

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**

**CABINET**

**HELD ON THURSDAY, 25 JULY, 2013 AT 4:00 P.M.**

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

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

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

Councillor B. Bottomer, Environment PDC Chair, was also in attendance.

**22. Apologies**

None.

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

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

**24. Updates from Portfolio Leaders**

**Leader of the Council**

Prince George – The Leader moved that congratulations should be sent on behalf of the Council to the Duke and Duchess of Cambridge on the birth of their son, Prince George.

Change in Political Composition of the Council – The Leader noted that 2 Conservative Councillors had left the Group to become UKIP Members. A report on allocation of seats to Committees and other bodies would be taken to the next Council meeting on 7 August, 2013.

## **Culture and Sport**

Cannock Stadium Site Feasibility Work – The Portfolio Leader advised that 7 expressions of interest had been received, that were under evaluation. The feasibility work was due to commence at the end of August and be concluded by the end of the year when the matter would be reported back to Cabinet.

Hednesford Park Tennis Courts – The Portfolio Leader reported that work was continuing on renewing the tennis courts and should be completed in early August.

Sensory Room, Chase Leisure Centre – The Portfolio Leader advised that the sensory room was due to open on Friday, 2 August, 2013.

Chase It Summer Programme, 2013 – The Portfolio Leader advised that the summer programme had started on 22 July, 2013, and already there had been substantial interest.

## **Economic Development and Planning**

Correspondence with Aidan Burley, MP – The Portfolio Leader reminded Members of public criticism from the local MP when the Council's budget for 2013-14 was set. It had been implied that, had the Council been more effective in collection of bad debts, then it would not have had to increase Council Tax by 2%. Cabinet had asked the Chief Executive to write to Mr. Burley advising him of the necessary legal procedures, and costs, associated with taking people to court, e.g. in pursuit of rent arrears, which often resulted in relatively small initial debts increasing substantially as due process was followed and additional costs incurred. Furthermore, in respect of commercial debts, it was common practice for companies to declare themselves bankrupt and for one or more of the directors to open up another business, occasionally trading under the same, or a very similar, name.

The MP had replied to advise that he had noted the Chief Executive's observations and he had forwarded copies of his letters to Brandon Lewis, Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG), for consideration and advice. The Department was concerned that associated legislation should be reviewed in order to ensure that it remained credible, and loopholes closed to avoid instances such as those cited.

## **Deputy Leader and Crime and Partnerships**

Draft Police and Crime Plan – The Portfolio Leader advised that the Police and Crime Commissioner had released his draft Police and Crime Plan for public consultation. He considered it important that the Council responded to the consultation, and it was agreed that he should liaise with the Partnership Team to prepare a draft response to be brought back to Cabinet on 22 August, 2013.

## **Housing**

Moss Road Estate – The Portfolio Leader advised that works were proceeding at a good pace, and that a site visit was being arranged for Ward and Cabinet Members to view progress on site.

## **Corporate Improvement**

Civic Building, Sharing of Accommodation – With regard to the report to be considered later on the agenda, the Portfolio Leader requested that the Chief Executive keep Members apprised of progress on an ongoing basis.

### **25. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 20 June, 2013**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 20 June, 2013 be approved as a correct record and signed.

### **26. Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period July – September, 2013 (Item 5.1 – 5.2 of the Official Minutes of the Council), was considered.

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period July– September, 2013, be noted.

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

(i) Economic Development and Planning - 28 March, 2013

RESOLVED:

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

(ii) Economic Development and Planning - 28 March, 2013

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

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 7.1 – 7.6 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Council be requested to include £220,000 of Affordable Housing Grant as an additional resource within the Housing Revenue Account Capital Programmes for 2013-14 and 2014-15.
- (B) £415,000 of agreed Capital Programme expenditure for the provision of additional Council dwellings is brought forward from 2014-15 to 2013-14.
- (C) The Head of Housing and Waste Management following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader be authorised to determine the vacant former Council dwellings for repurchase and that the terms and conditions are agreed by the Head of Planning and Regeneration.
- (D) The Head of Housing and Waste Management be authorised to enter into a contract with the Homes and Communities Agency regarding the £220,000 of Affordable Housing Grant.
- (E) Scheme approval and permission to spend is approved for the repurchase of 10 vacant former Council dwellings.

Reason(s) for the Decision

The Council had been successful in a bid for £220,000 of Affordable Housing Grant from the Homes and Communities Agency (HCA) to assist in the repurchase of 10 vacant former Council houses. This additional resource did not currently form part of the HRA Capital Programme and it was, therefore, necessary to seek Council approval in order that it could be included.

The bid was conditional on the Council supporting the scheme with £830,000 of agreed HRA Capital Programme expenditure and in order that the scheme could commence this year, it was necessary that £415,000 be brought forward from 2014-15 to 2013-14. Cabinet approval for this action was therefore sought.

It was also necessary to seek from Cabinet both scheme approval and permission to spend. Proposed criteria for the repurchase of the 10 former Council dwellings was set out in the report and it was proposed that the Head of Housing and Waste Management, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, be authorised to determine the dwellings for repurchase. Terms and conditions would also need to be agreed by the Head of Planning and Regeneration.

The Council would be required to enter into a contract with the HCA regarding the provision of the £220,000 of Affordable Housing Grant. Authorisation was, therefore, sought for the Head of Housing and Waste Management to enter

into the required agreement.

## **29. Housing Revenue Account Capital Programmes 2012-13 and 2013-14**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 8.1 – 8.25 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The position with regard to actual expenditure in respect of the 2012-13 HRA Capital Programme be noted and approval be given to incur £124,919 of additional scheme costs met through the virement of existing resources in respect of the following schemes:-
- |       |                                     |   |          |
|-------|-------------------------------------|---|----------|
| (i)   | Void Properties (Decent Homes)      | - | £106,325 |
| (ii)  | Redesign of Communal Entrance Halls | - | £1,916   |
| (iii) | Asbestos Testing and Removal        | - | £16,678  |
- (B) The reprogramming/slippage of £862,890 of expenditure from the 2012-13 HRA Capital Programme to the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme, as agreed by the Head of Housing, for the reasons detailed in Appendix 4 to the report be noted.
- (C) The £133,087 of expenditure brought forward from the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme, to the 2012-13 HRA Capital Programme, as agreed by the Head of Housing for the reasons detailed in Appendix 4 to the report, be noted.
- (D) The availability and use of resources in financing the 2012-13 HRA Capital Programme be noted including the £6,426,989 of resources carried forward to 2013-14.
- (F) The current position with regard to estimated expenditure in respect of the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme be noted and approval be given to increasing the Void Properties (Decent Homes) budget by £100,000, funded through virement from the bathroom replacement budget.
- (G) The current position regarding the estimated availability of capital resources in 2013-14 be noted and at this stage £3,217,194 of resources be carried forward to 2014-15.
- (H) Adjustments be made to the dwelling outputs in respect of the kitchen and bathroom replacement programmes within the 2012-13 "Place" Priority Delivery Plan as set out below:-
- |      |                                      |
|------|--------------------------------------|
| (i)  | Kitchen Replacement – 115 dwellings  |
| (ii) | Bathroom Replacement – 440 dwellings |

### Reason(s) for the Decision

The report presented the outturn expenditure and use of resources in respect of the 2012-13 HRA Capital Programme and reviews the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme in the light of the outturn expenditure and use of resources for 2012-13.

Details of the outturn expenditure for 2012-13 were presented as part of Appendix 1 to the report. Actual expenditure at 31 March, 2013 was £6,668,507 compared to the revised estimate of £7,420,750 reported to Cabinet on 31 January, 2013. The reasons for this decrease of £752,243 were detailed in Appendix 4 to the report.

Details of the outturn resources for 2012-13 were presented as part of Appendix 2. A total of £13,095,501 was available at 31 March, 2013 compared to £12,949,171 reported to Cabinet on 31 January, 2013. The reasons for this increase of £146,330 were detailed in Appendix 3 to the report.

A total of £6,426,994 of capital resources were available after financing the 2012-13 HRA Capital Programme. This compared to the £5,528,421 reported to Cabinet on 31 January, 2013, an increase of £898,573. A total of £6,426,994 of unused resources was, therefore, carried forward to 2013-14.

Expenditure in respect of the 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme was now estimated to be £12,889,800. This compared to £12,160,000 when Council determined the programme on 13 February, 2013. The reasons for the increase of £729,800 were detailed in Appendix 6 to the report and included £100,000 of additional expenditure in respect of Void Properties (Decent Homes) for which approval was sought.

Estimated available resources in 2013-14 were now forecast to be £16,106,994. This compared to £15,176,421 when Council determined the programme on 13 February, 2013. The reasons for this increase of £930,573 were detailed in Appendix 5 to the report.

Following the financing of the estimated 2013-14 HRA Capital Programme, £3,217,194 of resources were anticipated to be available and if not required during 2013-14 would be carried forward to 2014-15.

The expenditure variations in relation to the kitchen and bathroom programmes would result in changes to the dwelling outputs in the 2013-14 "Place" Priority Delivery Plan. It was suggested that these be amended in accordance with the revised outputs set out in paragraph 5.11 to the report.

