey side extension

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.78 – 6.91 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Fan (an objector) and Mr. John Reynolds, the applicant's agent, speaking in favour of the application.

RESOLVED:

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

56. Application CH/16/362, Cannock Chase Council, Civic Centre, Beecroft Road, Cannock, Proposed demolition of 2 no. bungalows, extension of existing car park and associated works (resubmission of application no. CH/16/149)

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.92 – 6.109 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

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

57. TPO No. 2016/02 - Proposed Tree Preservation Order at 30 Beech Tree Lane, Cannock

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.110 – 6.117 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Soltysik (an objector). The Council's Tree Officer also addressed the Committee and responded to the issues raised by the objector.

RESOLVED:

That TPO No. 2016/02 be confirmed without modification.

The meeting closed at 4.55 pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**

WEDNESDAY 23 NOVEMBER, 2016 AT 3.00 P.M.

IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (Chairman)
Pearson, A. (Vice Chairman)

Burnett, G.	Hoare, M.W.A.
Cooper, Miss J.	Kraujalis, J.T.
Dean, A.	(substitute for Preece, J.P.T.L.)
Dudson, Miss M.J.	Lea, C.I.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Snape, P.A.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Witton, P.T.

58. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors M. Grocott, J.P.T.L. Preece and M. Sutherland.

Notification had been received that Councillor J.T. Kraujalis would be substituting for Councillor J.P.T.L. Preece.

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

Member	Interest	Type
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Application CH/16/256, Cannock Sports Stadium, Pye Green Road, Cannock – Variation of condition 24 to planning permission CH/14/0350 to allow various amendments to the approved plans including the creation of 14 no. allotment plots with associated car parking (12 spaces) accessed via Lovatt Place: the retention of part of the existing athletics clubroom for use with proposed allotments: widening of Pye Green Road entrance and access; relocation of Adventure Play Area, provision of Green Gym/BMX Pump Track and extension of existing football pitch to create a full sized senior pitch including	Personal

repositioning to facilitate other improvement works – Member sits on the Committee of a football club that uses the stadium football pitches

60. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillor Mrs. S.M. Cartwright declared that she had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/16/256, Cannock Sports Stadium, Pye Green Road, Cannock – Variation of condition 24 to planning permission CH/14/0350 to allow various amendments to the approved plans including the creation of 14 no. allotment plots with associated car parking (12 spaces) accessed via Lovatt Place: the retention of part of the existing athletics clubroom for use with proposed allotments: widening of Pye Green Road entrance and access; relocation of Adventure Play Area, provision of Green Gym/BMX Pump Track and extension of existing football pitch to create a full sized senior pitch including repositioning to facilitate other improvement works.

Councillor G. Burnett declared that he had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/16/295, Land off Church Hill, Littleworth, Cannock WS12 1BD – Residential development: Erection of 6 no. dwellings

61. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 November, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

62. Members' Requests for Site Visits

None.

63. Application CH/16/355, Land to North of 270 Norton East Road, Norton Canes, Cannock WS11 9RP – Residential development, proposed erection of 1 dwelling and associated works

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.14 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

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

64. Application CH/16/328, 18 Attingham Drive, Cannock – Retrospective Application for the Retention of 2m high fence

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.15 – 6.23 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised the Committee that since writing the report two further letters of support had been received stating that the previous

hedge was overgrown and a cause of anti social behaviour (dog fouling). The fence was considered to be robust and an improvement of what was previously in place.

Prior to the determination of the application representations were made by Mr. Alcock, on behalf of the applicant, speaking in support of the application.

RESOLVED:

That the application, which was recommended for refusal, be approved as the Committee did not consider that the fence detracted from the amenity of the area given that there were similar fences in the surrounding area. The approval was subject to the following condition:-

(Condition not yet finalised as officers waiting for landscaping details from the applicant – will be referred to a future meeting of the Committee).

65. Application CH/16/314, 1 Spode Place, Cannock – Retrospective Application for the Retention of 2m high fence

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.24 – 6.32 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised the Committee that since writing the report three further letters of support had been received stating that the previous hedge was overgrown and a cause of anti social behaviour (dog fouling). The fence was considered to be robust and an improvement of what was previously in place.

Prior to the determination of the application representations were made by Mr. Alcock, the applicant, speaking in support of the application.

RESOLVED:

That the application, which was recommended for refusal, be approved as the Committee did not consider that the fence detracted from the amenity of the area given that there were similar fences in the surrounding area. The approval was subject to the following condition:-

(Condition not yet finalised as officers waiting for landscaping details from the applicant – will be referred to a future meeting of the Committee).

66. Application CH/16/295, Land off Church Hill, Littleworth, Cannock WS12 1BD – Residential development: Erection of 6 no. dwellings

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.33 – 6.50 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

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

Before the dwellings hereby approved are brought into use a scheme for the

erection of bat and bird boxes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and the works comprising the approved scheme implemented.

Reason

In order to enhance bird breeding opportunities and bat foraging areas on the site.

67. **Application CH/16/256, Cannock Sports Stadium, Pye Green Road, Cannock – Variation of condition 24 to planning permission CH/14/0350 to allow various amendments to the approved plans including the creation of 14 no. allotment plots with associated car parking (12 spaces) accessed via Lovatt Place: the retention of part of the existing athletics clubroom for use with proposed allotments: widening of Pye Green Road entrance and access; relocation of Adventure Play Area, provision of Green Gym/BMX Pump Track and extension of existing football pitch to create a full sized senior pitch including repositioning to facilitate other improvement works**

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.51 – 6.73 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised that since writing the report Staffordshire County Highways had requested three further conditions be added should permission be granted. These related to access, parking arrangements and visibility. The Officer added that it may be necessary to modify the conditions contained in the report as they had been based on the previous planning application. Therefore any conditions that were no longer required would be removed.

Members expressed concern regarding parking around the site and considered that the allocated parking spaces for allotment holders may be used by those attending the football matches. The Officer confirmed that the District Council, who was the applicant, was aware of these issues; however he would advise the Head of Leisure of the concern raised.

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:

Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to commencement of development full details of amended access from Lovatt Close including visibility splays shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The amended access shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to completion of the new allotments.

Reason: To comply with para. 32 of the NPPF and in the interest of highway safety

Notwithstanding the submitted details, prior to commencement of development full details of amended access from Pye Green Road shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The

ammended access shall thereafter be provided in accordance with the approved details prior to construction of the new Sports Stadium.

Reason: To comply with para. 32 of the NPPF and in the interest of highway safety

Prior to first use of the new allotments the parking area broadly indicated on the Proposed Phase 1 Masterplan shall be provided in a bound material with the individual bays clearly delineated and shall thereafter be retained for the life of the development

Reason: To comply with para.32 of the NPPF and in the interest of highway safety

If the allotments are to be supported by sheds. The design and maximum shed size shall be agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To safegaurd the amenity of the are in accordance with Local Plan Policy CP3.

The access and parking off Lovatt Place shall only be used in connection with the approved allotments.

Reason: In the interests of highway safety and to safeguard the amenity of nearby residents, in accordance with Local Plan Policy CP3.

The meeting closed at 3.50pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BETTER JOBS AND SKILLS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY 7 SEPTEMBER, 2016, AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:

Councillors

Martin, Mrs. C.E. (Chairman)
Sutherland, M. (Vice-Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Johnson, T.B.
Cooper, Miss J.	Molineux, G.N.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Snape, P.A.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Whitehouse, Miss S.
Hoare, M.W.A. (substituting for Councillor G. Burnett)	(substituting for Councillor M.S. Buttery)

Also in attendance:

- Councillor Mrs. D.M. Todd (Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader – observer);
- Councillor J.P.T.L. Preece (Environment Portfolio Leader);
- Sheila Dunning, Cannock Traders Association;
- Stephanie Cunningham, Hednesford Traders Association
- Dave Hancock, Rugeley Traders Association
- Carol Fittes and Lesley Yates, Hednesford in Partnership

8. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillors G. Burnett, M.S. Buttery, Mrs. C.L. Peake and G. Alcott (observer).

Councillors Hoare and Miss Whitehouse were in attendance as substitutes for Councillors Burnett and Buttery respectively.

It was noted that the Head of Economic Development would be joining the meeting for the later items on the agenda following the conclusion of the Cabinet Conference.

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

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

10. Minutes

Minute No 3. – Minutes

A Member queried if a legal challenge to the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village development had been lodged with the High Court in advance of the 9 September deadline. The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager replied that so far no indication had been received as to whether a legal challenge had been submitted, but a definite answer would not be known until the middle of week commencing 12 September.

Minute No. 4 – Better Jobs and Skills Scrutiny Committee Work Programme 2016-17

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager advised that Cabinet was due to consider the Cannock Town Centre Area Action Plan (AAP) Issues and Options Paper on 22 September for public consultation. Additionally, the working group set up to oversee production of the Local Plan (Part 2) would also be given the opportunity to feed into the AAP consultation. It was also confirmed that the Street Trading Policy would be included on the agenda for the 12 April, 2017 meeting of the Committee and the Senior Licensing Officer had been invited to attend for that item.

Minute No. 5 – Preparing Young People for Employment

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager noted regret that the new Arriva bus timetables implemented on 3 September had withdrawn a number of local services, including those which had served Kingswood Lakeside. Staffordshire County Council (SCC) was however looking into whether this service could be provided by another operator.

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 13 July, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

11. Town Centres Traders Issues

Cannock

Sheila Dunning reported the following issues from the Cannock Traders' Association:

- Clarity needed on what was being proposed for the Christmas period in respect of free car parking in the town centre.
- Sections of block paving around the town centre had either broken or sunk and needed to be fixed.
- The new Chairman of the Traders' Association had suggested re-naming it the 'Cannock Community Group'.
- Assistance was needed to advertise events, publish more positive advertising and keep notice boards up to date.
- Concern about what impact the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village would have on the town centre and whether a free shuttle bus would be provided between the two locations.

Members supported the concerns raised about the poor state of the block paving and raised wider concerns about the town centre being in bad shape in general.

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager provided the following responses to the issues raised:

- Understanding was that principle agreement had been reached for free car parking to be provided for two Saturdays before Christmas as had been the case in previous years, however this was still to be confirmed.
- A number of walkabouts had taken place in Cannock town centre and identified issues of broken block paving amongst others. There was budget provision available in the current year to try and address problems identified and a related report would be submitted to the Council's Leadership Team in the near future for consideration.
- Any name change to the Traders Association should continue to include Cannock for sake of clarity, but it was for the Traders to agree on what they felt was most suitable. The Terms of Reference would need to be redefined to emphasise the relationship between Cannock Town Centre and its surrounding businesses.
- Funding support for advertising would be difficult to provide but from the walkabouts it was clear that noticeboards required more regular updating. Furthermore, there was an opportunity through the Council's website to link to the Traders Associations, which would be an alternative avenue for advertising.
- Unknown as yet what impact Mill Green would have on the town centre, but it was hoped there would be an increase in visitors from people who wouldn't ordinarily visit the area. The S106 agreement for the development included provision for improved bus services, but these would not be operated on a free basis.

Sheila Dunning then queried what additional help the town centre would receive as a result of Mill Green. The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager replied that schedule 6 of the S106 agreement set out a number of improvements specifically for the town centre.

Hednesford

Stephanie Cunningham reported the following issues from the Hednesford Traders' Association:

- CCTV coverage within the town centre needed to be improved to address issues, particularly in the area near the library.
- Regular occurrences of vehicles being parked on double yellow lines on Anglesey Street and Eskrett Street which were causing blockages for passing traffic.

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager provided the following responses to the issues raised:

- Budget pressures and technological issues would need to be considered for the CCTV provision. Hednesford Town Council paid an annual sum of money for the cameras, but management of the cameras was the responsibility of the District Council.

- A report was due to be submitted to Cabinet on 22 September to seek approval for the principle of a Parking Order to be introduced on the car park to the rear of the Co-op store. As part of this discussion, it was hoped to address issues of on-street parking too. A related issue was the location of the taxi rank on Anglesey Street, but this would require further investigation by Staffordshire County Council.

A Member commented that the main issue for the car park to the rear of the Co-op was that it was regularly used by people commuting by train to work in Birmingham and Walsall and so were therefore taking up spaces all day because parking was free. The same Member also advised that Hednesford Town Council were due to consider a proposal to move the taxi rank to within the Anglesey Street car park.

Another Member commented that there needed to be equity in charges for usage of car parks across the district to ensure fairness for all residents.

Rugeley

Dave Hancock reported the following issues from the Rugeley Traders' Association:

- As with Cannock, there were issues in Rugeley town centre with uneven and broken block paving which needed to be addressed.
- Issues had occurred with lorries parking and causing obstructions to traffic. A clear parking zone was needed to stop this happening in future.

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager provided the following responses to the issues raised:

- Paving issues would be addressed as with Cannock town centre, however there was only a £100,000 budget available to undertake such improvement works across all three town centres.
- An area of land identified by the Traders Association for lorry drivers to park up overnight was owned by Staffordshire County Council who could be approached about providing the land for such a purpose, but a positive response was unlikely to be forthcoming.