### **30. Housing Revenue Account Provisional Outturn 2012-13**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 9.1 – 9.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the provisional outturn for the 2012-13 Housing Revenue Account Budget be noted.

Reason(s) for the Decision

The report presented the provisional outturn for the 2012-13 Housing Revenue Account Budget, as set out in Appendix 1.

Income at 31 March, 2013 was £19,166,301 compared to the revised budget position of £19,102,130 reported to Cabinet on 31 January, 2013. The £64,171 increase in income related primarily to the generation of additional rent income as a result of a lower rate of void dwellings.

Expenditure at 31 March, 2013 was £18,580,958 compared to the revised budget position of £19,535,960 reported to Cabinet on 31 January, 2013. The decrease in expenditure related primarily to savings in maintenance costs (voids and gas maintenance), supervision and management (employee and equipment costs), the provision for bad debts and capital financing. These savings had, however, been offset primarily by a £106,330 increase in the Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay for void dwellings requiring decent homes works funded through savings in respect of minor void works. The net effect of these changes was £955,001 of budget savings.

As a result of the changes, the net deficit of £433,830 (as reported to Cabinet on 31 January, 2013) had changed to a net surplus of £585,342.

Working balances at 31 March, 2013 were now £2.506 million compared to £1.487 million reported to Cabinet on 31 January, 2013.

**31. Gritting of Council Town Centre Car Parks**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 10.1 – 10.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Council owned town centre car parks and bus stations detailed in Appendix 1 to the report be gritted during the winters of 2013-14 and future years.

Reason(s) for the Decision

The three year General Fund Revenue Budget for 2013-14 to 2015-16 included (as a “growth item”) £27,500 per annum for the winter gritting of town centre car parks, subject to Cabinet’s consideration of the results of the 2012-13 pilot scheme.

The results of the pilot scheme were presented in the report and this was considered to have been a success. The pilot scheme had also enabled a number of deficiencies in relation to the initial service standard to be identified. These included the gritting of the Cannock and Rugeley Town Centre bus stations which are not designated highways and were, therefore, the Council's responsibility.

It was, therefore, proposed that the winter gritting of the Council owned town centre car parks and bus stations (identified in Appendix 1 to the report) should continue during the winters of 2013-14 and future years.

**32. Interim Planning Policy on Planning Obligations Relating to Impact of New Residential Development on the Cannock Chase Area of Conservation**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration (Item 11.1 – 11.19 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The interim policies aimed at mitigating the impact of residential development on the Cannock Chase SAC set out at paragraphs 5.7 to 5.8 of the report be applied with immediate effect in relation to planning applications for residential development which were currently subject to consultation and to any future applications submitted prior to adoption of a formal Supplementary Planning Document relating to the same policy issues.
- (B) The Council should participate in taking forward the policy making process by adoption of a joint Supplementary Planning Document with the other Local Planning Authorities in the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation partnership which would supersede the interim policy and that a budget of up to £5,000 be made available for this purpose.

Reason(s) for the Decision

Evidence produced to identify what impact the scale and distribution of housing proposed in the Local Plan would have on the integrity of the Cannock Chase Special Area of Conservation (SAC) indicated that the "in combination" effects of any housing proposals involving a net increase of one or more dwellings would have an adverse effect. The Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 (the "Habitats Regulations") require that where potential adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC are identified, mitigation measures may be a solution to avoid or reduce those impacts in order to enable plans or projects to proceed. These provisions applied both to individual planning applications and the Local Plan as a whole. The only other circumstances in

which a plan or project may proceed where adverse effects were identified was where there was an imperative reason of overriding public interest, which only applied in exceptional circumstances. Since designation of the SAC in 2005 the Council has had a duty to apply the provisions of the Habitat Regulations taking account of available evidence on impact of planning proposals.

The Local Plan, whose examination was scheduled to commence on 24 September, included a policy (CP13, reproduced at Appendix 1) requiring all new housing development to contribute to mitigation of impact on the SAC. As the evidence showed that all proposals for housing development either currently in the system as planning applications, or likely to be received as applications before adoption of the plan would have an adverse impact unless appropriate mitigation was provided, an interim policy was needed to secure appropriate mitigation pending the adoption of the Local Plan, in order to enable these applications to be supported. It was impracticable for applicants submitting small scale housing schemes to propose their own bespoke mitigation measures, but without an appropriate mitigation solution being available on a case by case basis the only alternative would be to refuse permission for these developments. This approach would clearly conflict with the key policy objective of meeting objectively assessed local housing need.

Legal advice obtained from Solicitors Bircham Dyson Bell, who had specialist knowledge in this area, recommended that the SAC partnership commenced work on a joint Supplementary Planning Document. An initial draft of this could form a basis for decision making on applications on an interim basis. Although they identified that there was a risk that use of a draft policy which had not yet been subject to formal consultation would be open to challenge, making decisions to grant planning permission without giving appropriate consideration to impacts on the SAC would also leave such decisions open to challenge.

### **33. Local Validation Criteria for Planning Applications**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Planning and Regeneration (Item 12.1 – 12.6 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Subject to (B), below, the updated local validation document, together with the revised national requirements which took effect on 25 June, 2013, be published as a combined document setting out Cannock Chase Council's overall validation requirements to be effective from 31 July, 2013.
- (B) Any minor changes arising from the consultation process and minor future changes required to keep the document up to date be determined by the Head of Planning and Regeneration in consultation with the Portfolio Leader for Planning and Economic Development.

### Reason(s) for the Decision

Two recent changes in legislation obligate the Council, acting as Local Planning Authority, to comply with the following provisions in relation to local validation requirements –

- The Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013 which received Royal Assent on 25/04/2013 ( section 5 ) limits the power of an LPA to require information to accompany planning applications in the following way –
  - 1) Information requests must be reasonable having regard to the nature and scale of the proposed development; and
  - 2) It being reasonable to think that the subject matter will be material to the determination of the application.
  
- An amendment to the Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) (England) Order 2010 requires that published local validation documents be less than 2 years old on 31 July, 2013 and thereafter be kept under review to maintain their currency as less than 2 years old.

Further amendments to the Development Management Procedure Order applying to the whole of England and taking effect on 25 June, 2013 change the definition of “reserved matters”, the circumstances when Design and Access Statements are required to accompany applications and the content of those statements. These changes had been incorporated into the draft document.

The current local validation document dated from 2008 and had not been comprehensively reviewed since then. In addition to the statutory obligations identified above, it was clearly in the interests of the efficient and effective operation of development management processes to have a set of well explained, relevant information requirements tailored to the scale and complexity of applications. This would give applicants/agents consistent guidance on how to prepare their applications and enables the specialist information needs of statutory consultees e.g. Natural England, Environment Agency, local highway authority to be met. In addition it would enable the local community to have sufficient information to make informed comments on applications. Finally it would ensure that Members had the appropriate information in addition to the contents of officers’ reports where the Planning Control Committee was the decision maker.

A comprehensive review of local validation requirements had been undertaken and combined with the latest national requirements. A summary of the subject areas covered and the consultation undertaken is set out in section 5 of the report. The draft document was also available on the Council’s website with paper copies in reception and Members’ group rooms.

### **34. Permission to Spend – Stile Cop Cemetery Extension**

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

RESOLVED:

That permission to spend on the extension of Stile Cop Cemetery as included in the Council's Capital Programme for 2013-14, be approved.

#### Reason(s) for the Decision

In order to provide additional burial space as detailed in the Bereavement Services Plan 2009, it was necessary for Cabinet to consider the granting of permission to spend, to extend Stile Cop Cemetery (Phase 2).

The proposed extension works would provide for another 1,000 adult graves which at the current burial rate was sufficient for another 7-10 years.

It was anticipated that subject to the granting of planning permission later this year, contractors would be appointed and the work, which was likely to take between 3 and 6 months, weather and conditions permitting, could start on site in early 2014.

### **35. General Fund – Final Accounts, 2012-13**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 14.1 – 14.24 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the final accounts position for the year ending 31 March 2013 be noted.

#### Reason(s) for the Decision

The accounts for 2012-13 were closed and the formal Statement of Accounts had been submitted for External Audit, and hence might be subject to change. However, it was considered very unlikely this would have a material impact on the revenue or capital outturn.

The final accounts for 2012/13 showed an under spending against the budget of £45,000.

The majority of the outturn variances, including income variations were identified as part of the 2013/14 budget process and now formed part of the current year's budgets.

### **36. Civic Building, Sharing of Accommodation**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Executive (Item No. 15.1 – 15.6 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Cabinet recommend to Council that a scheme for Civic Centre accommodation works of £500,000 be included in the 2013-14 Capital Programme and that Contract Procedure Rules be waived to ensure the work is carried out as a matter of urgency.
- (B) The Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council be authorised to agree the term of the lease for the Partnership Trust.
- (C) Subject to paragraphs (A) and (B), above, a spend of £500,000 to enable works to be carried out to the Civic building be approved to ensure the Council can take advantage of sharing accommodation with partner agencies.

#### Reason(s) for the Decision

The Council was again facing Central Government funding cuts and needed to explore ways in which it could drive efficiency savings and protect front line services.

A recent study had demonstrated that it would be possible for the Civic Building to accommodate up to 140 extra persons, if the principles of 'agile working' were adopted.

Agile working principles included 'hot desking', where appropriate, and providing only minimal storage on site.

The Staffordshire Partnership Trust had indicated that they would be keen to move into the Civic Building following the closure of Ivy House in Cannock, and had now confirmed their intent.

The Police had also expressed an interest in moving staff into the building, and a letter of intent had been received.

To take advantage of the situation, a capital spend of up to £500,000 had been identified as needed to carry out the necessary modifications to the building. It had been agreed that the cost will be split 50:50 with Staffordshire County Council, and, therefore, approval was required from Council to spend upto £250,000 of its own resources.

It was envisaged that the costs involved in moving Police Officers into the

building would be met largely by the Police, but negotiations were only at a very early stage.

Employees of the County Council already occupy part of the building's first floor and were paying a commercial rent to the Council.

Depending on the outcome of final negotiations, the income to the Council from all of the above was estimated to be in excess of £200,000 per annum.

**37. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

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



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

**HELD ON THURSDAY, 25 JULY, 2013 AT 4:00 P.M.**

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

**PART 2**

**38. Home Improvement Agency Procurement and Participation Agreement with Staffordshire County Council and Staffordshire Local Authorities**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 17.1 – 17.112 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The Service Specification at Appendix 1 to the report, forming the basis of the procurement exercise and the procurement timescales, be supported.
- (B) The Participation Agreement at Appendix 2 to the report, be agreed and supported.

Reason(s) for the Decision

In 2003 the current arrangements for Home Improvement Agencies (HIA's) were implemented, which set up three organisations providing HIA services across Staffordshire. Separate arrangements were made for Stoke – on - Trent.

The County Council had been considering the situation regarding procurement for several years and had now concluded that the service should be retendered as 10 years had elapsed since the original scheme was set up. The current providers would be considered as part of the current tendering exercise.

Agreement on the principles of the Service Specification and the process were sought from members, as well as agreement of the Participation Agreement proposed by Staffordshire County Council.

The meeting closed at 4.40 p.m.

---

LEADER

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY, 10 JULY, 2013 AT 4.10 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

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

Allen, F.W.C.	Freeman, Miss. M.A.
Davies, D.N.	Whitehouse, Mrs. L.
Fisher, P.	

**15. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G.D. Ball, J. Rowley, M. Sutherland, Mrs. D.M. Todd and R. Todd.

**16. Declarations of Interests of Members and Officers 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.

**17. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

None disclosed.

**18. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 19 June, 2013 be approved as a correct record.

**19. Members' requests for site visits**

There were no requests for site visits.

**20. Application CH/13/0036, Outline residential development. 3 four bed detached houses, Whitelodge, New Penkridge Road, Cannock**

Following a site visit by Members of the Committee consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Enclosure 6.1 – 6.11 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.

---

CHAIRMAN

The meeting closed at 15:04 pm.

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY, 31 JULY, 2013 AT 4.10 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

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

Allen, F.W.C.	Pearson, A.
Ball, G.D.	Stretton, Mrs P.Z.
Davies, D.N.	Sutherland, M.
Fisher, P.	Todd, Mrs D.M.
Freeman, Miss. M.A.	Todd, R.

**21. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors J.D. Bernard and Mrs L. Whitehouse.

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

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>	<u>Type</u>
Mrs P.Z. Stretton	Application CH/13/0127 – Unit 24, Martindale, Cannock, Addition of use for children’s nursery (D1) in conjunction with the existing children’s play centre (D2). – <b><i>Member knows the applicant</i></b>	Personal
Mrs D.M. Todd	Application CH/13/0127 – Unit 24, Martindale, Cannock, Addition of use for children’s nursery (D1) in conjunction with the existing children’s play centre (D2). – <b><i>Member knows the applicant</i></b>	Personal
Mr R. Todd	Application CH/13/0127 – Unit 24, Martindale, Cannock, Addition of use for children’s nursery (D1) in conjunction with the existing children’s play centre (D2). – <b><i>Member knows the applicant</i></b>	Personal

**23. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

None disclosed.

**24. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 10 July, 2013 be approved as a correct record, subject to an amendment being made to include Councillor A. Pearson on the list of apologies given.

**25. Members' requests for site visits**

There were no requests for site visits.

**26. Application CH/13/0166 – 32 Rugeley Road, Hazel Slade  
Residential Development – erection of two detached 5 bedroom  
houses**

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

The Development Control Manager advised Members that whilst the developer had submitted a revised method statement, but, the Council's Landscape officers were still objecting on the basis of lack of information and impact on existing trees.

Accordingly it was recommended that additional conditions are proposed in respect of tree protection and landscape management should Members be minded to approve the application.

Prior to the application being considered, a representation was made by Mr J. Reynolds, agent for the applicant.

Councillor. A Pearson suggested that additional planting be incorporated along the garden boundaries to provide further screening.

RESOLVED:

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

8. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence until a scheme detailing the external environment-landscape, including planting (particularly along the rear and side boundaries of the gardens to the approved dwellings, to provide some additional screening of the approved dwellings), fencing, walls, surface treatment & construction details for the site has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. The details shall be

in the form as specified in Annex C of the Supplementary Planning Guidance 'Trees, Landscape and Development'.

Reason

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

11. No part of the development hereby approved shall commence or any actions likely to interfere with the biological function of the retained trees and hedges shall take place, until details for tree and hedge protection have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include the position and construction of all fencing and the care & maintenance of the trees & hedges within.

Reason

The existing vegetation makes an important contribution to the visual amenity of the area. In accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

12. Prior to the commencement of any construction or site preparation works including any actions likely to interfere with the biological function of the retained trees and hedges, pursuant to Condition 11 above shall be erected to the approved layout.

Within the enclosed area known as the Tree Protection Zone, no work will be permitted without the written consent of the Local Planning Authority. No storage of material, equipment or vehicles will be permitted within this zone. Service routes will not be permitted to cross the Tree Protection Zones unless written consent of the Local Planning Authority is obtained. The Tree Protection Zone will be maintained intact and the vegetation within maintained until the cessation of all construction works or until the Local Planning Authority gives written consent for variation.

Reason

To ensure the retention and protection of the existing vegetation which makes an important contribution to the visual amenity of the area. In accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

13. No part of the development shall commence until details of all arboricultural work have been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. Details shall include a method statement and schedule of works.

Reason

The existing vegetation makes an important contribution to the visual amenity of the area and in accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

14. The approved arboricultural work pursuant to Condition 13 above shall be carried out fully in accordance with the submitted details including timetable and to BS 3998 Tree Work & BS 5837 Trees in Relation to Construction, unless otherwise approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure the retention and appropriate maintenance of the existing vegetation which makes an important contribution to the visual amenity of the area. In accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

15. No part of the development shall commence until a programme detailing the phasing of work has been submitted to and approved by the Local Planning Authority. This shall include site clearance, arboricultural work, protective fencing, construction of access drive etc.

Reason

To ensure the protection and retention of the existing vegetation, which makes an important contribution to the visual amenity of the area. In accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

16. The works on site will be carried out in accordance with the approved programme of works unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To ensure the protection and retention of the existing vegetation, which makes an important contribution to the visual amenity of the area. In accordance with Local Plan Policies B8, C8 and C15.

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

Reason

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

**27. Application CH/13/0127 – Unit 24, Martindale, Cannock  
Addition of use for children’s nursery (D1) in conjunction with the  
existing children’s play centre (D2).**

Following a site visit by Members of the Committee, consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Enclosure 6.19 – 6.27 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to the application being considered, a representation was made by Mr S. Faizey, agent for the applicant.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved, subject to the following conditions and reasons:

1. The development to which this permission relates must be begun not later than the expiration of three years beginning with the date on which this permission is granted.

Reason

To comply with the requirements of Section 91 of the Town & Country Planning Act 1990.

2. The development hereby permitted shall be used as a children's nursery (Use Class D1) in conjunction with the existing childrens play facility (Use Class D2) of the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (or any Order revoking and re-enacting that Order with or without modification), and for no other use specified within use Classes D1 and D2.

Reason

To ensure that any other D1 & D2 uses do not prejudice the amenity and function of neighbouring units or the parking provision, which are located within an established industrial / business park and to ensure the vitality and viability of Cannock and Hednesford Town Centres.

3. No goods, plant, materials or waste shall be stored or deposited on any part of the site outside the building except in an enclosed container, the siting and design of which has been agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority.

Reason

To safeguard the amenities of the locality and to ensure that adequate space is retained for the parking, loading and unloading of vehicles and to ensure compliance with the Local Plan Policies E5:Outside Storage.