Councillors Preece and Mrs Todd arrived at the meeting during the consideration of this item.

12. Hednesford in Partnership

Carol Fittes and Lesley Yates delivered a presentation to Members on Hednesford in Partnership (HiP) which covered the following:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current committee structure 	<p>Chair – Carol Fittes</p> <p>Vice-Chair – Paul Woodhead</p> <p>Treasurer – Lesley Yates</p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background to formation of Hednesford in Partnership 	<p>HiP was set up to bring together local groups such as; Friends of Hednesford Park, Heart of Hednesford Restoration Project and Hednesford Traders Association.</p> <p>Community sessions and focus groups held to find out what the public wanted to see HiP achieve within two, five and ten years.</p> <p>Decision makers from local groups and organisations meet together to discuss and organise activities.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aims and objectives 	<p>To facilitate collaboration between local bodies, so as to promote Hednesford as a great place to live, work, do business and visit.</p> <p>To combine the forces of local organisations in order to develop funding bids for community wide and specific local projects, thereby potentially attracting greater investment.</p> <p>To provide a transparent way for local organisations to share with each other information about the activities they are undertaking, their experiences, local intelligence and best practice.</p> <p>To assist with the promotion and co-ordination of community events and initiatives.</p> <p>To encourage individuals to volunteer in support of the work of community organisations and build a bank of volunteers.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vision for Hednesford 	<p>Creating long term sustainability for Hednesford, making it a great place to live, work and visit.</p> <p>Arts & Architecture (creating a theme).</p> <p>Events (joint – working together).</p> <p>Marketing & Promotion.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Parters 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chase Chamber of Commerce • Hednesford Town Football Club • Hednesford Traders • Staffordshire University Academy • Kingsmead School • CHAPS (Chase Arts in Public Spaces) • Museum of Cannock Chase • South Staffordshire College • McDonalds • Hednesford Town Council • Heart of Hednesford Restoration Project

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chase Creative Hub • Community Wellbeing Arts, Inspiring Healthy Lifestyles • Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group • Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty • Staffordshire Fire and Rescue Service • St. Peters Church • Friends of Hednesford Park • Cannock Chase Council
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achievements so far 	<p>April 2016, Bridging Communities Initiative - £10,000 received from Staffordshire County Council's Community Arts Fund.</p> <p>Working in partnership to deliver Summer and Christmas events.</p> <p>Launching four specialist markets in 2017.</p> <p>September 2016, submitted a bid for 'Celebrate' lottery funding for a carnival event in Hednesford in August 2017.</p>

A Member queried what the proposed five and ten year plans were. Carol Fittes replied that the longer term plans needed to be realistic about what could be achieved as finances and timescales needed to be accounted for, but projects such as redevelopment of Hednesford railway station and buildings renovations had been discussed. The two year plan included items which could be delivered quickly and help to engage more people and organisations in the Partnership.

Another Member then queried what the theme for the town would be. Lesley Yates replied that this would be developed as the artwork for the railway bridge starts to come together (to be achieved via the Bridging Communities initiative) but it was recognised that an identity for the town needed to be established. Members commented that it was important for the identity to be forward looking, but also recognised the heritage and history of Hednesford.

13. Priority Delivery Plan – Q1 Report

Members noted the latest performance information (Item 6.1 to 6.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager apologised to the Committee for the continued absence of the Head of Economic Development and introduced the Q1 outturn report. He then reported that the direction of travel performance indicators for quarter 1 were broadly positive, drawing Members' attention to the following indicators:

Improving skills and accessibility to local employment opportunities

The employment rate for the district was above the regional and national average and Job Seeker's Allowance (JSA) claimant numbers sitting below 1%. There

was ongoing concern however about the number of 16-18 year olds classed as being not in education, employment or training (NEETS).

Supporting attractive and competitive town centres

Town Centres vacancy rates had increased compared to the previous quarter, but were still better than the national vacancy rate. Cannock Town Centre had however experienced an upward trend in the number of vacant premises.

Secure improvements to Cannock, Hednesford and Rugeley Town railway stations

The S106 agreement for the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village included provision that improvements would be made to Cannock train station, along with connectivity improvements to/from the town centre and Mill Green. Improvements were also required to Hednesford and Rugeley Town stations, however any such improvements would have to be funded locally.

Continue working with partners to facilitate the formulation and implementation of EU funded projects to support business start ups and the growth of existing businesses.

The launch of the Business Growth Programme had been heavily delayed, and further information was awaited as to when the launch would happen. Grant monies from the Skills Funding Agency were only available until March 2018.

To work with Staffordshire County Council to clear the site of the former Aelfgar School site in advance of a re-tendering to secure an Extracare facility within Rugeley Town Centre.

The Extracare review was still underway so no further update was available at this time, however it was expected that the site would still be cleared in due course.

Other issues

A Member raised concern with the announcement from Gestamp Tallent to relocate 800 workers from their current site in Bridgtown to a new site at Four Ashes in South Staffordshire District and the accompanying loss in business rates for the Council. The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager replied that the Council had tried to work with Gestamp to secure alternative locations in the district as they had outgrown their current site but no suitable relocation options could be identified. It was expected that the transfer to the new site would take place gradually over three to four years, so the impact upon Gestamp's existing employees and the district would not hit all in one go. The company had however indicated they would be willing to retain a training facility in the area. Assurances would also be sought from the company that transport would be provided for all workers affected by the relocation. In respect of business rates, the buildings currently occupied by Gestamp would still be liable for business rates if retained, and other existing/future proposals for development of new employment floorspace within the district would help to mitigate any loss of business rates income.

Councillor Mrs. Grice left the meeting at this point and did not return.

A Member requested an update on the continued development of the Kingswood Lakeside site. The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager replied that two further schemes were currently under discussion and other

existing schemes were nearing completion. If all agreed and proposed schemes were achieved then the site would almost be at 100% capacity.

14. West Midlands Combined Authority Update

Due to the Head of Economic Development not being in attendance, this item was deferred to the next meeting of the Committee.

15. Work Programme Update

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager reported that the agenda for the 8 December meeting would be mainly focussed on transport matters. Network Rail had been invited to provide an update on the Chase Line electrification project, Jeff Tucker from SCC had been invited to provide an update on bus services (a representative from Arriva may also be in attendance for this item).

A Member suggested that Staffordshire County Councillor Mark Winnington should also be invited as the current Chairman of West Midlands Rail.

The meeting closed at 5:50pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON MONDAY 5 SEPTEMBER, 2016, AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:

Councillors

Johnson, T.B. (Chairman)

Lea, C.I. (Vice-Chairman)

Cooper, Miss J. (substitute)

Dean, A.

Dudson, Miss M.J.

Freeman, Miss M.A.

Martin, Mrs. C.E.

Smith, C.D.

Snape, P.A.

Stretton, Mrs. P.Z.

Sutherland, M.

Witton, P.T.

Also in attendance:

- Councillor C. Bennett (Crime & Partnerships Portfolio Leader, Observer).
- Chief Inspector Geoff Knight, Cannock Local Policing Team.
- Ms. Anna McLauchlan, CACH Co-ordinator.

7. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillor Mrs. D. Grice

Councillor Miss J. Cooper was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Mrs. Grice.

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

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

9. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 July, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

10. Hate Crime – Communities Against Crimes of Hate (CACH)

Ms. Anna McLauchlan, CACH Co-ordinator, was in attendance to deliver a presentation on the above matter, which covered the following:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who Are CACH? 	<p>Multi-agency partnership covering; Stafford Borough, South Staffordshire, Cannock Chase District, East Staffordshire, Tamworth Borough, and Lichfield District.</p> <p>Also Challenge North Staffordshire (CNS) covering; Staffordshire Moorlands, Newcastle-under-Lyme and Stoke-on-Trent.</p> <p>Both organisations work to reduce Hate Crime and Hate incidents.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How We Do It: 	<p>Promote understanding of different communities.</p> <p>Online presence via social media.</p> <p>Support partners with delivering best practice policies and procedures.</p> <p>Provide training/awareness sessions.</p> <p>Compile reports of incidents to feed into country-wide intelligence to identify 'hotspots'.</p> <p>Offer advocacy and 1:1 support to people experience hate crime, hate incidents and identity based bullying.</p> <p>Practical advice about what options are available to the IP.</p> <p>Liaising with police, housing and other's on the IP's behalf.</p> <p>Offering proactive work to targeted groups/schools.</p> <p>Emotional support.</p> <p>Suggest therapeutic options to Improve wellbeing.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hate Crime Definitions 	<p>Any crime motivated by hostility towards the victim's perceived difference.</p> <p>Must take into account the perception of victim/others.</p> <p>Race, age, disability, sexual orientation, gender identity, belief, visual difference, alternative (subculture) and others.</p>

	<p>Staffordshire Police only record hate crimes on the basis of; race, religion/belief, sexual orientation, transgender, disability and other.</p> <p>Verbal abuse, graffiti, anti-social behaviour, bullying, arson, harassment, threats, physical assault, murder.</p> <p>Can include; threats, harassment etc. made via email or social media.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hate Crime Cases 	<p>Examples of historic cases.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Impact of Hate 	<p><u>All Hate Crime – Emotional Response Experienced</u></p> <p>Anger – 67% Annoyance – 50% Shock – 40% Loss of confidence/feeling vulnerable – 35% Fear – 39% Anxiety/panic attacks – 23% Crying/tears – 13% Difficulty sleeping – 17% Depression – 20% Other – 3%</p> <p><u>British Crime Survey</u></p> <p>Anger – 60% Annoyance – 60% Shock – 28% Loss of confidence/feeling vulnerable – 15% Fear – 14% Anxiety/panic attacks – 6% Crying/tears – 9% Difficulty sleeping – 8% Depression – 6% Other – 3%</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CACH Reports Q1 2016/17 	<p>64 individuals (26 in CCDC area).</p> <p>Circa 700 incidents (circa 310 in CCDC area).</p> <p>2015/16: 147 individuals, c. 740 incidents.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hate Crime in Cannock Q1 	<p>Race – 34% Religion – 23% Disability – 23% Sexual Orientation – 10% Transgender – 7% Mental Health – 3%</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Types of Incidents Reported 2015/16 	<p>Verbal – 46% Harassment – 22% Assault – 12% Threat of Violence – 7% Mate Crime – 3% Damage to Property – 3% Cyber – 3% Graffiti – 2% Theft – 1% Hate Mail – 1%</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The National Picture 	<p><u>Reported: 44,480</u> Race – 37,848 Sexual Orientation – 4,622 Religion – 2,273 Disability – 1,985 Transgender – 55</p> <p><u>British Crime Survey: 325,000</u> Race – 154,000 Sexual Orientation – 39,000 Religion – 70,000 Disability – 62,000 Transgender – not known</p> <p>Underreporting – Stonewall and Mencap Surveys</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hate Crime and Staffordshire 	<p>Not the area where CACH receive the highest number of reports from, however:</p> <p>Rural isolation.</p> <p>Aging population – mate crime.</p> <p>Not much diversity culturally.</p> <p>Individuals feel isolated and often let down by services in the past.</p> <p>Lack of local support/community groups relevant to them.</p> <p>Long standing issues.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How to Refer 	<p>Tel: 07971 497 988</p> <p>Web: www.cachpartnership.org.uk</p> <p>Email: selfreport@cachpartnership.org.uk</p> <p>Twitter: @CACHPartnership</p> <p>Facebook: /CACHPartnership</p>
--	--

Ms. McLauchlan advised that some people reported incidents straight to CACH rather than through the police, hence stated reporting figures being different for the two organisations.

A Member queried what was meant by the term ‘mate crime’. Ms. McLauchlan replied that this applied to instances where an individual suffering from learning difficulties or socially isolation was befriended by another individual and taken advantage of due to their vulnerability.

A Member queried what was being done to tackle the increased number of hate crime incidents reported following the outcome of the EU Referendum. Ms. McLauchlan replied that incidents had decreased following an initial increase after the result was known, but it would be necessary to keep an eye on this once a better picture about the UK’s future relationship with the EU was known.

A Member queried if the reporting definitions used by CACH were in keeping with recent guidance issued by the Home Office. Ms. McLauchlan replied that the headings/definitions used were as a result of what incidents had been reported over the past 12 to 18 months, but did cover what had been advised by the Home Office.

A Member queried if there was a breakdown available for the types of disability incidents reported. Ms McLauchlan replied that the most recent figures available indicated that it was an even split between learning and physical disabilities. In respect of underreporting, the Mencap survey reported that 90% of respondents had experienced some form of hate crime on a daily basis, of which 75% never reported. These figures were also at a similar level for participants in the Stonewall survey.