4. The premises shall not be open for business outside the hours of 7.00 am to 6.30 pm on any day.

Reason

To ensure that the proposed development does not prejudice the enjoyment by neighbouring occupiers of their properties and to ensure compliance with the Local Plan Policies B8: Design Principles of New Built Development, E2: Development of Vacant/Under Used Land and E8: Development Outside Existing Industrial Areas

5. The number of children and babies at the premises shall be restricted to a maximum of 50 at any one time.

Reason:

In the interests of Highway Safety.

6. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans and documents:

Design & Access Statement

12024/1

12024/3B

120242B

12024/7A

Reason

For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.

---

CHAIRMAN

The meeting closed at 3:25 pm.

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY, 21 AUGUST, 2013 AT 3.00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

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

Allen, F.W.C.	Pearson, A.
Anslow, C.	Stretton, Mrs P.Z.
Ball, G.D.	Sutherland, M.
Fisher, P.	Todd, Mrs D.M.
Freeman, Miss. M.A.	Todd, R.
Grocott, M.R.	Whitehouse, Mrs. L.

**28. Apologies**

No apologies were received.

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

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

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>	<u>Type</u>
Mr P.A. Fisher	Application CH/13/0231 – Birchwood, Kingsley Wood Road, Rugeley, first floor extension. <b><i>Member knows the applicant and is a member of the same political group as the applicant.</i></b>	Personal and Pecuniary
Mr M. Grocott	Application CH/13/0109 – The Globe Island, Sandy Lane/Horse Fair/Western Springs Road/Elmore Lane, Rugeley, installation of a memorial to former miners of Lea Hall and Brereton collieries comprising of 4 sculptures. <b><i>Member knows the applicant, and has previously spoken elsewhere against the application.</i></b>	Personal and Pecuniary

<u>Member</u>	<u>Nature of Interest</u>	<u>Type</u>
Mr M. Grocott	Application CH/13/0231 – Birchwood, Kingsley Wood Road, Rugeley, first floor extension. <b><i>Member knows the applicant.</i></b>	Personal

### **30. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

All Members of the Committee were lobbied via letter (excluding Councillor M. Grocott, who informed the Chairman he had not read it) in respect of application CH/13/0232 – Langbourn House/Hillcroft Road/Ivy House at junction of Longford Road, Wolverhampton Road, Cannock.

### **31. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 31 July, 2013 be approved as a correct record.

### **32. Members' requests for site visits**

There were no requests for site visits.

### **33. Application CH/13/0232 – Langbourn House/Hillcroft House/Ivy House at junction of Longford Road & Wolverhampton Road, Cannock, Discharge of conditions 2a and b of planning permission CH/13/0027**

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

Prior to the application being considered, representations were received from the following:

- Objectors to the application – Mrs Lydall and Mrs Price;
- Agent for the applicant – Mrs H. Sutton;
- Supporter of the application – Mr Alexander.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Condition 2a as outlined in the report be discharged, provided that the parking layout be amended to relocate as many parking spaces as practicable away from the rear gardens of properties on Longford Road, to alongside the access to Wolverhampton Road, and if possible, increase the overall number of parking spaces. Furthermore, that landscaping be developed at the rear of the properties on Longford Road, in place of the originally planned

parking spaces.

- (B) Condition 2b not be discharged as this is subject to on-going discussions. Furthermore, that subject to any compensatory funds being negotiated via a Section 106 agreement to enable condition 2b to be discharged, that this funding be used to improve the existing play area at Wellington Drive, Longford.
- (C) Staffordshire County Council Highways Department be requested to revisit the site and that they be requested to consider how highway safety problems, particularly arising from on-street parking in the vicinity of the application site, can be mitigated.

**34. Application CH/13/0109, The Globe Island, Sandy Lane/Horse Fair/Western Springs Road/Elmore Lane, Rugeley, Installation of memorial to former miners of Lea Hall and Brereton Collieries comprising 4 sculptures**

*Having declared a personal and pecuniary interest in respect of this item, Councillor M. Grocott left the room for the duration of this item.*

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Enclosure 6.19 – 6.25 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to the application being considered, representations were received from the following:

- Supporter of the application – Councillor C. Bennett;
- Supporter of the application – Councillor A. Dudson.

RESOLVED:

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

**35. Application CH/13/0231, Birchwood, Kingsley Wood Road, Rugeley, first floor extension**

*Having declared a personal and pecuniary interest in respect of this item, Councillor P. A. Fisher left the room for the duration of this item.*

*Councillor M. Grocott had declared a personal interest in this item, but was not required to leave the room during the consideration of this item.*

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Enclosure 6.26 – 6.33 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.

**36. Application CH/13/0220, 72 Hatherton Road, Cannock, first floor side extension**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Enclosure 6.34 – 6.40 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.

**37. TPO No. 2013/04 27 Abbots Walk, Rugeley**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Development Control Manager (Enclosure 6.41 – 6.45 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That this item be deferred until the next meeting of the Planning Control Committee.

The meeting closed at 4:40 pm.

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**  
**TUESDAY, 25 JUNE, 2013 AT 4.00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 1**

PRESENT:

Councillors

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

Dudson, A.            Molineux, G. N.  
Johnson, J.         Whitehouse, Mrs L.

Also Present

Grant Patterson, Director, Grant Thornton UK LLP

**1. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor B. Gamble.

**2. 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.

**3. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 March 2013 be approved as a correct record and signed.

**4. Annual Treasury Management Report 2012-13**

*The Chairman informed Members that item 10 of the Agenda, 'Annual Treasury Management Report 2012-13', would be taken before item 4, 'Strategic Risk Register'.*

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 10.1 – 10.10 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Finance circulated a revised version of his report at the start of this item, explaining that an out-of-date version had been submitted for circulation in error.

The Head of Finance then provided an overview of the report, explaining that it outlined the Council's performance in relation to its capital expenditure, borrowing and investments for 2012-13. The following specific points were then brought to the Committee's attention:

- Borrowing was only undertaken as a last resort option when utilisation of reserves or surplus S106 funds was no longer possible;
- Borrowing was monitored on a daily basis, with the Council seeking professional advice on how to manage and invest such funds accordingly;
- Where any investment was undertaken, the Council would only invest in AAA rated banks;
- Any surplus cash flows received by the Council were invested back into services, primarily the capital programme.

Councillor Johnson asked if the Council used outside agencies to provide advice on investments.

The Head of Finance replied that outside agencies were used, but the final decision on what investments to make and who to invest with always rested with the Council to ensure they were kept within the Council's treasury indicator limits.

The Chairman asked why finance related risks were only classified as 'low' risks by the external auditors.

Mr G. Patterson, Director, Grant Thornton, replied that the auditors could check back on how and where financing happened as there was a clear audit trail in place, so there was a lower level of risk of monitoring activity in those areas.

RESOLVED:

1. That the actual 2012/13 prudential and treasury indicators, as detailed in the report, be approved;
2. That the Annual Treasury Management Report for 2012-13 be noted.

## **5. Strategic Risk Register**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 4.1 – 4.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Governance provided an overview of the report, explaining that it detailed how the Council performed in managing its strategic risks, both during the final quarter of 2012-13 and for the whole year.

It was reported that a review of the Strategic Risk Register was being undertaken, and a revised version would be presented to the next meeting of the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the Committee is satisfied with the effectiveness of the Council's Risk Management arrangements for the 2012/13 financial year.

## **6. Review of Effectiveness of Internal Audit**

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

The Head of Governance provided an overview of the report, explaining how the review was undertaken, and what the outcomes of the review were.

It was also reported that a self-review of the Committee would be carried out later on in 2013/14, as it had been some years since a review last took place.

RESOLVED:

1. That the findings of the annual review of the effectiveness of internal audit for 2012-13 be noted;
2. That it be noted Internal Audit is operating effectively and can be relied upon when considering the Annual Governance Statement for 2012-13.

## **7. Internal Audit Annual Report 2012-13**

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

The Chief Internal Auditor explained the report provided a summary of work undertaken by the service during 2012-13. The following points were then brought to the Committee's attention:

- 'Reasonable assurance' was the most realistic rating Internal Audit could provide in respect of the Council's governance arrangements,

as a full review was not undertaken each year;

- 100% of the planned audit work for 2012-13 had been completed.

Councillor Johnson asked if the Council appointed different external auditors on an annual basis.

Mr G. Patterson, Director, Grant Thornton, replied that this was not the case, and they currently had a five year contract in place with the Council, which could be extended for a further three years, subject to approval by the Audit Commission, who were the responsible body for making such appointments.

RESOLVED:

That the 2012-13 Internal Audit Annual Report be noted.

## **8. Annual Governance Statement 2012-13**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 7.1 – 7.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Governance provided an overview of the report, explaining that Council was statutorily required to produce and approve an Annual Governance Statement.

The Chair asked what plans there were for induction training for Members. The Head of Governance explained that induction training for the Committee Members would be provided on immediately before the Committee meeting scheduled for 20 August 2014 (time and venue to be advised).

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL:

That the Annual Governance Statement for 2012-13 be approved.

## **9. External Audit – Audit Fees 2013-14**

The Committee received for information a letter from Grant Thornton, external auditors (Item 8.1 to 8.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council), which outlined the audit fees payable by the Council during 2013-14.

Mr G. Patterson, Director, Grant Thornton, explained there had been no change in the fees payable in comparison with 2012-13.

**10. External Audit – Audit Plan 2012-13**

Consideration was given to the Report of Grant Thornton, external auditors (Item 9.1 – 9.19 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Mr G. Patterson, Director, Grant Thornton, explained that the report detailed how the audit work was undertaken, what interim work had been carried out during the year, and what key tasks were still to be completed.

---

CHAIRMAN

(The meeting closed at 5:20pm)

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE**  
**THURSDAY 20 JUNE, 2013 AT 10.00 A.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

Stretton, Mrs. P.Z. (Chairman)

Allen, F.W.C.

Fisher, P.A.

Anslow, C.

Grice, Mrs D.

Bernard, J.D.

Todd, Mrs D.M.

**8. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors B. Bottomer and P.A. Snape.

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

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

**10. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Licensing and Public Protection Committee held on 24 May, 2013 be approved as a correct record.

**11. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

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

**THIS PAGE IS LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE**  
**THURSDAY 20 JUNE, 2013 AT 10.00 A.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 2**

**12. Application for a Hackney Carriage Proprietors' Licence**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 5.1 – 5.38 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

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

The Officer of the Licensing Authority presented the Council's case by taking the Committee through the report outlining the relevant issues for consideration and Members were asked to consider whether the Applicant's vehicle was considered to be exceptional.

The Committee then viewed the Applicant's vehicle.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority then concluded the presentation of the Council's case.

The Applicant and Members of the Committee were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer. No questions were raised.

The Applicant then presented his case to the Committee.

Members and the Officer of the Licensing Authority were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Applicant.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Applicant were offered the opportunity to sum up their cases. Both parties stated no summation was necessary.

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

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

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Having regard to all the circumstances, the application for a hackney carriage proprietors' licence be granted, as the Committee considers the vehicle is exceptional in accordance with the Council's policy on age restrictions for hackney carriage vehicles.
- (B) The Committee asked the Applicant to be mindful that in 12 months' time the vehicle may not be classed as exceptional if the condition of the alloy wheels is not addressed.

Reason for the Decisions

Although the mileage is above the guidance mileage of 140,000 for a diesel vehicle that is seven years old, the exterior and the interior of the vehicle are in very good condition.

**13. Application for a Hackney Carriage Proprietors' Licence**

*Prior to consideration of this item, Councillor C. Anslow declared a personal interest as he knew the brother of the Applicant.*

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 6.1 – 6.22 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

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

The Officer of the Licensing Authority presented the Council's case by taking the Committee through the report outlining the relevant issues for consideration and Members were asked to consider whether the Applicant's vehicle was considered to be exceptional.

The Committee then viewed the Applicant's vehicle.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority then concluded the presentation of the Council's case.

The Applicant and Members of the Committee were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer. No questions were raised.

The Applicant then presented his case to the Committee.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority was afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Applicant. No questions were raised by the Officer.

Members of the Committee were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Applicant.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Applicant were afforded the opportunity to sum up their cases. The Officer of the Licensing Authority declared that no summation was necessary, whereas the Applicant provided a brief summation of his case.

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

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

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Having regard to all the circumstances, the application for a hackney carriage proprietors' licence be granted, as the Committee considers the vehicle is exceptional in accordance with the Council's policy on age restrictions for hackney carriage vehicles.
- (B) The Committee asked the Applicant to be mindful that in 12 months' time the vehicle may not be classed as exceptional if the condition of the seats is not addressed.

Reason for the Decisions

Although the mileage is slightly over the guidance mileage of 140,000 for a diesel vehicle that is seven years old the exterior and the interior of the vehicle are in very good condition.

---

CHAIRMAN

The meeting closed at 11.10 a.m.

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE**  
**FRIDAY 09 AUGUST 2013 AT 10.00 A.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

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

Anslow, C.	Grice, Mrs D.
Fisher, P.A.	Sutherland, M.

**14. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Paul Snape and Mrs D.M. Todd.

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

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

**16. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting of the Licensing and Public Protection Committee held on 20 June 2013 be approved as a correct record.

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

**THIS PAGE IS LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE**  
**FRIDAY 09 AUGUST 2013 AT 10.00 A.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 2**

**18. Application for a Hackney Carriage Proprietors' Licence – Exceptional Vehicle**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Enclosure 5.1 – 5.31 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

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

The Officer of the Licensing Authority presented the Council's case by taking the Committee through the report outlining the relevant issues for consideration and Members were asked to consider whether the Applicant's vehicle was considered to be exceptional.

The Committee then viewed the Applicant's vehicle.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority then concluded the presentation of the Council's case.

The Applicant and Members of the Committee were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer. No questions were raised.

The Applicant then presented his case to the Committee.

Members and the Officer of the Licensing Authority were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Applicant. No questions were put forward by the Officer.

The Officer of the Licensing Authority and the Applicant were offered the opportunity to sum up their cases. Both parties stated no summation was necessary.

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

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

RESOLVED:

That, having regard to all the circumstances, the application for a hackney carriage proprietors' licence be refused, as the Committee does not consider that the vehicle is exceptional in accordance with the Council's policy on age restrictions for hackney carriage vehicles.

Reasons for the Decision

1. The condition of the exterior of the vehicle is not good.
2. The paint work is marked and shows signs of previous damage.
3. There are signs of corrosion and the paintwork on areas of repair is not smooth.
4. The seal around the windscreen is damaged.
5. The rear bumper is loose.
6. Overall the vehicle is now showing obvious signs of its long term use.

The Chairman then advised the applicant of his right of appeal against this decision, explaining that any such appeal must be lodged with the Crown Court within 21 days of the date of the applicant receiving the official Decision Notice of the Committee.

---

CHAIRMAN

The meeting closed at 10:40 a.m.

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL**  
**TUESDAY 03 SEPTEMBER 2013 AT 10.00 A.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

Anslow, C.  
Bottomer, B.  
Freeman, Miss M.A.

**1. Appointment of Chairman**

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

**2. Apologies**

No apologies were received.

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

No declarations of interest were made.

**4. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

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

**THIS PAGE HAS BEEN LEFT INTENTIONALLY BLANK**

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL**  
**TUESDAY 03 SEPTEMBER 2013 AT 10.00 A.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 2**

**5. Housing Appeal**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 5.1 – 5.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

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

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

The Officer presented the Council's case by taking the Panel through the report. The Appellant and Appellant's Representative and Members of the Panel were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer. No questions were raised by the Appellant or his representative.

The Appellant's Representative presented the Appellant's case on his behalf. The Officer and Members of the Panel were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Appellant and Appellant's Representative.

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

The Appellant, Appellant's Representative and the Officer then left the room to enable the Panel to deliberate in private, calling on only the Council's Legal Advisor and Senior Committee Officer for advice.

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

UNANIMOUS DECISION:

That the Appellant's appeal be dismissed. Accordingly, the Appellant will not be entitled to succeed to the tenancy of 21 Madden Close.

### Reasons for Decision

The Panel has carefully considered all relevant factors, issues and the representations made on behalf of the Appellant. However, both the law and the Council's Succession Policy are very clear in that there has already been one previous succession to the tenancy.

The Panel has a lot of sympathy and compassion for the Appellant's case, and would therefore ask that Housing Tenancy Services does its utmost to ensure that the Appellant is offered suitable alternative one bedroomed ground floor accommodation within the immediate vicinity at the earliest possible opportunity.

## **6. Appeal Against Exclusion from the Housing Register**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 6.1 – 6.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

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

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

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

The Appellant's Representative presented the Appellant's case on her behalf. The Officer and Members of the Panel were then afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Appellant and Appellant's Representative.

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

The Appellant, Appellant's Representative and the Officer then left the room to enable the Panel to deliberate in private, calling on only the Council's Legal Advisor and Senior Committee Officer for advice.

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

### UNANIMOUS DECISION:

That the Appellant's appeal be allowed. Thus, the Appellant's exclusion from the Housing Register is to be removed thereby enabling her to be placed back on the Register.

### Reasons for Decision

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

The Panel is of the view that the actions of Bromford Support and the information relied upon cannot be considered sufficient to justify the decision to exclude. Whilst the actions of the Appellant which resulted in her receiving a police caution cannot be excused, the decision to exclude her from the Housing Register was unjustified in the circumstances.

The meeting closed at 12:50pm

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY 24 JULY, 2013**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

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

Bernard, Mrs A.F.                      Sutton, Mrs. H.M  
Fisher, P.A.

Also present:                      Staffordshire County Councillor Mrs C. Mitchell

**1. Apologies**

Apologies were received from Councillor Miss M. A. Freeman.

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

There were no interests declared.

**3. Minutes**

The Head of Environmental Health raised the following points:

- Minute number 50 – a response was still awaited for a representative from the NHS 111 service to attend a future meeting of the Committee to provide more information about the service and the challenges it had faced since it launched.
- Minute number 53 – a response was still awaited from Staffordshire County Council to arrange a visit to Bilbrook House. In relation to this, the District Commissioner had provided information that an adapted facility was being installed at Cannock Hospital which may be suitable for the Committee to go and visit.