11. Police Performance Report

Chief Inspector Knight provided Members with an update on the latest crime and anti-social behaviour (ASB) numbers since 1 April this year, which detailed that for the 12 months period ending 4 September 2016, crime increased in the District by 5.9% when compared with the previous 12 months period (5,784 reported cases compared to 5,463 previously) and ASB increased by 25% (3,458 reported cases compared to 2,770 previously). Of the reported ASB cases, 559 were committed by youths. Members also received details of the role profiles of PCs and PCSOs as requested at the last meeting. All areas across Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent had seen an increase in crime rates, but the percentage increase for Cannock Chase was the lowest.

In respect of the anti-social behaviour figures, a Member asked for clarification as to what the 'Youth Qualifiers' were. The Chief Inspector replied that these had been introduced by the Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) as a way of clearly identifying ASB incidents caused by youths. A request had also been submitted to the PCC that Qualifiers for alcohol and drug related incidents also be included in the monitoring data.

The Chief Inspector advised that a force-wide working group had been established to look at what incidents were considered to be ASB to ensure that reports were being recorded and categorised accurately.

A Member reported an issue about a number of repeated incidents of criminal damage which had recently happened at the Prince of Wales Theatre and raised concern about the Police response and lack of action taken to deal with this.

Members then gave positive feedback about the use of the recently adopted Traveller and Gypsy Protocol to stop an unauthorised encampment being set up on the Cannock leisure centre car park.

The Chief Inspector then reported that a Police Partnerships Manager had been appointed to provide the parish and town councils with a dedicated contact person and attend meetings in the event that local PCs or PCSOs were unable to do so.

12. Anti-Social Behaviour – Use of New Powers and Tools

The Environmental Protection Manager was in attendance to deliver a presentation on the above matter, which covered the following:

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Background 	<p>In force October 2014.</p> <p>Supplements existing powers.</p> <p>Range of options available.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Protection Notices (CPNs) 	<p>Targets those responsible for ASB.</p> <p>Three specific tests to be met.</p> <p>Set process to follow.</p> <p>3 CPN Warnings issued by CCDC Environmental Health and no CPNs issued.</p> <p>6 CPN Warnings issued by CCDC Housing and 1 CPN issued.</p> <p>45 CPN Warnings issued by the local Police and 17 CPNs issued.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Spaces Protection Order (PSPO) 	<p>Area based power.</p> <p>Four specific tests to be met.</p> <p>Set process to follow.</p> <p>Enables action on new anti-social activities.</p> <p>Replace existing controls – October 2017.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gating Orders 	<p>3 existing.</p> <p>Preliminary consultation with interested parties.</p> <p>Report to Cabinet in preparation.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dog Control Orders 	<p>2 existing.</p> <p>Preliminary consultation with interested parties – in preparation.</p> <p>Controls to be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dog fouling Dogs off leads Prohibition from specified areas Requirement to put dogs on lead on instruction Numbers of dogs a person can walk Requirement to carry poo bags or similar receptacle
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Designated Public Places Orders 	<p>Preliminary consultation with interested parties – scheduled for October 2016.</p> <p>Areas provisionally identified.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Timescales 	<p>Dates for; evidence collation, production of Cabinet report, consultation period, production of final report, publication and challenge of PSPOs.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Injunction (Civil) 	<p>Two tests – non-housing related (harassment, alarm, distress) and housing related (nuisance/annoyance).</p> <p>“Just and convenient” solutions.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Criminal Behaviour Order (CBO) 	<p>Offender convicted of an offence.</p> <p>Tests must be met.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Closure Notice/Order 	<p>Notice – up to 48 hours (Officer).</p> <p>Order – up to 6 months (Court).</p> <p>Nuisance or disorder near premises.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dispersal Notice/Order 	<p>Police only.</p> <p>Harassment, alarm or distress.</p> <p>Action to remove/reduce problem.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Absolute Ground for Possession 	<p>Social and private sector landlords.</p> <p>Fast eviction of anti-social tenants.</p> <p>Tenant, household member or visitor.</p> <p>Court <u>must</u> grant possession – except where human rights defence raised.</p> <p>Tests:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convicted of serious offence • Breach of civil injunction • Conviction for breach of a CBO • Conviction for noise nuisance • Property subject to Closure Order
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Trigger 	<p>“Corporate complaints” system for ASB.</p> <p>Administered by Police 101 number.</p> <p>3 complaints received in 6 month period.</p> <p>Only one received since introduced.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Powers and Tools 	<p>Police have used Dispersal Notices 25 times and Dispersal Orders 36 times (can only be used by the Police). No other available powers have so far been used by the Police or CCDC.</p>

Members requested that Cannock Park be included in any future PSPOs proposed due to previous ASB incidents which had occurred there.

The Environmental Protection Manager reported that a PSPO for ‘car cruising’ had been considered, however there was not sufficient evidence available to warrant introducing such an Order at the present time.

13. Quarter 1 Performance Report 2016-17 – Cleaner and Safer Environments Priority Delivery Plan (Community Safety Section)

Members noted the latest performance information (Item 7.1 to 7.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

14. Work Programme Update

The Head of Environmental Health reported that the draft agenda for the December meeting of the Committee included the Q2 Priority Delivery Plan performance report, the latest Police performance data and scrutiny reviews of the new ASB powers and Hate Crime.

The meeting closed at 5:50pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CUSTOMERS AND CORPORATE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY 13 OCTOBER, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Dudson, Miss M.J. (Chairman)
Snape, D.J. (Vice-Chairman)

Freeman, Miss M.A.	Martin, Mrs. C.E.
Foley, D.	Pearson, A.R.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Smith, C.D.
Johnson, T.B.	Sutherland, M.

Also in attendance:

- Councillor Mrs. M.A. Davis (Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader, Observer).
- Councillor J.T. Kraujalis (Corporate Improvement Portfolio Leader, Observer).

6. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillors G. Burnett, M.S. Buttery and M.R. Grocott.

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

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

8. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 27 July, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

9. Financial Recovery Plan Consultation

The Committee gave consideration to the related Cabinet report and associated documents (Item 4.1 – 4.44 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Policy and Performance Manager advised the Committee that this meeting was being held as part of the wider public consultation on the Financial Recovery

Plan (FRP). The public consultation commenced on 23 September and was due to end on 4 November. To date over 150 online responses had been received to the consultation survey and more than 600 paper copies of the survey had been distributed. The FRP page on the Council's website had been viewed over 700 times, and the accompanying video over 300 times. Arrangements had also been made through a market research company to conduct a telephone survey with a representative sample of 400 residents from across the district. Alongside all this, a number of press releases had been issued about the consultation as well as updates via the Council's social media channels. Four public meetings had also been arranged for weeks commencing 17 and 24 October, 2016.

A Member raised concerns that the consultation had been poorly publicised, rolled out too quickly and residents not given enough detail about why the specific savings options had been proposed. The Managing Director replied that the consultation had been publicised via the local press and Council's website for a number of weeks and the Leader of the Council had so far given five media interviews on the subject. All Members had received the relevant information as part of the 22 September Cabinet papers which were also publicly available on the Council's website. Compared to other public bodies the Council was doing a lot to ensure that residents and businesses were engaged with the consultation, but Members were more than welcome to put forward suggestions for additional ways engagement could take place.

Members then queried what format the public meetings would take, whether or not senior representatives of the Council would be in attendance and had plans been made to hold any further meetings than the four already scheduled. The Managing Director and Policy & Performance Manager replied that the meetings would start with a general introduction to the Council's financial situation and the FRP, followed by an open discussion on the savings options. Attendees would then be given the opportunity to complete a paper survey at the end of the meeting. The Managing Director, Head of Finance, two additional Heads of Service and at least one Cabinet member would be present at each meeting. In respect of holding further meetings, this would be determined once the first four meetings had been held.

A Member asked if it would be made clear at the public meetings that the FRP process was being undertaken because of external funding changes which had impacted negatively on the Council and not because of the Council's finances being mismanaged, which had been rumoured. The Managing Director replied that the external auditors had given the Council's financial management a clean bill of health, so it would definitely be made clear that the FRP was being put in place due to reductions in central government funding and the loss of business rates from the early closure of Rugeley Power Station.

Members sought clarification as to whether multiple survey responses by individuals could be prevented. The Policy & Performance Manager replied that would be difficult to achieve for paper surveys completed, but multiple online responses would be extracted and withdrawn from the final total once the consultation finished.

Members then raised questions and provided comments on the following savings options as detailed in the survey:

Use of Capital funds and earmarked reserves to save approximately £500,000

A Member queried if this would have a negative impact on the Council's working balances. The Head of Finance advised that this would not be the case as the Council was required to keep working balances at a minimum of 5.5% of gross expenditure. A risk analysis was undertaken each year to ensure that an appropriate level of working balances was retained.

Reduce operational costs of Parks & Open Spaces services – £15,000 saving; Deliver the staffed parks service in-house – £16,000 saving; and, Reduce the contingency budget in Parks & Open Spaces – £63,000 saving

A Member queried if the options to reduce operational costs and contingency budgets were linked to the proposal to bring the service in-house, and if so, what impact would that have on management of the district's parks. The Managing Director replied that they were linked, but each was presented as a standalone savings option. In terms of impact, this was addressed on pages 4.26-4.27 of the report.

The same Member then raised concern that not enough detail was provided about how an in-house contract would operate, although bringing the contract in-house was supported. The Managing Director replied that operational detail about the contract would only be produced by Officers if the option was agreed for inclusion in the draft budget for 2017/18.

Delete vacant Property Services Manager post and create Senior Officer post – £10,000 saving; Delete Senior Management post in Environmental Health – £87,000 saving; Delete Senior Management post in Financial Management – £31,000 saving; and, Delete Risk & Resilience Manager post in Governance – £58,000 saving

A Member queried if the above options would result in any Officers being made redundant, and if so, would any associated payments apply. The Managing Director replied that the figures listed were the savings that would be achieved after any exit payments had been made. In respect of redundancies, this scenario only applied to the Environmental Health and Finance posts and the current post holder for the Finance post could also be eligible for redeployment. The Property Services Manager post had been vacant for over 3 years, and the post holder for the Risk & Resilience post was due to retire at the end of the current financial year, so no exit payments would apply to either of these roles.

Another Member then queried what would be the total financial impact on the Council as a result of any redundancies made and what would be the best/worst case financial scenarios. The Head of Finance replied that the total financial impact was difficult to determine as in some departments more than one post was at risk, but it was expected that any redundancy monies would be paid out of funding set aside for such purposes. Figures for best and worst cases scenarios would be calculated and circulated to the Committee for reference.

Reduction in the Internal Audit provision – £55,000 saving; Stafford BC led Shared Services to deliver savings – £94,000 saving; Review call handling operation between Contact Centre and Social Alarms Service – £20,000 saving; Explore option of joint working between Street Cleansing and Parks & Open Spaces – TBC saving; and, Explore Development Control and Environmental Health as shared services – TBC saving

A Member queried if Officers were satisfied that all options for potential shared services had been researched. The Managing Director replied that this was correct for those areas which would not be constrained by being part of a shared services arrangement.

Another Member then queried when potential savings were likely to be known for those areas marked as 'TBC'. The Managing Director replied that in respect of Planning Policy/Development Control and Environmental Health, business cases were being developed, but any potential savings wouldn't become clear until the business cases were finalised and approved for discussion. With regards to Street Cleansing and Parks & Open Spaces, as part of the management restructure review these two departments were proposed to be brought under one Head of Service, at which point the working structures of each department would be reviewed to determine where savings could be achieved. The Head of Finance further replied that it was difficult to give specific savings figures as the Council did not have full control over what shared services arrangements may look like, but work had commenced today in order to have any proposals ready for implementation from 1 April, 2017.

Remove allowance paid to Elected Members for IT equipment – £10,000 saving

A Member queried that if this allowance was to be removed/reduced, would IT facilities within the Members' Group Rooms be improved instead, particularly in instances where Members may still wish to print off paper copies of report etc. The Managing Director replied that upgrading of IT equipment was not planned at present. With regards to printing, it was intended that the Council would seek to reduce/remove the requirement for document printing and move to paperless working where possible, but this was a long term aim.

The same Member then queried whether consideration had been given instead to the Council directly purchasing IT equipment for Members on a bulk basis. The Managing Director replied that this had not been considered, however the ICT department were available to help Members with any queries on the most suitable equipment to purchase.

A Motion was then proposed and seconded that Cabinet be asked to consider revising its proposal so that the Members' Computer Allowance be halved to £400 rather than being cut entirely. A vote was duly taken and the Motion was not carried.

No longer fund or install Christmas illuminations – £35,000 saving

A Member commented that this matter could cause problems in non-parished areas of the district as parished areas were likely to see the costs of providing Christmas illuminations being picked up the relevant parish/town councils instead. The Managing Director replied that assurances had been given to the parish/town councils that all areas of the district would be adversely affected by this proposal.