AGREED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 22 April 2013 be approved as a correct record.

**4. Appointment of Representative to Staffordshire County Council's Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee**

RESOLVED:

That Councillor B. Gamble be appointed as the Council's representative to the Staffordshire County Council Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee for 2013/14.

**5. Appointment of Independent Co-opted Member**

RESOLVED:

That HealthWatch Staffordshire be appointed as the Independent Co-opted Member on to the Committee for 2013/14. The Head of Environmental Health to clarify with HealthWatch who the named representative will be.

**6. Update – HealthWatch Staffordshire**

Due to there not being a representative of HealthWatch in attendance, no update was provided.

**7. Items Arising from the Staffordshire County Council's Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee**

RESOLVED:

That the Staffordshire County Council's Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee Digest paper be noted.

**8. Latest Position with Trust Special Administrators (TSAs) Proposals for Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust**

The Head of Environmental Health informed Members that the TSAs had announced the following revised timetable in respect of their proposals:

- Wednesday 31 July – draft recommendations will be published;
- Tuesday 06 August – formal consultation period will commence;
- Tuesday 01 October – formal consultation period will close.

The Head of Environmental Health then raised that the next meeting of the Committee was scheduled for 27 August, which would allow time for the Committee to consider the draft recommendations and submit comments to Staffordshire County Council, as the relevant statutory respondent to the TSAs. It was also noted that as part of the next stage of the TSAs work, more information may become available regarding Cannock Hospital developments.

## 9. Work Plan Items for 2013/14 Municipal Year

*Councillor Mrs A.F. Bernard arrived at the meeting during the consideration of this item. As she was no longer a member of the Committee, the Committee agreed that she would be able to stay and participate in the meeting, but would not be able to vote on any items.*

Members considered the proposed work programme for 2013/14.

The Chairman raised that the Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership Trust had held an event earlier on in the day at Cannock Fire Station to explain to attendees what they did and how they operated. The Chairman then commented that it would be helpful to invite them along to a future meeting of the Committee for this same purpose.

The Head of Environmental Health commented as follows:

- The Partnership Trust came into existence at the same time as the Primary Care Trusts (PCTs) were being disbanded;
- The Partnership Trust took on the directly delivered work of the PCTs, whilst most of the commissioning of services went to the Clinical Commissioning Groups (CCGs);
- The aim of the Partnership Trust was to provide more joined up and integrated services to users;
- The work of the TSAs had not been included on the work programme as it would be picked up as necessary.

The Chairman raised that it would be useful to include an item of follow-up work regarding catering provision at Cannock Hospital, as he had been provided with results from satisfaction surveys which had recently been undertaken.

Councillor Mrs A.F. Bernard raised that in the past issues had been brought to the Committee and discussed, however follow-up work had not been undertaken with the relevant bodies once they had received feedback from the Committee, and as such it was important for timely review sessions to be conducted.

The Chairman agreed with this point and noted that it was important to conduct follow-up work in order to establish what action had been taken, if any.

**AGREED:**

That the following items form the Health Scrutiny Committee's work programme for 2013/14:

- Visit to Adapted House at Bilbrook;
- Review of Disabled Adaptations;
- NHS Non-Emergency 111 Service;
- Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Partnership Trust.

- Catering Provision at Cannock Hospital – Follow-up Review.

## **10. Scoping of Health Scrutiny Review of Disabled Adaptations**

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Environmental Health.

The Head of Environmental Health raised the following points:

- Members had raised at the Committee last year and in other arenas issues regarding disabled adaptations;
- This was an area which was particularly under pressure budget wise and was undergoing change, with adult social care provision being put under the responsibility of the Partnership Trust;
- The flowchart shown on pages 10.3 and 10.4 of the report outlined the process for determining allocation of disabled adaptations;
- An initial assessment of needs was undertaken, and where necessary, simple aids and/or equipment would be provided. A person with more complex needs would be subject to a more detailed assessment;
- For residents in private accommodation, adaptation costs were means tested, which meant that some of the cost may have to be met by the resident. The means test however did not apply to children;
- For residents in Council owned accommodation, the adaptations would be made by the Council, or the resident moved into a suitable property which had already been adapted;
- In private accommodation, the work was carried out by the Council's Home Improvement Agency, who received relevant grant funding;
- Adaptations for children tended to be the most complex and expensive to install, as the adaptations could potentially be in place for at least 20 years;
- Adaptations types were matched to the varying needs of residents concerned.

The Chairman commented as follows:

- The approach outlined in the report was the right one to take;
- It was worth focussing on start to finish completion times;
- Also important to clearly understand costs involved;
- Would also be helpful to look at comparators against other local authorities;

The Head of Environmental Health responded that benchmarking had in the past taken place, and was lead by the Audit Commission, however since the Commission's demise, it had been difficult to maintain the benchmarking work.

Councillor Mrs A.F. Bernard queried whether under value for money, it would be possible to look at whether adaptations were recycled and placed

into other homes in instances where they were no longer required.

The Head of Environmental Health responded that the County Council had a storage facility in place where items were repaired and refurbished then redistributed as necessary.

RESOLVED:

That the review scope (including the review parameters set out in paragraph 6.3 of the report) for provision of disabled adaptations in the District be agreed.

**11. Date of Next Meeting**

Members noted the date of the next meeting scheduled for Tuesday 27 August 2013, which would be used to focus solely on the draft proposals from the TSAs.

---

CHAIRMAN

(The meeting closed at 4.45 p.m.).

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

**THURSDAY, 13 JUNE, 2013 AT 7.00PM**

**AT NORTON CANES HIGH SCHOOL, NORTON CANES**

PRESENT: Cannock Chase Councillors:

Sutherland, M. (Chair)  
Bernard, Mrs. A.F. (Vice Chair)

Bernard, J.D.	Spicer, Mrs. A.
Gilbert, P.	Todd, Mrs. D.*
Holder, M.J.	Whitehouse, Mrs. L.
Rowley, J.	

Other District Councillor(s):

Kraujalis, J.	Todd, R.
Toth, J.	

Cannock Chase Council Officers:

T. McGovern	Corporate Director
S. Partridge	Democratic Services Manager

Representatives from the following organisations:

Cannock Chase CCG	(J. Bletcher)
Staffordshire Police	(Sgt. Lawlor; PCSO Liz Dale)
Staffordshire County Council	(SCC Cllr. G. Adamson)
Staffordshire County Council	(SCC Cllr. Mrs. C. Mitchell)
Staffordshire County Council	(SCC Cllr. Mrs. D. Todd*)
Heath Hayes P.C.	(A Dean)
Norton Canes P.C.	(J. Beddows)

Approximately 1 local resident

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

Councillor M. Sutherlans was elected as Chairman, and Councillor Mrs. A.F. Bernard as Vice-Chairman for the current Municipal Year.

**2. Apologies**

None.

**3. Declarations of Interest**

None.

**4. Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 14 March, 2013 were agreed as a correct record.

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

None.

**6. Questions for Staffordshire Police**

Sgt. Lawlor introduced himself to the forum. He was relatively new to the area, though he had substantial police experience in various fields of work. He would be covering the combined Cannock Chase police area, along with Sergeants Edge and Kenny, and working closely with the respective PCSO's, such as Liz Dale, who was with him.

No questions had been submitted in advance, but Sgt. Lawlor invited questions from the floor.

A Member enquired if any information was available about an incident that had happened the previous day in St. James Place, Norton Canes, which had required an Armed Response Unit to attend. Sgt. Lawlor advised that he was not aware of the incident, but would try and find out and provide feedback.

Norton Canes Parish Councillor John Beddows commented that Norton Canes had got its own Neighbourhood PC in 2000, but there didn't appear to be much of a police presence at all recently. Sgt. Lawlor advised that this had been due to a combination of sickness and changes in neighbourhood policing policy. As a result, there appeared to be less bobbies on the beat, but this was offset by an increased PCSO presence and more responsive policing.

**7. Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group**

Jonathan Bletcher, Director, Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group provided a presentation entitled "NHS Cannock Chase – Integrated Plan and Commissioning Intentions". The presentation outlined the responsibilities of the Cannock Chase CCG which had officially come into being on 1 April, 2013; and shared a management structure (35 people), with Stafford and Surrounds CCG. The two had a

combined budget of £304m, covering a population of 270,000 (132,000 in Cannock Chase area, i.e. CCDC plus Huntington; Cheslyn Hay and Great Wyrley). The CCG covered 27 local GP practices.

Members expressed concern about inconsistencies between GP practices, for example in the lead times from booking an appointment to getting to see a GP. Mr. Bletcher advised that the CCG was attempting to raise standards generally, and improve patient access and choice.

Members also enquired if patient choice had impacted negatively on Stafford and Cannock hospitals, i.e. following the bad publicity, doctors had advised patients to go elsewhere for treatment. Mr. Bletcher advised that it was as much about patient choice as doctors' recommendations, and the CCG had no powers to force GP's to use particular hospitals.