A Motion was then proposed and seconded that Cabinet ask the developers of the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village if they would be interested in providing funding/sponsorship towards provision of Christmas illuminations in Cannock Town Centre and Chadsmoor in future years. A vote was duly taken and the Motion was carried. The Managing Director advised the Committee that the developers had put forward significant sums of money for capital and Cannock town centre improvements as part of the final S106 agreement, so they may not be agreeable to this proposal. Furthermore, if any such proposal was agreed to, it was likely that any such funding would only be available from Christmas 2019 at the earliest.

Reduce the grant to the Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) – £53,000 saving

A number of Members did not support this proposal as they considered that the CAB provided a vital support/advice service for residents which was used to a greater level than in neighbouring areas.

A Member queried what revised service the CAB would offer if the funding reduction was agreed. The Managing Director replied that this was still being discussed with CAB representatives. The Head of Finance further replied that the CAB had had to meet with Cabinet in recent years to explain their performance levels and Value for Money achieved through the grant funding given to them by the Council, particularly due to this Council paying more than double for the CAB's services than neighbouring councils.

A Member queried whether a formal procurement process was followed for funding the services provided by the CAB and had market testing of other such service providers been considered. The Managing Director replied that the a formal procurement process hadn't been undertaken in recent years, but could be an option going forward. Regular contract monitoring did however take place. Market testing for services could also be done, but at present it was unknown as to what alternative service providers existed.

A Member commented that the Council gave the CAB approximately £132,000 each year without asking what services were provided for that funding, so information needed to be provided by the CAB to justify that amount of money being given. Additionally, the Council needed to consider other ways of determining the funding amount, such as payment on a 'per case' basis. The Head of Finance replied that a proposal had been put forward by the CAB to increase opening hours and extend the range of services offered, which Cabinet at the time approved. Trying to fund on a 'per case' basis would be complex as the CAB's services were not only provided to residents of Cannock Chase district. The Managing Director further replied that he would ask the Head of Commissioning to circulate to the Committee the latest performance and workload data from the CAB.

Another Member then suggested that a new Service Level Agreement (SLA) was required going forward which clearly set out what funding the CAB would receive from the Council, and what services the CAB would provide to residents from that funding stream.

A Motion was then proposed and seconded that Cabinet be asked to review the level of proposed reductions to the CAB grant to determine whether a smaller reduction could be proposed instead. A vote was duly taken and the Motion was carried.

A further Motion was then proposed and seconded that Cabinet ask Officers to explore alternative options for provision of advice services to residents within the district, with a view to market testing the service and report back on their findings. A vote was duly taken and the Motion was carried.

Reduce the operating hours of the CCTV service – £12,000 saving; Continue to operate the CCTV service with a contribution from Staffordshire Police – £18,000 saving; and, Cease to operate the CCTV service – £107,000 saving

A Member queried if the above were being considered as three different savings options. The Managing Director replied that this was correct because if the option to cease operation of the service was chosen, then the options to reduce operating hours and to seek a financial contribution from the Police would be removed. If the option to reduce operating hours was chosen then the CCTV would still be active but physical staff time monitoring the CCTV would be less. In respect of the Police contribution proposal, the Police had been written in order to seek their views about it and a response was awaited.

Stop floral displays in Town Centres and on traffic islands, including hanging baskets – £12,000 saving

Members were not in agreement with this proposal, stating that the floral displays were an important enhancement to the visual scenery of the district.

A Motion was then proposed and seconded that Cabinet be asked to review the level of proposed reduction in floral displays funding to determine whether a smaller reduction could be proposed instead. A vote was duly taken and the Motion was carried.

Withdraw from the Green Flag application process – £1,000 saving

A Member queried whether the above proposal affected all parks within the district. The Managing Director replied that Hednesford Park was excluded from this proposal as achieving and maintaining Green Flag status was a condition of the grant monies provided by the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF).

The same Member then queried if this condition was time limited. The Managing Director replied that the HLF agreement would have to be checked to find this out.

Another Member then commented it would be useful to know what extra work and costs were involved to bring each park up to Green Flag status. The Head of Finance replied that it was recognised additional maintenance costs etc. were accrued, and this information was being prepared for the Cabinet as they had also raised this question.

A Motion was then proposed and seconded that Cabinet review the stated savings target for withdrawal from the Green Flag application process to include actual costs involved with achieving/maintaining Green Flag status. A vote was duly taken and the Motion was carried.

Stop providing a Revenues and Benefits reception and enquiry service at Rugeley Area Office and Hednesford Library – £44,000 saving

A Member queried if the above proposal would result in the Area Office being closed down. The Managing Director replied that this was the case, but alternative options for service provision would be explored, along with any future use of the building itself.

A Motion was then proposed and seconded that Cabinet give consideration to relocating the Rugeley Area Office to an existing shared premise within the Town (such as the Market Hall) and provide a reduced level of service from that premise instead of withdrawing the service entirely. A vote was duly taken and the Motion was carried.

(Councillor Mrs. Davis left the meeting at this point and did not return.)

Reduction in management hours in Economic Development – £23,000 saving

A Member queried if the above proposal would result in any redundancies being made. The Managing Director replied that no redundancies would be made as this was a voluntary proposal from the current post holder to reduce their working hours.

Reduce the capacity to deal with claims for housing benefit and council tax reduction – £44,000 saving

A Member commented that this proposal could cause similar problems for residents as the proposed CAB funding reduction would. The Head of Finance replied that ideally this option would not have been put forward, however it needed to be considered nonetheless. The service would still exist, but turnaround times for processing claims would be increased. As the Revenues and Benefits team was a shared service with Stafford Borough Council each council could determine its own processes for assessing claims, but it was preferable that both councils adopt the same timescales. Accordingly, this proposal was going to be put to Stafford BC's Cabinet for consideration.

Increase fees for football pitch hire by 20% – £4,000 saving

Members were against this proposal as they felt it could deter existing and future users from using the facilities and would also negatively impact on the Council's attempts to improve the health and wellbeing of residents.

A Motion was proposed and seconded that Cabinet be asked to review the level of proposed percentage increase in hire fees for football pitches to determine whether a smaller increase could be proposed instead. A vote was duly taken and the Motion was carried.

Review existing contract for leisure and culture services to deliver savings – £150,000 saving

A Member queried what arrangements were in place with Wigan Leisure and Culture Trust (WLCT) to deliver the leisure and culture services. The Managing Director replied that potentially the contract with WLCT could run for a period of 20 years, however any negotiations on contract extensions would cover a range of issues including performance targets, Value for Money etc.

Increase parking charges – £50,000 saving

A Member queried if this option applied to all Council owned car parks within the district. The Managing Director replied that it applied only to those car parks for which a charge was already levied.

The same Member then queried if the Council had undertaken an asset review as part of the FRP process. The Managing Director replied that a number of asset management issues were being actively consulted on. A review was also underway of the Hawks Green Depot site but the detail was still being worked on, so it had not been included as a consultation option. The Rugeley Area Office building was also being looked at to potentially secure a capital receipt for the Council, however part of the building was currently occupied by Staffordshire County Council, so the lease arrangements would need to be reviewed before any possible sale could be considered.

RESOLVED:

That as part of the consultation responses on the Financial Recovery Plan, the following recommendations be submitted to Cabinet for consideration:

- (A) Ask the developers of the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village if they would be interested in providing funding/sponsorship towards provision of Christmas illuminations in Cannock Town Centre and Chadsmoor in future years.
- (B) Review the level of proposed reductions to the CAB grant to determine whether a smaller reduction could be proposed instead.
- (C) Ask Officers to explore alternative options for provision of advice services to residents within the district, with a view to market testing the service and report back on their findings.
- (D) Review the level of proposed reduction in floral displays funding to determine whether a smaller reduction could be proposed instead.
- (E) Review the stated savings target for withdrawal from the Green Flag application process to include actual costs involved with achieving/maintaining Green Flag status.
- (F) Give consideration to relocating the Rugeley Area Office to an existing shared premise within the Town (such as the Market Hall) and provide a reduced level of service from that premise instead of withdrawing the service entirely.
- (G) Review the level of proposed percentage increase in hire fees for football pitches to determine whether a smaller increase could be proposed instead.

Reasons for Recommendations

As Cannock and Chadsmoor were unparished areas, seeking funding from the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village developers would be an alternative means of providing Christmas lights for those areas which would not otherwise have access to funding from the District Council or a parish/town council.

A broad range of services could still be provided to residents by the CAB given the high number of cases the local CAB dealt with when compared to neighbouring areas.

The Council would be able to determine how much value for money it received from its SLA with the CAB compared with what other services may exist and whether alternative services may be better for residents.

Some floral displays could still be provided instead of being fully withdrawn as not having any displays would reduce the aesthetics of the areas concerned.

Revenues and Benefits services could still be provided locally instead of being withdrawn entirely, whilst a saving would still be achieved from any potential sale of the Area Office building.

A more accurate (and more likely, higher) savings figure for withdrawal from the Green Flag programme would be achieved by ensuring all relevant costs were identified.

Residents would be less likely deterred from using the football pitches if the fee increase was reduced, and the Council's objective of 'increasing access to physically active and healthy lifestyles' would still be achieved.

(Councillor Smith left the meeting at the end of this item and did not return.)

10. Quarter 1 Performance Report 2016-17 – Customers Priority Delivery Plan

Members noted the latest performance information (tem 5.1 – 5.10 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The meeting closed at 6:15pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 30 AUGUST, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Cooper, Miss J. (Chairman)
Pearson, A.R. (Vice-Chairman)

Dean, A.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.
Foley, D.	Witton, P.T.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Woodhead, P.E.
Hoare, M.W.A.	

Also in attendance:-

Councillor J. Preece (Environment Portfolio Leader-observer)
Councillor G. Adamson (Leader of the Council-observer)

7. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. A. Allt, J. Bowater, Mrs. S.M. Cartwright and A. Dudson.

Notification had been received that Councillor M. Sutherland would be substituting for Councillor J. Bowater. However, he was not in attendance at the meeting.

8. 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.

9. Minutes

A Councillor referred to Minute 5 (page 4) and explained that a fellow Councillor had asked her to read out a statement which provided an update regarding the concern she had raised at the previous meeting about the overgrown weeds/hedges in the Rugeley area.

The statement was as follows - "Following the last meeting I have spoken with Steve Clarke (Cleansing Supervisor) on the above matter who advised me that spraying of weeds had taken place along roads and pathways within Rugeley town centre etc., however there was no budget available to sweep up the dead weeds once the spraying was done. I also mentioned to him about the bridge which was also overgrown with weeds. Since speaking with Steve I have visited the bridge area to see if anything had been done, but as it stands the area is still weedy and untidy".

The Waste and Engineering Services Manager confirmed that this area was now clear and the weeds had been removed. He advised that Officers were currently in discussion with Staffordshire County Council regarding this matter as there was financial pressure on the County to reduce weed spraying but Cannock Chase Council wanted to maintain the town centres in good condition.

With regard to Minute 5 (page 5) a Member had concern that water courses/flooding was scheduled on the Work Programme for April 2017. He considered that it should be discussed sooner in case there was a flooding incident during the winter months. The Head of Housing and Waste Management confirmed that the item would be a presentation on how the Council was involved in managing water courses/flooding and therefore this will not effect how a flooding incident would be dealt with. The Waste and Engineering Services Manager confirmed that Staffordshire County Council was the flooding authority but either himself or Steve Schofield, the Senior Technical Officer were the contacts locally for any flooding issues.

A Member asked when the briefing note regarding log burners would be circulated. The Environmental Protection Manager confirmed that the briefing note regarding log burners had not yet been completed but would be forthcoming for the next meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 July, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

10. Oak Tree Farm

The Environment Protection Manager provided the Committee with an update on the situation at Oak Tree Farm, Slitting Mill.

He advised that Mr. Ward had been successfully prosecuted in 2011 by Cannock Chase Council's Environmental Health Team following a protracted investigation into the illegal deposit and treatment of waste by burning. He was fined over £10,000. Unfortunately this did not deter Mr. Ward and he was successfully prosecuted again in 2015 by Cannock Chase Council's Environmental Health Team for the illegal deposit and treatment of waste by burning. A penalty of over £17,000 was added to the sum outstanding from the previous conviction (£7,955). This totalled £25k. The Court agreed he could pay back the fine at £20 per week.

The Environment Agency had issued an exemption to give him authority to burn some types of waste. However, Mr. Ward took this to mean that he could burn anything. The D7 exemption was therefore withdrawn by the Environment Agency.

In October 2015 it was noted that there was an accumulating mound of chipped wood waste on site at the farm. The matter was referred to both the Environment Agency (Environmental Permitting Authority) and the Planning Department, Staffordshire County Council (Minerals and Waste Planning Authority).

In December warnings were given to Mr. Ward and Steven Morgan (the Operator of a wood chipping business) by the Environment Agency and Staffordshire County Council. Mr. Ward was given the opportunity to apply for planning permission for the development and to reduce the volume of wood waste on site to comply with the Waste Exemption issued by the Environment Agency.