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

Because of the ongoing Trust Special Administration, nobody was in attendance. Mr. Bletcher was able to advise that he had become aware that afternoon of a request from the Trust Special Administrator for extensions to the consultation (30 days) and consideration (10 days) periods. As a result, the public meetings etc that had just been arranged and publicised would need to be reorganised.

The Chairman thanked Mr. Bletcher for bringing the matter to the forum's notice.

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

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

No other matters were raised for referral back to the Fire and Rescue Service.

#### **10. Questions for Staffordshire County Council (Highways)**

Mr. P. Gibbs was unable to attend the meeting, but had submitted the following question:

*'Why have Highways spent considerable monies on additional speed humps in Wimblebury Road? They do not prevent excess speed by wide wheel base vehicles. They prevent proper road clearance of snow, as evidence and appear to be at random spacing and style.'*

Mark Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager, Staffordshire County Council (Highways), had provided the following response, as detailed on the agenda:

*'The speed cushions have been spaced at 50- 60m intervals. We do agree that the speed cushions do not always prevent wide wheel based vehicles to exceed the speed limit, and this is one of the reasons behind installing flat top road humps at either ends of the scheme and a kerb to kerb flat top road hump outside the school, roughly, in the middle of the extents of the scheme.*

*The flat top road humps are designed to initially reduce the speed of the vehicle, and the speed cushions to help maintain the lower speed. The kerb to kerb flat top road hump has been design to provide a flush surface to facilitate easier crossing for pedestrians and to further lower the speed of vehicles.*

*All of the residents along Wimblebury Road, and many of the adjoining streets were consulted, we also consulted with the County/ District Councillors Members, and also the Parish Council, prior to its installation.*

*In terms of snow clearance the strategic routes (on A&B roads) do not have traffic calming features, however on the more residential routes general gritting is not effected by traffic calming to a great extent, in terms of ploughing the blades travel up and down as they approach the ramps but I do appreciate there may be some gaps.*

*Overall problems with snow are a small issue compared with providing a safety solution along this road 365 days a year.'*

**11. Any Other Business**

None.

**12. Next Meeting**

Thursday, 12 September, 2013.  
Venue: Hayes Green Community Centre.

**13. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings**

None.

The meeting closed at 8.00 pm.

---

CHAIRMAN



The Chairman welcomed Sgt. D. Edge to the meeting who was in attendance to answer questions relating to local policing matters that had been submitted in advance. As no questions had been submitted in advance, Sgt. Edge took questions from the floor.

A local resident raised concern about groups of youths gathering in the Hednesford area. She commented that a local shop owner (AJ's in Cardigan Place) had recently had her windows smashed twice in two months. She had telephoned the Police to report the incident and had been advised to contact the Council to establish if the CCTV cameras had been recording. However, on contacting the Council she was advised to go through the Police. These incidents had caused distress to the lady concerned and had cost her £250 excess each time on her insurance claim.

Sgt. Edge explained that he was concerned with the response the lady had received as the incident should have been dealt with by the Police. He would ask the local policing officer to contact the lady concerned to discuss the incidents and offer reassurance.

With regards to anti social behaviour in general, he commented that the Police were aware of the areas where ASB was occurring and patrol strategies had been put in place to tackle this. With the better weather arriving there would be a seasonal peak in ASB and the police would work with PCSO's and the local neighbourhood team to address any issues that arose.

The local resident commented that the CCTV operator had indicated that images were often blurred and it was difficult to identify individuals. Sgt. Edge explained that images were sometimes blurred due to the cameras being sighted a distance away and there being a need to zoom in. However, it was often the case that officers could recognise offenders by the clothing they were wearing or by their manner.

The Chairman referred to the recent incidents of vandalism at the new Aquarius building whereby the upper windows on the glass-fronted building had been smashed and the glass canopy below was also broken. The incidents had caused damage amounting to a considerable sum of money.

Sgt. Burns explained that the Police had a strategy in place to deal with offenders once they were caught.

The Head of Planning and Regeneration confirmed that the developer, St. Modwen had recently installed CCTV which gave crystal clear images. The developers were hopeful that the ASB/vandalism would be dealt with by the Police as they did not wish to amend the scheme.

Councillor Todd commented that the perception of CCTV was negative

and questioned whether the images gathered had led to any convictions.

Sgt. Edge confirmed that, nationally, CCTV was a huge success and images gathered had led to a significant number of convictions and the Government had provided substantial funding for CCTV. The Corporate Director agreed and commented that the CCTV operators spent a lot of time copying the images for use as evidence in convictions. He also advised that the Council was trialling a new digital wireless camera in one location. This was more mobile, would cut costs and would also provide better images. If the trial was successful it was intended to provide two additional cameras in locations within Hednesford town centre.

Councillor Pearson commented on the recent number of thefts of land rovers/pick up type trucks. Sgt. Edge confirmed he was not aware of an increase in theft of motor vehicles in the area.

Councillor Mrs. Grice referred to the recent incident of fly-tipping on land at Redbrook Lane, Brereton and had concern that a similar incident could occur at the West Cannock No 5 Sports and Social Club. The incident was being investigated by the Environment Agency due to the large scale of the fly-tipping. Sgt. Edge explained that this would be a matter for the land owner of the Club to consider.

The Chairman thanked Sgt. Edge for attending the Forum and responding to the questions raised.

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

It was reported that no questions had been submitted.

## **7. Speeding Traffic – Keys Park Road, Hednesford**

Item had been requested by Councillor G. Ball. Mark Keeling, Staffordshire County Council (Highways) was unable to attend the Forum but had provided the following response:

“We have now completed an investigation and feasibility study for Keys Park Road. There are various considerations that have been highlighted that will be discussed with County Councillors George Adamson and Christine Mitchell. I will be meeting with the Councillors shortly to discuss this and other highways issues within the area. We will continue to monitor the site and provide enforcement support with the use of the mobile camera as part of an ongoing programme”.

The Chairman confirmed that he had recently met with Mark Keeling and that Highways Officers were looking at various options to slow the traffic down.

Councillor Gamble raised concern that Councillor Ball had been asking this question for two years and an Officer from Staffordshire County

Highways had not yet attended a Forum meeting.

## **8. Update on Hednesford Town Centre Regeneration**

Item requested by Councillor G. Ball. Bob Phillips, Head of Planning and Regeneration advised that the retail/leisure regeneration scheme was nearing completion with Aldi due to open in the first week of August. The final unit on the Rugeley Road site was under offer to Pizza Hut. With regard to Phase 2 (Tesco) he confirmed that St Modwen were considering an offer of interest that had been expressed in the vacant unit under the Community facility. Additionally, St. Modwen's had indicated they wished to push through the walls by Discount UK to make two units. The Forum also noted that the lease on the Community facility had been completed today

He also advised that there were discussions ongoing with Traders regarding the Rugeley Road car park in addition to discussions with Aldi regarding the operation of the car park. Once all the spaces were operating and the units had been let an early review of the car park would be undertaken to assess the impact. The Council considered that there was a substantial amount of car parking spaces available in various locations. However, the management of these would need to be addressed.

Councillor Grice commented that the parking warden had recently illegally parked his car outside B & M whilst he then went on to issue tickets to the other cars that were parked illegally. It was considered that this did not set a good impression. The Corporate Director confirmed that the Council held the contract with APCOA and would therefore investigate this matter.

Councillor Pearson explained that the Joint Parking Committee would be meeting in July and the issue of extending the waiting time from 20 minutes on Market Street would be considered. The Head of Planning and Regeneration confirmed that consultants had carried out a survey of the Rugeley Road car park and indicated that it would be helpful if vehicles were allowed to park for a longer period on Market Street. The Chairman advised that he too would be supporting a longer waiting time of 40 minutes along Market Street when the matter was considered at the Joint Parking Committee.

Concern was expressed regarding the pedestrian crossing from the park to Tesco's as it was not clear where to cross safely.

## **9. Update on Hednesford Park**

Item requested by Councillor G. Ball. Tony McGovern, Corporate Director advised that the Council the agreement with the Heritage Lottery Fund (HLF) had been signed off.

He confirmed that in addition to the HLF money additional funding had

been secured from Staffordshire Environmental Fund to provide tennis courts. This was for the sum of £30,000 which had to be spent by the end of June. Therefore, work had commenced on the construction of the tennis courts in May and would be continuing for some weeks. Both adult and junior courts would be provided.

In addition to the £3m HLF project the Council was also exploring the possibility of establishing a full size ATP on one of the football pitches on the park (providing there was adequate space). There was currently only one full size ATP in the District and this was located at Cardinal Griffin School. The Council would be assessing whether Hednesford Park was the appropriate location for the second full size ATP to be provided in the District. A few alternative locations in the Hednesford area would also be explored. He confirmed that this £1m investment along with the £3m HLF project was a substantial investment into Hednesford parks/leisure facilities.