The Environment Agency is preparing a case against Mr Morgan for waste offences. Staffordshire County Council is considering further action against Mr. Ward which may include consideration of an injunction. They are also considering a request from Mr. Morgan for more time to remove the accumulated waste. The Environmental Protection Manager confirmed that it was the responsibility of both the Environment Agency and Staffordshire County Council to pursue these issues. In the meantime, Cannock Chase Council Officers will continue to monitor the site.

In response to questions from Members the Environmental Protection Manager advised that the Court had determined that fines should be issued to Mr. Ward for the offences even though they were aware he had land holdings. He had apparently informed the Court that the land holdings were in his wife's name.

He further confirmed that the Environment Agency would be focussing their investigation on Mr. Morgan with a view to preparing a prosecution case and would consider options to pursue Mr. Ward for receiving proceeds of crime.

11. Waste Contract Performance Update

The Waste and Engineering Services Manager provided a presentation on the performance of the Waste Contract. He advised that there were no major issues with the Contractor and the new service still was 'bedding in'. The contamination issue was not due to the new contractor but to new regulations and market conditions. A new recycling campaign was due to be launched to raise awareness of the importance of recycling. Discussions were taking place with with a Materials Recycling Facility and partnering authorities.

Biffa had reduced from 6 vehicles to 5 in June and changes to some round times had occurred as the team were working later into the afternoons. Rural properties had been provided refuse sacks to use in wheeled bins. CCTV was provided on all vehicles which recorded all issues with public / motorists along

with any missed bin footage.

He advised that there were new back office systems at Biffa and Cannock Chase Council which allows for the real time checking of streets completed, bins not presented for collection and any contamination issues. He confirmed that contamination remains the largest issue with 25 loads being rejected since March 2015 (full/part). This has led to lost recycling of 7-8 Tonnes per load at a cost of approximately £1,500 per full load. The most common form of contamination in the blue bin was food waste, animal bedding and nappies. These were generally hidden within the bin and not placed on top.

He made reference to the new “Stop and Think” recycling campaign and Members were shown an example of the poster and sticker which would be applied to all blue bins outlining what can and can’t be recycled. Articles regarding the campaign had appeared in the local press / social media / buses. The remaining educational budget had been set aside from the ‘food out campaign’.

He then referred to the “food out campaign” which had commenced prior to the start of the contract (February – March 2016). Food had to be removed from the blue bins due to a charge in disposal. There was a saving of approximately £90,000 and the campaign had been extremely successful so far. No garden waste loads had been rejected to date.

He confirmed the following statistics:-

- 50.1% Recycling (WDF 2014/15)
- 82nd out of 325 authorities (2014/15)
- Top Quartile Performer
- Recycled 10,850 Tonnes of Dry Recyclables
- Composted 9,000 Tonnes of Garden & Food waste

Members were offered the opportunity to ask questions and the following issues were raised. Reference was made to the row of terraced houses where there was difficulty in getting the bins into the rear of the properties. Confirmation was sought as to whether they should be issued with refuse sacks similar to what was being done with the rural properties. The Waste and Engineering Services Manager confirmed that discussions were taking place with residents at this location and consideration was being given to operating a sack collection.

With regard to contaminated loads the Environment Portfolio Leader, Councillor Preece clarified that for a bin to be classed as contaminated the contaminated waste would have to be physically visible and not hidden in the load.

A Member asked whether it was made clear to residents what could be recycled in their blue bin. The Waste and Engineering Services Manager confirmed that an annual recycling calendar was produced which outlined what could be placed in each of the bins. Additionally, information could be obtained from the Council’s website and downloaded via an app available on the

website.

A Member asked whether there had been an increase in contaminated loads since April. The Waste and Engineering Services Manager confirmed that there had been a stricter regime at the recycling facility which had led to an increase; however, this was not due to Biffa taking over the contract. It was in Biffa's best interest not to take contaminated loads to the recycling facility.

Members noted that where residents were continually found to be placing incorrect items into their blue bins they would receive a letter advising them that their bin would be taken off them if they continued to recycle incorrectly. They would have to sign to say they would use it correctly prior to it being returned to them. The Council wanted to improve the quality of the recycling presented to the recycling facility and did not want to begin to ask residents to sort their own recycling (source segregate). Keeping things simple was the key. Source segregation was a costly option and it did not form part of the contract. It was hopeful that the campaign would help to ensure residents recycled correctly.

Reference was made to the proposed sticker which would be applied to the blue bins to make it clear what could be recycled. The sticker stated that all paper could be recycled when in fact shredded paper was not welcome in the recycling bin. The Officer was asked whether this should be included on the sticker. The Waste and Engineering Services Manager commented that whilst the recycling facility did not wish shredded paper to be placed in the blue bins it technically could be recycled. It would be difficult to include this on the sticker. A Member considered that the sticker should highlight the need for the recycling to be washed and clean prior to being placed in the blue bins. It was also considered that the sticker should advise that the blue bins would not be taken away if they were contaminated with a non recyclable item. Additionally it was suggested that wording could be added to highlight that recycling "saved money".

In response to a question from the Leader the Waste and Engineering Services Manager confirmed that refuse collectors were sometimes subjected to abuse. There had been an incident of a resident punching a refuse collector when he refused to take away a contaminated load. Additionally there was an incident whereby a resident had parked illegally blocking access to a junction and the refuse vehicle had to mount the kerb to get passed. When the resident threatened to send her video evidence of the vehicle mounting the kerb to the Police the refuse collector had to point out that the resident was actually parked illegally and the CCTV on the lorry had captured the whole incident.

12. Environmental Protection

The Environmental Protection Manager provided a presentation which outlined the services covered by the Environmental Protection Team, the staffing, achievements during 2015-16 and highlights for 2016-17.

The Committee noted that the services covered were as follows:-

- Statutory Nuisance investigations – noise/dust/fumes/odours/smoke
- Waste-related crime enforcement – fly tipping/waste carriers/littering
- Planning/Licensing consultations – assessment/comment on applications
- Environmental Permitting – industrial processes (air/land and water pollution)
- Air Quality Management – air quality management areas/monitoring
- Contaminated Land – assessment/investigation
- Scrap Metal Dealers – inspection/enforcement
- Dog Control – dog fouling//stray dogs/dogs off leads
- Pest Control – domestic pests/in-house support
- Additional duties – insecure, filthy and verminous properties, education/promotional work, land charges searches, Freedom of Information/Environmental information requests and MP enquiries, Civil Contingencies support

(At this point in the proceedings Councillor A. Pearson left the room and was not present for the remainder of the meeting).

The Officer advised that the Environmental Protection Team consisted of the Service Manager, Senior Environmental Health Officer, Scientific Officer, 4 Pollution Control/Environmental Health Officers and 2 Environmental Enforcement Assistants. There were external contractors for the dog collection service/kennelling and pest control.

He outlined the following achievements during 2015-16:-

- 2000 Service Requests dealt with
- 20 Fixed Penalty Notices served
- Successful Prosecutions for :
 - Dog off lead
 - Illegal disposal of waste
 - Breaches of Scrap Metal Dealers Act
- 8 Nuisance Abatement Notices issued for :
 - Noise (5)
 - Other (3)
- 2 Seizures of noise equipment
- 68 inspections of Industrial processes
- Air Quality Monitoring station relocated to Five Ways Island
- Official launch of ECO Stars Scheme
- 990 pest reports addressed
- 136 stray dogs collected – 75 reunited with owners
- 178 dogs microchipped Free chipping event
- Good Junior Citizen and Environmental Citizen Awards Schemes launched

Members noted that the highlights for 2016-17 were as follows:-

- Declare 3rd Air Quality Management Area
- Implementation of new Fixed Penalty Notice for fly tipping

- Re - Tender pest control, stray dog collection and Kennelling contracts
- Declare Public Space Protection Orders for:
 - Dog Control
 - Gating
 - Alcohol-related issues
- Refresh “Good Junior Citizen” and “Environmental Citizen” Awards Initiative

Members were offered the opportunity to ask questions. In response to a question from a Member the Environmental Protection Manager confirmed that Five Ways Island had been identified as a potential Air Quality Management Area a while ago. During the preliminary assessment air quality levels were not exceeded. However, Officers undertook further monitoring and levels were found to be increasing and have now exceeded the levels required to enable it to be declared an Air Quality Management Area.

13. Bus Shelters

The Waste and Engineering Services Manager provided the Committee with a presentation on the replacement/refurbishment of bus shelters in the District.

He advised that a two year (2015-2017) Capital Bus Shelter Replacement / Refurbishment had been undertaken. This was condition based.

The Committee were advised that:-

- £24k p.a. x 2 for Council Owned Shelters
- Programmed works now all complete
- 6 Replacements (2015/16)
- 1 Removal
- 5 Refurbishments
- 7 Replacements (2016/17)

Members were shown photographs of the recent works to the bus shelters throughout the District.

The Committee noted that an early payment discount had led to a £3k surplus. This surplus was to be used to refurbish additional bus shelters such as those located at Rugeley Bus Station.

14. Additional Items

Countryside Estate Review

The Head of Housing and Waste Management referred to the Countryside Estate Review which was discussed at the previous meeting. The Head of Commissioning had provided two letters and these were circulated to the Committee for information. The letter from Staffordshire County Council (dated May 2016) outlined the proposals for the future management of the countryside estate. For Cannock this included Cannock Chase Country Park, Sevens Road picnic area and Wimblebury Road picnic area. The response to these

proposals was outlined in our letter dated June 2016. She advised that the County were currently assessing the feedback to the consultation.

Should the Committee wish to receive further information on this review they could invite Ian Wykes, Commissioner for the Rural County to attend a future meeting. However, should this be agreed it would be necessary to remove an item from the Work Programme.

Councillor Woodhead advised that he was involved in this review via a Body he was a member of and suggested that he could provide further information on this review to the Chairman.

Brindley Crescent

Councillor Mrs. Grice explained that a number of residents had raised concern regarding the layout of Brindley Crescent in Brindley Heath whereby the road had been cut into two by a grass verge in the middle. This was causing various problems for the residents and she sought clarification as to where to raise the concerns. The Waste and Engineering Services Manager stated that the works had been undertaken during the 1980's as part of a highways improvement scheme. He advised that the concerns should be raised with Mark Keeling, Staffordshire County Council Highways.

The meeting closed at 5.25pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY 29 SEPTEMBER, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Cooper, Miss J. (Chairman)
Pearson, A.R. (Vice-Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S.	Hoare, M.W.A.
Dean, A.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.
Freeman, Miss M.	Witton, P.T.
(substituting for Dudson A.)	Woodhead, P.E.
Foley, D.	
Grice, Mrs. D.	

Also in attendance:-

Councillor J. Preece (Environment Portfolio Leader-observer)

15. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. A. Allt, J. Bowater and A. Dudson.

Notification had been received that Councillor Miss M. Freeman would be substituting for Councillor A. Dudson.

16. 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.

17. Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED:

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

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
THURSDAY 29 SEPTEMBER, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

18. Pest Control Service

The Legal Services Manager advised that an additional meeting of the Environment Scrutiny Committee had been convened to consider the Not for Publication report and the decision in respect of the Council's Pest Control Service that was considered by Cabinet on 22 September, 2016.

The Committee noted that exemption from the call-in process may apply in cases where an issue needs to be determined and implemented as a matter of urgency. Political Group Leaders are required to agree the exemption and, in this case, agreement could not be reached. As a result, the additional Environment Scrutiny Committee had been convened to consider the matter without the necessity of the call-in procedure being invoked.

He explained that a Member of the Committee could propose a motion and, subject to this being seconded, it would be debated by the Committee in accordance with the following procedure:-

- (i) During the course of the debate Members of the Committee may propose minor amendments to the motion with the consent of the proposer
- (ii) The Committee may:-
 - (a) Reject the motion, or
 - (b) Refer the decision back to the Cabinet for reconsideration with a recommendation
 - (c) Refer the matter to full Council with a recommendation for a decision

The Chairman then called upon the Head of Environmental Health and the Environmental Protection Manager to outline the background to the report. The reason for seeking exemption to the call in process due to the need for the matter to be determined and implemented as a matter of urgency was explained. Members noted that the tender process for a new contractor would need to commence on 30 September, 2016 so that a new contractor would be in place by 1 January, 2017 as the present contractor had given 3 months notice to terminate the contract early.

Following this the Chairman invited Members of the Committee to propose a motion.

Councillor Pearson moved the following motion which was seconded by Councillor Witton:-

“That the Committee agree with the decision of Cabinet that a limited pest control service be provided to residents with free rat and mice treatments and charges applied to all other treatments offered.”

The motion was debated by the Committee.

Following the debate a vote was taken and the motion was carried.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee agree with the decision of Cabinet that a limited pest control service be provided to residents with free rat and mice treatments and charges applied to all other treatments offered.

The meeting closed at 4.30pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE CALL-IN
HELD ON MONDAY 3 OCTOBER, 2016 AT 4:00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors:

Freeman, Miss. M.A. (Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Pearson, A.R.
Cooper, Miss. J.	Smith, C.D.
Dudson, Miss. M.J.	Whitehouse, Miss. S.
Johnson, T.B.	Woodhead, P.E.
Martin, Mrs. C.E.	

Proposer of Call-In: Councillor P. Woodhead

By Invitation: Councillor Mrs. C. Mitchell (Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader)
Mr. M. Edmonds, Head of Commissioning
Mr. B. Kean, Head of Finance

19. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J.P. Johnson, Mrs. H.M. Sutton (Vice-Chairman) and Mrs. A. Allt.

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

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

21. Party Whip Declarations

There were no Party Whip Declarations received.

22. Call-In Request – Capital and Revenue Costs for Development of New Cemetery

Proposer of the call-in: Councillor P. Woodhead

The Chairman invited the Proposer of the call-in to read the Motion and give reasons for the call-in.

Recommendation of Cabinet Subject to Call-in (Minute 41 of the meeting of 25

August, 2016):

- (A) Option 2 be determined as the preferred option in respect of this project.
- (B) The Head of Commissioning, in consultation with the Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader, be authorised to procure a specialist private sector partner to deliver the cemetery proposal, if Option 2 is determined.
- (C) Delegated authority be granted to the Head of Commissioning, in consultation with the Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader, to take such actions as may be necessary to progress the agreed recommendations within the approved budget.

The Proposer then read out his Motion:

Proposal

An extensive scrutiny of the business case and supporting information to challenge the basis of the decision and make recommendations for consideration by Cabinet.

Reason for Call-in

The decision of Cabinet to seek a private sector partner (specialist operator) to secure the additional capital investment required to deliver the proposed cemetery, in return for operating the site as a private burial business, with the prospect/opportunity of adding a crematorium is a flawed business decision which creates yet another outsourced service outside the direct control and benefit of the residents of Cannock Chase.

In a climate where finances are scarce and the need for secure, sustained and viable income sources need to be established which do not rely upon government grants, which are disappearing, council tax and business rates we need to explore all alternative, innovative, and future income sources in great depth before potentially dismissing these for private company profit.

Greater consideration needs to be given regarding the public funds already spent based on previous decisions of council as it does not appear the intent of these decisions and the money approved to then gift this over to the private sector. The decision to recommend this course of action runs contrary to the will of the Council.

If we continue to export our services at the rate committed too by the Cabinet we will starve ourselves of future potential revenue streams and this will impact on the ability of the Council to deliver sustainable services for future generations. It appears to suggest that a deal for 70 years would be considered and this is a timeframe which should not be left to a single officer and Cabinet member and should be a decision made in public with a debate by full Council. Further the business case and the supporting evidence should be fully examined and scrutinised prior to the determination of the option chosen.

The care of loved ones at the time of death and afterwards is a matter of huge sensitivity and this decision does not recognise the wider public interest and runs

counter to the Council stated objectives to improve our District.

Seconder: Councillor Miss. S. Whitehouse who also spoke prior to the debate.

Debate on Motion

Proposer

The Proposer referred to the Financial Recovery Plan and discussed the option to increase fees and charges for burials by 20% to £33K. He also discussed areas around the use of private sector partners.

At this point the Legal Services Manager reminded the Proposer that confidential information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person would need to be discussed in private.

Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader

The Culture and Sport Leader stated that the Council was in a very difficult financial position to many years ago. She indicated that the Peer Review which was held recently which had highlighted the need for the Council to work with other organisations.

She referred to Option 2 agreed by Cabinet and advised Members that information on costs would be made available to the Health Scrutiny Committee prior to expressions of interests being sought. She also advised that it was likely that the costs for burials would remain similar to those at Stile Cop Cemetery.

Head of Commissioning

The Head of Commissioning reported that the option was still out of consultation, and explained that the income stemmed from existing burials and space. This was based on current arrangements with Stile Cop Cemetery. He indicated that this would not impact on any decision concerning the increase of fees and charges of £33K.

Response by the Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader

The Culture and Sport Leader read the following:

“Thank you Chairman for inviting me to reply to the motion proposed by Councillor Woodhead and supported by Councillors Grocott, Dean, Whitehouse and Buttery.

In my reply I will cover for the Committee, all of the key points raised by Cllr Woodhead in his “Call In” Request. I will explain the background and context in which the Cabinet decision was made on 25th August so that you fully understand the reasons for that decision.

I also make no apologies for the length of my reply. Delivery of a cemetery for the southern part of the district is long overdue and I want to ensure that the Committee

fully understands how important this issue is to our residents.

Many of the experienced and longer serving Members will know, this Council has been searching for a number of years to establish a new cemetery that would serve the burial requirements of the southern part of the District. As far back as 1993 the Amenities Committee agreed the criteria for selecting a new cemetery site for this part of the District.

Cannock Cemetery has been closed to new burials for over 10 years - since April 2006.

The Council, in its budget for 2010/11 made a financial commitment of £1.5million to fund a new cemetery and ever since, this Cabinet which was formed in 2011 has been committed to ensuring that the residents of Cannock Chase and in particular the southern part of the district have a new cemetery suitable to meet their needs and requirements. It is worth understanding that the financial allocation was an estimate as no site had been identified or secured at that time.

This commitment to delivering a new cemetery is a Key Priority for the Council as reiterated in the Council's approved Priority Delivery Plan for 2016-17.

With the aim of achieving this objective and commitment, Cabinet made a decision to purchase the ex-Bleak House Colliery site for use as a new cemetery on 18th December 2014. This was a massive and significant step forward in delivering a new cemetery site given that the Council had been searching since 1993.

Following this decision, planning approval was granted for a new cemetery on 28th January 2015 and the purchase of the 47 acre site completed on 22nd October 2015.

In less than 12 months this Cabinet has ensured that due diligence tests have been undertaken on the preferred site to assess its suitability for use as a cemetery, secured planning consent and purchased the site so that a cemetery can finally be developed to meet the needs of our residents.

Councillor Woodhead in his "Call In" suggests that the decision to progress the delivery of a cemetery by exploring opportunities with the private sector is flawed. Clearly there is a need for a new cemetery in this part of the district. Indeed I would be very surprised if any Member of this Council thought otherwise. I would be equally surprised if Members thought that the decision to explore all options available to the Council to deliver a new cemetery before making a final decision is flawed. Surely the more information gathered before a decision is made leads to a more informed decision as it would be irresponsible not to do so.

As for the misunderstanding by Councillor Woodhead that a decision has been made to procure and appoint a private sector partner, this is simply incorrect.

As is the suggestion that any such decision would be made by a Council Officer and myself without any referral back to Cabinet.

As is the assumption that Cabinet would not give further consideration to all other options available to the Council before making a final decision on the development of a new cemetery site. This means that all viable options will be presented to Cabinet for a final decision including the option to make the additional capital available to establish a new cemetery and the option to manage “in-house” should this be a sustainable and viable solution.

To clarify, the decision taken by Cabinet provides the basis for exploring options; it does not represent final decisions on this matter. The only reason for the report being confidential was due to commercial information being discussed.

It may be helpful at this stage for the Committee, Councillor Woodhead and the other supporters of the “Call In” to note that the approach adopted has been used on the Waste Collection service and previous to that on the Council’s Culture and Leisure Service.

With regard to Culture and Leisure services I am sure Members of the Council at that time will recall that following Cabinet’s decision on 22 July 2010 “to procure a private sector partner for the management of leisure services be approved” no decision to appoint a contractor was made as a result of that recommendation. Following that decision the Culture and Sport Policy Development Committee was involved in determining the Council’s Core Key Requirements for the tender specification. That Committee met on 7 occasions, with Members being invited to attend various site inspections and Members also received presentations from the 5 bidders before any decisions were referred back to Cabinet for consideration. The final decision as to whether to award a contract was made on 17th November 2011 – some 16 months later!!!

The point that I make is that Cabinet’s recommendation on 25th August is very similar to that made by the Cabinet on 22 July 2010 when Councillor Grocott himself was the Portfolio Leader. The decision is to explore options to “test the market” with private sector partners to see if it is possible for the Council to secure capital investment to deliver the much needed cemetery. It is not a decision to award a contract to a private sector partner. In making this decision Cabinet considered the key risks associated with both options in the report and concluded that risks associated with Option 2 such as loss of control, potential tensions as a result of a more commercial focus and risk of failure should a company dissolve be mitigated by Officers wherever possible. The intention would be to engage with members of the appropriate Scrutiny Committee in this process (as with the Leisure process) to determine any key non-negotiable requirements before any invitations to tender are made.

This process therefore virtually mirrors the Culture and Leisure process with the commercial aspects also requiring both reports to be Part 2 Confidential Report items. These are the actions of a prudent Council who explore all relevant options

before making final decisions on the commitment of significant public funds for such an important facility for the District.

Councillor Woodhead's reference to scarce resources is very appropriate and particularly relevant to the context in which Cabinet considered the options contained in the report on 25th August. I say this given that this Council is facing its most difficult financial position for many years needing to address a deficit of £2.15 million at its peak and an ongoing deficit of £1.6 million per annum from 2019-20.

All Members were made aware in the Report to Cabinet on 21 July 2016 of the Council's Financial position and of the need to develop a robust Financial Recovery Plan (FRP) in order to deliver a balanced budget for the Council going forward. The Council currently forecasts to have £1.043 million of uncommitted resources and a key element of the FRP is to capitalise via purchasing outright a number of vehicles and equipment rather than renting or leasing these items. These proposals will save the revenue budget £350,000 per annum. However, this will require the Council to release £1 million of capital resources over the next three years and £1.75 million over a five year period to acquire such vehicles/equipment when either the lease expires or they come to the end of the useful life. Over the next 3 years this will completely utilise all of the Council's capital resources.

In considering Option 1 in the report on 25th August Cabinet had to consider spending £300k capital from a balance of £430k in order to establish a cemetery or to consider Option 2 to explore opportunities with the private sector before making a decision to commit to any further capital expenditure.

The recommendation of Cabinet to first explore options with a private sector specialist operator to secure the additional capital investment required to deliver the cemetery proposals and possibly a new crematorium, in return for operating the site as a private burial business is a prudent, sensible and measured approach. It enables Cabinet to make an informed decision based upon all relevant facts and options.

This option may potentially deliver greater capital investment, possible income opportunities and greater certainty around future revenue budgets and will ultimately be dependent on a comparison of tenders against retention in house (including possible income stream projections) before any final decision is made.

I cannot understand Councillor Woodhead's claim that Cabinet's decision on the 25th August "runs contrary to the will of the Council". The Council's Priority Delivery Plan for 2016-17 which was approved by full Council on 6th April 2016 contains a specific action to "Explore delivery options for a new cemetery site"

So how does the decision to explore options with the private sector run contrary to the will of the Council?

Similarly, the action "to explore delivery options for a new cemetery site" is included in the Cleaner and Safer Environment Priority Delivery Plan for 2016-17 and yet at

the two public meetings held to date, at which both Councillor Woodhead and Councillor Dean attended there is no record in the minutes of any Member commenting or raising concerns about this action. I find this more unbelievable given that the primary focus of the meeting held on 19 July 2016 was to determine the work programme for the year. Yet again the minutes confirm that no Member requested any more information on the cemetery project or requested further work on this action to be included in the work programme for the year.

In making its decision Cabinet considered whether establishing a new cemetery was still a council priority. Clearly it is. In making its decision Cabinet understood that the Council does not have a statutory duty to provide a new cemetery and consequently it had to balance this discretionary duty, with the Council's capacity to provide additional capital investment at this time and with the knowledge that there is a complete lack of burial space in the southern part of the district.

Taking into account all of these factors the decision taken by Cabinet at this time to explore options with the private sector is, I believe a responsible one. By making this decision Cabinet were aware that the timetable would change until the outcomes from such an exercise could be evaluated and reported back to Cabinet.

To conclude, the local Government financial landscape has changed considerably since the Council resolved to provide £1.5million to identify, acquire and establish a new cemetery in 2010-11.

The proposed cemetery is now estimated to cost £1.8 million and although the need for a new cemetery has not diminished the financial capacity of the authority has and the original earmarked sum is not sufficient.

I would also like to point out that the delivery of the Council's core responsibilities involves working with the private sector on a range of services from building new houses to emptying bins across the district. These partnerships are based on clear agreements/specifications produced by the Council and performance managed on a regular basis.

Cabinet will provide a new cemetery but one that will provide best value for our residents.

If in making our decision as a Cabinet we had ignored this position we would have failed in our commitment to progress the delivery of a new cemetery and in our responsibility to explore all options both internally and externally before making a final decision AND more importantly we would have failed in our duty to the residents of Cannock Chase".

"I will now bring your attention to the following quote from Bob Kean, the Head of Finance":

"The recommendation of Cabinet to explore options with a private sector specialist operator to secure the additional capital investment required to deliver the cemetery

proposals, in return for operating the site as a private burial business provides the best business case for the Council.

The option may potentially deliver greater capital investment, possible income opportunities and greater certainty around future revenue budgets and is ultimately dependent of a comparison of tenders against retention in-house”.

Response from the Proposer

The Proposer reflected on how sensitive the issue of bereavement was and the importance of how it was dealt with.

He advised that he was not a member of the Council when the leisure service contract was being discussed however he commented on the profit share scheme linked to this.

He also discussed the pest control contract where notice of 3 months could be given by either the contractor or the Council and the problem with investment companies profiting.

The Proposer also expressed concern that outsourcing would stop the Council providing basic services in the future.

Proposal

The Proposal was read out by the Legal Services Manager, that:

“An extensive scrutiny of the business case and supporting information to challenge the basis of the decision and make recommendations for consideration by Cabinet”.

The Chairman moved the matter to a vote. The Motion to refer the matter back to Cabinet for reconsideration was not supported.

A further Motion proposed by Councillor A.R. Pearson that no further action be taken was moved, and seconded by Councillor T.B. Johnson.

RESOLVED:

That the Cabinet’s original decision be upheld in respect of Minute 41 (A), (B) and (C) of the meeting held on 25 August, 2016.

CHAIRMAN

The meeting concluded at 4:45 p.m.

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY 18 OCTOBER, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
 Councillors

Freeman, Miss M.A. (Chairman)
 Sutton, Mrs. H.M. (Vice-Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Martin, Mrs. C.E.
Cooper, Miss J.	Pearson, A.R.
Dudson, Miss M.J.	Stretton, Mrs. P.Z. (substitute)
Lea, C.I. (substitute)	Woodhead, P.E.

Also in attendance:

- SCC Co-opted Member – Councillor Mrs. D.M. Todd.
- Angela Schulp, District Commissioner, SCC.
- Nicola Bromage, Commissioning Manager, Mental Health Care, SCC.
- Councillor Mrs. M.A. Davis (Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader, Observer).
- Councillor Mrs. C. Mitchell (Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader, Observer).
- Councillor P.A. Snape (Observer).

23. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillors Mrs. A. Allt, J.P. Johnson, T.B. Johnson, C.D. Smith and Miss S. Whitehouse.

Apologies were also noted for Elizabeth Learoyd, Independent Co-opted Member from Healthwatch Staffordshire.

Councillors Lea and Mrs. Stretton were in attendance as substitutes for Councillors J.P. Johnson and T.B. Johnson respectively.

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

Member	Interest	Type
Mitchell, Mrs C.	Agenda Item 4, Presentation – Mental Health and Wellbeing: <i>Daughter worked as a therapist for the Chase Emotional Wellbeing Service.</i>	Personal

25. Minutes

Minute No. 11 - Defibrillator

The Head of Environmental Health reported that purchase of a defibrillator machine for the Civic Suite was being progressed, with a view to one being installed by the end of October. Councillor Snape reported that he was intending to submit a Motion to Full Council on 16 November regarding this matter.

Minute No. 11 – Arthritis Care Group

A Member commented that contrary to what was published in the previous minutes Amanda Milling MP did not yet appear to be involved with giving support to this group. To date slow progress had been made in determining what support the group needed.

Minute No. 11 – Suspension of Accident and Emergency Services to under 18s at County Hospital Stafford

The Chairman reported that this matter had been discussed at a recent meeting of the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee with the Chief Nurse and Acting Chief Executive of the University Hospitals North Midlands NHS Trust. Disappointment was raised at the meeting that information had not been supplied by the Trust about the impact the suspension had had on residents in Cannock Chase as well as Stafford. The Chairman was advised that this information would be provided, however to date nothing had been provided.

Minute No. 15 – Healthwatch Staffordshire Update

A Member commented that in the first paragraph of this minute the fire station reference should read 'Hednesford Road Fire Station'.

Minute No. 17 – Health Accountability Sessions

The Head of Environmental Health reminded Members that they were allowed to attend the accountability sessions as members of the public and also pre-submit questions for discussion. The Chairman had an automatic right to attend the sessions as a member of the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee.

Minute No. 18 – Work Programme Update

Members expressed disappointment that County Councillor Alan White had refused a request to attend this Committee to answer questions on the Better Care Fund. The Chairman agreed with Members and advised that she would ask him in person to reconsider the request.

The Head of Environmental Health reported that an informal meeting of the Committee had been arranged for 10 November to allow Members to take part in an informal question and answer session with the current Chair of the Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group. Questions for the Chair were to be pre-submitted by no later than Tuesday 1 November.

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 September, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

26. Presentation – Mental Health and Wellbeing

The Committee received a presentation from Nicola Bromage, Staffordshire County Council on the above matter which covered the following:

3 Clear Outcomes:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People will be healthier and more independent. • They will feel safer, happier and more supported in and by their communities. • They will be able to access employment.
Aims:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To improve the mental health and wellbeing of the population, including those recovering from a mental illness. • To improve access to and delivery of mental health services with better outcomes for individuals with mental illness and their carers.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In any one year 1 in 4 British adults experience at least one mental disorder. • 1.2m people in England have a learning disability. • There will be over a million people with dementia by 2021. • 5.4% of men and 3.4% of women have a personality disorder. • 10% of 15-16 year olds have a mental disorder. • Among people under 65, nearly half of all ill health is mental illness. • Between 8% and 12% of the population experience depression in any year.
Priority Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Physical Health. • Work. • A safe place to live. • Part of the community and reduced social stigma. • No s136 detentions in police custody. • Reduced demand. • Support for Carers.
Cross Cutting Issues:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parenting and family pressures. • Financial stability. • Ill health. • Educational attainment. • Drugs and Alcohol. • Crime and safer communities. • Housing. • Social networks.

Support Services:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psychiatric Liaison. • Mental health helpline. • Carers Hub. • Work4You. • Recovery Hub. • South Staffordshire Network for Mental Health (SSN4MH). • Early Intervention Team (EIT). • Brendon House. • Crisis Resolution Home Treatment (CRHT). • Single Point of Access (SPA). • Community Mental Health Teams (CMHT). • Chase Emotional Wellbeing Service (CEWS).
Mental Wellbeing:	<p>Good mental health is about being confident, happy and being able to cope with the stresses of everyday life.</p> <p>We know some factors can increase the risk of poor mental wellbeing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Social isolation, loneliness or discrimination; • Homelessness or poor housing; • A long-term physical health condition; • Social disadvantage, poverty or debt; • Unemployment; • Caring for a family member or friend. <p>To do something about these issues we need a partnership approach.</p>
Focus on Recovery:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Independence. • Inclusion. • Reduced stigma.
What have we said we will do?:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The right response 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. • No one will be detained in a police cell. • Reduce stigma and discrimination. • Build on the strength of communities. • Make the pathways through services clearer. • Intervene early. • Increase the number of people in employment. • Access to appropriate housing. • Consider emotional wellbeing alongside physical wellbeing – equal parity. • Support people to recover. • Strengthen our workforce. • Drive innovation.

<p>What does 2020-21 look like?:</p>	<p>Overview of the vision for 2020/21:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Achieving 25% access to treatment for Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) services. • Core 24 standards for Liaison Psychiatry in acute hospitals. • Crisis Resolution Home Treatment (CRHT) will be compliant with CORE fidelity standards. • Reduction in premature mortality rates for people with severe mental illness. • Meet the needs of children and young people ensuring 35% of those with diagnosable mental illness can access community provision. • All children and young people will receive treatment from Community Eating Disorder services against established national targets. <p>What are the key transformations?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrated Long Term Condition (LTC)/IAPT Teams. • Workforce and training plans identifying the need to embed mental health in primary, community and acute settings. • Mechanisms developed to identify across the health system the investment and savings through integrated working. • Data and Metrics transparency on spend, access, quality and outcomes. <p>Summary of anticipated impact:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 10% reduction in suicides. • Reduction in Out of Area Placements. • Increasing number of people with a LTC are able to self manage their condition. • Reduction in Urgent Care attendance and LOS in acute hospitals.
--------------------------------------	--

Nicola Bromage also advised that the South Staffordshire and Shropshire NHS Foundation Trust currently had 26 active pathways in place for access to mental health support. A review was underway to streamline the number of pathways in order to tailored support to individuals rather than having to keep referring individuals to different pathways depending on what their needs were.

A Member commented that good mental health support services were provided in the district, but asked for clarity on how the aim of having no s136 detentions would be achieved. Nicola Bromage replied that safe centres were set up in Stafford and Tamworth, and a funding bid had been submitted to extra safe centres to be provided. There was however that as part of forthcoming legislation s136 powers would be repealed anyway. A 'street triage' system was also in place which gave support to police to reduce the usage of s136 powers whenever possible.

A Member then queried how many beds were available in the Stafford safe centre. Nicola Bromage replied that there were approximately 51 beds available for those with acute and organic mental health issues, but accurate figures could be circulated via email.

The same Member then asked for clarification on how many s136 detentions had occurred within Staffordshire. Nicola Bromage replied that no such detentions had occurred in the south Staffordshire area; however s136 had been used in north Staffordshire. Again, accurate numbers could be circulated to Members.

A Member commented that the number of existing pathways could be a barrier for people to access services, so asked for clarity on how the streamlined service would overcome this. Nicola Bromage replied that the Single Point of Access would give people just one telephone number to call and speed up the process of assessments and referrals, thereby making access to support much easier.

A Member commented that delivery targets applied to the Employment Service and CEWS by the County Council and Clinical Commissioning Group were putting unnecessary pressure on employees, and so asked what outcomes were expected of the new service. Nicola Bromage replied that each part of the service was subject to different contract commissioning requirements due to the range of services provided. The Employment Service for example was purely an outcome based service and funded on that basis, whereas CEWS had to meet certain standards depending on what patient support was being provided, therefore it was much more difficult to apply outcome based targets and timescales in such circumstances.

A Member raised concern that in respect of s136 powers, these relied on police being able to identify whether or not a detained individual had a mental health condition, and so should be appropriately trained for such situations. Nicola Bromage replied that a mental health awareness programme for the police was being planned, which would be in addition to the street triage service.

A Member noted that the Recovery Hub was focussed on providing support to those aged 16+, so asked what services were available for those aged under 16. Angela Schulp replied that support services were provided at a low level through local schools, however where needed individuals would be referred up to the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service (CAMHS). Within Cannock Chase district demand for use of CAMHS was high compared to other areas. Triage services were also in place across the County through local Foundation Trusts.

A Member queried if First Aid for Mental Health could be introduced into local employers. Nicola Bromage replied that this was being looked into as some workplaces did already have such schemes in place. Additionally, the West Midlands Combined Authority Mental Health Commission was also looking into this matter.

The Committee then thanked Nicola Bromage and Angela Schulp for their attendance and the detail included within the presentation.

27. Healthwatch Staffordshire - Update

Due to the Healthwatch representative not being in attendance, no update was given for this item.

28. Staffordshire County Council's Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee – Update

The Chairman drew Members attention to the Digest of the Select Committee meeting held on 19 September, 2016, and advised that a meeting of the Select Committee had been arranged for 24 October, 2016, to discuss matters related to the Better Care Fund. The papers for the meeting were however confidential, so an update about what had been discussed would be provided at a later date.

29. Work Programme

The Head of Environmental Health advised that the work programme was on track to be completed as agreed. Two main items were arranged to be discussed at future meetings, these being the Food Hygiene Service and Safer Food Project and the latest work of the Royal Wolverhampton Hospitals NHS Trust. The final scheduled meeting of the year would be used to undertake a review of delivery of this year's work programme.

A Member requested that if possible, a further update be provided to the Committee on proposed cuts to community pharmacy funding which could result in some community pharmacies being closed down. The Chairman agreed and requested that Peter Prokopa, Chief Operations Officer of the South Staffordshire Local Pharmaceutical Committee be invited back to a meeting of the Committee before the end of the current Municipal Year.

The meeting closed at 5:05pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
MONDAY 12 SEPTEMBER, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT:: Councillors:

Foley, D. (Chairman)
Burnett, G. (Vice-Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Molineux, G.N.
Cooper, Miss. J.	Peake, Mrs. C.L.
Dudson, A.	Snape, D.J.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Witton, P.T.
Hoare, M.W.A.	

6. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Miss S. Whitehouse, F.W.C. Allen (Observer), Housing Portfolio Leader and Mrs. M.A. Davis (Observer), Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader – for matters relating to Social Alarms.

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

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

8. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 12 July, 2016 be approved as a correct record.

9. Quarter 1 Performance Report 2016-17 – More and Better Housing Priority Delivery Plan

Members considered the Quarter 1 Performance Report 2016-17, More and Better Housing Priority Delivery Plan (Item 4.1 – 4.5).

Improving the Council's social housing stock and raising standards in the private rented sector

Houses in Multiple Occupation

Mike Walker, Environmental Protection Manager reported that the Council currently had around 45 houses in multiple occupation (HMO), this figure varies throughout the year as it related to the number of people that occupied the property and inevitably as tenants left some properties would no longer be regarded as HMOs .

He reported that of the two prohibition notices served last year, one HMO landlord was the subject of prosecution and received a substantial fine.

In response to a question raised by a Member, the Environmental Protection Manager reported that inspections undertaken on HMOs were not charged for, however if notices were served, the Council could charge a fee.

Reviews of Voids Process to improve turnarounds and sustain tenancies

Nirmal Samrai, Head of Housing and Waste Management reported that an internal voids group would be established. She also advised that the Council had now signed up to a 5 year agreement with energy provider Scottish and Southern to provide utilities from October. She commented that if the agreement was not in the best interests of the Council, it could be terminated.

She reported that two new Tenancy Sustainment Officers had been appointed, with one of the posts seconded to Staffordshire County Council Building Resilient Families and Communities Programme to provide help and support to tenants. Funding of £30K had been provided from the County Council to fund one post.

Planning for the housing needs of the District

Ensure the Council can demonstrate that it has a 5 year supply of housing land to underpin the construction of new housing stock across the District

Members discussed the supply of housing land and were keen to receive information/presentation at a future meeting from the Head of Economic Development regarding the SHLAA.

Members noted the contents of the Quarter 1 Performance Report 2016-17, Better Health Priority Delivery Plan.

10. Overview of Housing Management

A presentation was given by the Head of Housing and Waste Management which included information on the following:

- Housing Services
- Housing Property Services
- Housing Property Services Manager – Rick Pepper
- Housing Maintenance Manager – Catherine Owen

- Budget Monitoring
- Responsive Repairs Team
- Voids
- Repairs Team
- Stores
- Strategic Housing and Tenancy Services Manager – Janet Baldasera
- Money Management Team
- Allocations Team
- Estate Management
- Systems Administration
- Housing Options and Homelessness
- Housing Strategy
- Supported Housing
- Tenancy Sustainment Team

(At this point Councillor Mrs. S.M. Cartwright joined the meeting).

Members referred to the presentation and asked questions concerning the current contractor and the ending of lifetime tenancies.

In response to the questions, the Head of Housing and Waste Management advised that the current contract would end in 2018 and the re-tender process would begin. With regard to lifetime tenancies the Strategic Housing and Tenancy Services Manager reported that although legislation was available, regulations were still awaited.

In response to a question raised by a Member regarding the sheltered housing schemes, It was reported that there were four schemes located at Caxton Court, Gracemoor Court, Longford Court and St. Barbara House, Rugeley with around 120 residents overall.

Members also discussed homelessness and asked what numbers of rough sleepers there were currently in Cannock.

In response to this it was reported that there would usually be fewer than ten, although people from other towns came to Cannock which could have an effect on the real numbers.

11. Overview of Housing Allocations

(At this point Councillors Mrs. D. Grice and P. Witton left the meeting).

A presentation was given by Janet Baldasera, Strategic Housing and Tenancy Services Manager which included information on the following:

- Statutory Framework and Legal Principles 1/2
- Cannock Chase Policy 1/2
- Allocations Scheme – Principles
- Eligibility and Qualifications Assessment
- Reasonable/Additional Preference

- Determining Priority between Households
- Band 1 +
- Band 1-4
- Assessment Criteria 1
- Assessment Criteria 2
- Assessment Criteria 3
- Property Eligibility
- Nominations – Registered Providers
- Applications
- Allocation
- Statistics – 2015-16
- Review Issues
- New Legislation

A Member referred to the eligibility and qualification criteria and asked about the local connection when determining if an application would be accepted.

The Strategic Housing and Tenancy Services Manager referred to and provided information with regard to the Localism Act 2011.

A Member referred to the property eligibility and was keen to know about downsizing from a larger property to a smaller one and what impact this would have on benefit payments.

The Head of Housing and Waste Management advised that the tenant would be offered one move only, and if this was not accepted, the discretionary housing payment would stop.

Members also discussed the private sector landlord register, over occupied and under occupied properties and tenancy audits which would ascertain who resided in a property.

12. Housing Allocations Sub-Group

The Chairman discussed the Housing Allocations Sub-Group and it was agreed that the group should be politically balanced to reflect the balance of the Committee. The Group would consist of three Labour Members, one of which is the Chair and two Conservative Group Members.

The following Members for the Sub-Group were agreed:

Councillor D. Foley (L)
 Councillor G. Burnett (C)
 Councillor M. Hoard (C)

The Chairman would confirm the remaining two Members from the Labour Group.

CHAIRMAN

(The meeting concluded at 5.35 p.m.).

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY 27 SEPTEMBER 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Witton, P.T. (Chairman)
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (Vice-Chairman)

Bowater, J.. Woodhead, P.E.
Johnson, J.P.

Also Present:

- James Cook, Engagement Lead – Grant Thornton (External Auditors)
- Laura Hinsley, Manager – Grant Thornton (External Auditors)

11. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillors M.S. Buttery and Mrs. D. Grice.

12. 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.

13. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 28 June, 2016, be approved as a correct record and signed.

14. The Audit Findings for Cannock Chase District Council

Consideration was given to the Report of the External Auditors.

James Cook talked Members' through a number of key aspects of the external auditors' report in relation to: asset valuations; revaluation of council dwellings; Council accounts and Value for Money; materiality; welfare expenditure audit and a letter of representation requirement.

A Member queried what plans were being put together for future development of the Power Station site. The Head of Finance replied that a working group had been established to agree a plan, however decontamination of the site would take around three years, so it would be at least four years before any site redevelopment could take place. These timelines were however dependent on the station owners as the responsible body for decommissioning and demolishing the station.

A Member queried when asset valuations of the leisure centres last took place and what future impact the most recent valuation would have on the Council's finances. The Head of Finance replied that the previous valuations were done in 2013/14 as part of a five year rolling programme and that there would be no impact on the Council's accounts or prudential borrowing as a result of the latest valuation.

RESOLVED:

That the report of the External Auditors be noted.

15. External Audit of the Statement of Accounts 2015/16

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 5.1 – 5.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The contents of the report be noted, with reference to the 'Audit Findings for Cannock Chase District Council' and 'Statement of Accounts 2015/16' reports also considered as part of the meeting.
- (B) The Management Representation Letter be approved (to be signed off by the Chairman on behalf of the Committee).

16. Statement of Accounts 2015/16

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 6.1 – 6.6 + separate booklet of the Official Minutes of the Council).

A Member queried if the Council's cash flow situation was likely to get worse in the future, and if so, was the Council allowed to run into a cash deficit. The Head of Finance replied that the Council was not allowed to run a deficit, however the issue was being addressed as part of the Financial Recovery Plan process but there was still work to be done.

RESOLVED:

That the audited Statement of Accounts for 2015/16 be approved.

17. Internal Audit Quarter 1 Report 2016-17

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Internal Auditor (Item 7.1 – 7.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

In respect of Appendix 4 of the report, a Member queried why recommendations had originally been made in respect of corporate project management for the audit of Leisure & Culture Major Projects. The Chief Internal Auditor replied that concerns had been raised about a lack of corporate oversight for project management by a designated officer to ensure consistency of approach across departments, sharing of best practice and reducing risk. In recent years external project management support had been sought for key projects and Officers in some departments did have project management experience. The Head of Finance further replied that for high level projects Leadership Team would always ensure that relevant external and professional support were provided, but it was down to the individual project leads to identify what that support should be.

The same Member then queried if a formal procedure/framework was in place to ensure that projects were delivered in the right way. The Chief Internal Auditor replied that no such document was in place; it was left to each lead officer to determine the approach they will adopt for managing projects. The issue had been discussed with senior management and they were happy to accept the risks associated with the absence of a corporate framework on the basis that Officers were expected to make appropriate arrangements for managing projects. The Head of Finance further replied whilst no such document existed, risk management methodologies and procurement processes were embedded in the culture of the Council.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The contents of the Internal Audit Report for Quarter 1 2016-17 be noted.
- (B) The IT Audit Plan, as set out in Appendix 5 of the report, be approved.

The meeting closed at 4:50 p.m.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL
WEDNESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2016 AT 10:00 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Alcott, G.	Snape, P.A.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Snape, D.J.	

1. Appointment of Chairman

Councillor G. Alcott was appointed Chairman for the meeting.

2. Apologies

No apologies for absence were received.

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

No declarations of interest were made.

4. Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED:

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

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL

WEDNESDAY 14 DECEMBER 2016 AT 10:00 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

5. Complaint

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Managing Director (Item 5.1 – 5.121 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chairman invited all those present to introduce themselves and confirm their understanding of the procedure for the Hearing.

The Panel noted that the individuals who were the subject of the complaint had been issued with the relevant papers and invited to attend the meeting. They had indicated they would not be attending.

The Officer representing the Council presented the Council's case by taking the Panel through the report. Members of the Panel were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer representing the Council.

The Officer representing the Council was then given the opportunity to sum up his case to the Panel.

The Panel then deliberated in private accompanied by the Council's Legal Advisor and Secretary to the Panel.

At the conclusion of the deliberations the Officer representing the Council and the other officers then returned to the meeting and the Chairman outlined the decision of the Panel as follows:-

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The Panel considered the report and appendices, the representations of the Managing Director and other officers present and the LGO Guidance on Managing Unreasonable Complainant Behaviour and considered that it was proportionate to designate the individuals who were the subject of the complaint as vexatious complainants.
- (B) The Panel approved the procedure set out in Appendix 1 of the report for dealing with the individuals who were the subject of the complaint in the future.

Reasons for Decisions

There was a substantial history of dealing with complaints from the individuals who were the subject of the complaint, going back to at least 2006/07.

The individuals who were the subject of the complaint regularly and persistently raised the same or similar issues with the Council even when a full response to their concerns had already been supplied.

The proposed procedure at Appendix 1 of the report would permit the individuals who were the subject of the complaint to raise concerns, with the involvement of the Managing Director and the District Ward Councillors.

Nothing in this decision precluded the individuals who were the subject of the complaint from making emergency calls.

The meeting concluded at 10.40 a.m.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL
MONDAY 19 DECEMBER 2016 AT 9:30 A.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Freeman, Miss. M.A.	Lea, C.I.
Johnson, T.B.	Snape, P.A.

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 Mrs. S.M. Cartwright.

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 1 and 2, Part 1, Schedule 12A, Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE

APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL

MONDAY 19 DECEMBER 2016 AT 9:30 A.M.

IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

5. Complaint

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 5.1 – 5.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chairman invited all those present to introduce themselves and confirm their understanding of the procedure for the Hearing.

The Officer representing the Council presented the Council's case by taking the Panel through the report. The Complainant and Members of the Panel were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer representing the Council. Both the Complainant and Members of the Panel asked questions.

The Complainant then presented his case to the Panel. The Officer representing the Council and Members of the Panel were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Complainant. Both the Officer representing the Council and Members of the Panel asked questions.

The Officer representing the Council and the Complainant were then given the opportunity to sum up their respective cases to the Panel.

The Panel then deliberated in private, accompanied by the Council's Legal Advisor and Secretary to the Panel.

At the conclusion of the deliberations the Complainant and Officer representing the Council returned to the meeting and the Chairman outlined the decision of the Panel as follows:-

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The Panel considered the report and appendices, and the representations of both the Complainant and Officer representing the Council.
- (B) The Panel considered Item 5.5, paragraph 5.9 of the report which summarised ten separate complaints made by the Complainant and the Panel concluded the following in respect of each complaint:

- (i) The Panel did not agree that the Council should cover the cost of the hard standing, as such a payment would be contrary to the Council's Policy.
- (ii) The Panel did not agree that the Council should cover the cost of removing further trees - the Panel considered this was not reasonable.
- (iii) The Panel did not agree that the Council should cover the cost of installing boundary fencing, as this would be contrary to Council Policy.
- (iv) The Panel noted the complaints regarding the front and rear doors. The Panel felt it appropriate for Council officers to arrange a further inspection and to carry out any required remedial works.
- (v) The Panel noted the complaints about the windows. The Panel was pleased to hear that Council officers had arranged to bring forward the planned programme for the works, and was pleased to note that the works were now in the planned programme for October 2017
- (vi) The Panel noted the complaints about pointing of brickwork at the outhouse, but also noted that no further action was required as the pointing had already been carried out.
- (vii) The Panel noted the request for an external party to investigate the complaints. The Appeals and Complaints Panel had been arranged to consider the complaints.
- (viii) The Panel noted the complaints about guttering. The Panel felt it appropriate for Council officers to arrange for further inspection of the guttering and then to carry out any required remedial works
- (ix) The Panel noted the complaints about the disturbance caused by the neighbours, specifically damage to guttering by the neighbours' cat. The Panel recommended that the Complainants take up the offer of informal mediation with the neighbours that was still available.
- (x) In respect of the complaints about puddles at the front of the property, the Panel noted that new drainage was recently installed, and recommended that a further inspection should be arranged in the event of further flooding.

The Chairman advised that should the Complainant be dissatisfied with the decision taken, the next and final step would be to make a complaint to the Local Government Ombudsman.

CHAIRMAN

(The meeting concluded at 12:40 p.m.)