Councillor Ball asked whether there had been any progression with the skateboard park. The Corporate Director advised that the skateboard park had been identified as priority; however, no start date had been confirmed. There was a significant amount of building work being undertaken on the site to develop the tennis courts and it was not considered appropriate for the skateboard park to be built at the same time. This would create health and safety issues as the children using the skateboard park would be playing on what was in fact a building site.

He also confirmed that there were proposals to improve the existing car park in the HLF scheme. However, the requirements for additional parking for the ATP scheme would also need to be assessed without compromising the HLF scheme.

Councillor Pearson advised the Forum that Friends of Hednesford Park were holding a meeting this Thursday at 7.00pm at Pye Green Community Centre.

#### **10. Mid Staffs NHS Foundation Trust - update**

The Chairman advised that Trust had provided two updates and these were distributed to those present. The update stated that the TSA's had requested additional time from Monitor to develop their draft recommendations. As a result of this, the proposed public meetings had been cancelled and would be rescheduled accordingly once the new timetable had been confirmed. The update also advised on the catering arrangements. Concern was raised at the significant costs involved in having to publicise the cancellation of the proposed meetings.

The Chairman advised that Wolverhampton Acute and Walsall had expressed an interest in being involved in the future management of Cannock Hospital to address the under-utilisation issue.

Councillor Gamble explained that the Health Scrutiny Committee had looked at the catering arrangements at Cannock Chase Hospital and considered that the service was running well.

**11. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings**

The Chairman reported that the next Forum was scheduled for 18 September, 2013. Any questions would need to be submitted on the forms supplied.

**12. Dates of Future Meetings**

The Chairman confirmed the dates of the meetings of the Hednesford Community Forum:-

18 September, 2013 – at the new Aquarius facility (if available)

11 December, 2013

3 March, 2014

---

CHAIRMAN

(The meeting closed at 7.50 p.m.)

AMENDED NOTES (ITEM 13)

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**NOTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**RUGELEY AND BRERETON COMMUNITY FORUM**

**MONDAY, 10 JUNE, 2013 AT 7.00PM**

**AT RUGELEY ROSE THEATRE, TAYLOR'S LANE, RUGELEY**

PRESENT: Cannock Chase Councillors:

Grocott, M.R. (Chair)

Allt, Mrs. A.	Lovell, A.
Bennett, C.	Molineux, G.N.
Dudson, A.*	
Fisher, P.A.	

Other District Councillor(s):

Rowley, J.	Toth, J.
Spicer, Mrs. A.	

Cannock Chase Council Officers:

S. Shilvock	Head of Environmental Health
S. Partridge	Democratic Services Manager

Representatives from the following organisations:

Staffordshire Police	(Sgt. D. Kenny; PC Paul Bradbury; PCSO Laura Sandy)
Staffordshire County Council	(SCC Cllr. G. Martin)
Staffordshire County Council	(SCC Cllr. A. Dudson*)
Staffordshire County Council	(G. Hunt)
Lichfield Diocese	(Rev. Michael Newman)
Neighbourhood Watch	(Ms. V. Singleton)

Approximately 10 local residents

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

Councillor M.R. Grocott was elected as Chairman, and Councillor J. Johnson as Vice-Chairman for the current Municipal Year.

**2. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from CCDC Councillors B.

## AMENDED NOTES (ITEM 13)

Bottomer; D.N. Davies; and J. Johnson.

### **3. Declarations of Interest**

None.

### **4. Notes**

The notes of the meeting held on 11 March, 2013 were accepted as a correct record.

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

None.

The Chairman took the opportunity to remind Members of the District Council, and Town and Parish Councils present, that the forum was intended primarily for residents to raise points with them, not for Members to use it as a talking shop or a means of scoring points off one another.

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

No questions had been submitted in advance, but the Police representatives invited questions from the floor.

Concerns were raised about parking issues in the following locations:

- Bryans Lane, near Fierro's Garage, between Market Street and Forge Road;
- Sneydlands (parking restricted to residents, which might be causing knock-on effect in vicinity).
- Drop-offs and pick-ups outside John Bamford School.

The Chairman asked Mark Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager, SCC (Highways), to make a note of the areas of concern.

In respect of school drop offs and pick ups, PC Bradbury advised that this was a problem common to all schools. If there was a particular problem at any time, generally, the school crossing patrols would ask the police to attend to sort out the situation.

Finally, Sgt. Kenny advised that, from a policing perspective, the Rugeley Charter Fair had been extremely. Councillors said that they were pleased to hear this and thanked the police for their support at the event.

### **7. Question(s) Submitted by Mrs. Margaret Beardsmore, Work Party Coordinator, Inland Waterways Association**

Mrs. Beardsmore had submitted apologies that she would not be able to

AMENDED NOTES (ITEM 13)

attend the Forum. The Chairman read out her questions and the responses provided by Officers of the Council, as detailed on the agenda. (Questions and answers shown below.)

- **We have been promised a litter bin on Wolseley Road, by the long path which goes down to the canal. When is this going to be installed please?**

*Steve Clarke, CCDC, had responded to Mrs. Beardsmore, and it is intended that a bin be installed as part of a planned programme in the area in early June.*

- **Dog poo, litter, and ant-social behaviour is an on-going issue along the canal in Rugeley. This gives a bad impression of the town to visitors, and is an ongoing source of irritation to residents. Is it possible to set up a 'working group' with police, Councillors and other interested parties in order to try and reduce this problem?**

*Duncan Rollo, Partnership Manager, Cannock LPT (Police) had advised that he was more than happy to assist with these issues, as he chairs the Multi Agency Briefing Hub, that meets three times a week to discuss the issues that sit outside the Police arena and require a number of agencies working together to resolve. He would also be happy to visit the areas of concern and would arrange to meet Mrs. Beardsmore on her return from holiday.*

- **The Tesco development has now started. What is the situation regarding the promised S106 money? The Leathermill Lane area of the town is part of the conservation area and is the main 'official' visitor boat moorings for Rugeley. These boaters provide a vital source of tourist income for our shopkeepers and it is important to create a good impression. The S106 money is intended to go towards improvements in this area but to date there has been no consultation with Inland Waterways Association, who have organised many work parties in Rugeley to improve the canalside. There also does not seem to have been any consultation recently with Canal and River Trust. I would appreciate clarification on this issue please.**

*The Planning Department had provided the following detailed response:*

*The S106 monies have been received and are allocated as follows:*

1. *£310,000 is for an improved pedestrian link from the store to the town centre + environmental improvements in the town centre.*
2. *£48,000 is for an improved cycle link from the store to the by-*

## AMENDED NOTES (ITEM 13)

*pass.*

3. *£55,000 is for improvements to the canal towpath.*
4. *£180,000 is for improved bus services/bus infrastructure.*

*The Council are currently working up a scheme to deliver item 1 and would be happy to talk to the IWA as well as the Canals and Rivers Trust about item 3 and how this might be linked with item 2.*

*In the first instance representatives of IWA as well as the Canals and Rivers Trust should contact Peter Scholes - Principal Landscape and Countryside Officer."*

With regard to the S.106 monies, Councillor N. Stanley, Rugeley Town Council, advised that the response appeared to conflict with other information given to RTC in an e-mail dated 09/05/13, in respect of improvements in Brook Square and the proposed Miners' Memorial and what S.106 monies were being used for this. Apparently, the e-mail listed 3 different sources of S.106 monies, and he considered that there appeared to be inconsistencies or inaccuracies between that and the response provided to the Forum. He asked 'When will Rugeley Town Council and the people of Rugeley know which monies are being used?', and stated that it was "questionable" whether the right money was being used for the right purpose.

Officers were unable to respond to the specific matters raised, but advised that they would seek clarification, and ask appropriate colleagues to respond to the Town Council.

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

The Reverend Michael Newman attended with Graham Hunt, Staffordshire County Council, to provide an update. He reiterated previous advice that, legally, the building had to be declared redundant for the purposes of worship in the town as the church belonged to the town and it had to be shown that adequate, or better, facilities existed elsewhere. The Church Buildings Council had visited the building and prepared an assessment report, and the Architectural Heritage Trust was preparing an options analysis to consider viable future uses.

The Reverend Newman advised that the Old Chancel would definitely be repaired to ensure its integrity and likely improved. £3,000 AHF grant monies had been promised for initial works, which were subject to match funding from other sources. It was hoped that the Heritage Lottery Fund would assist, and SCC Cllr. G. Martin had also offered to contribute.

Greenwoods Heritage Advisers in Lichfield had offered their services free of charge initially, and had estimated the cost of building around the current outline to provide a tourist / heritage facility would be in the region of up to £500,000. Moving forward, it was likely that the Diocese

would retain ownership and lease it to a charitable management trust for 99 years.

**9. Cannock Chase Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) and Stafford and Surrounds CCG**

Andrew Donald, Chief Officer, NHS Stafford & Surrounds CCG and NHS Cannock Chase CCG, spoke about the role of the CCG's and responded to questions. Briefly, he advised that the CCG's had officially come into being on 1 April, 2013; were two separate organisations with a shared management structure (35 people), and a combined budget of £304m, covering a population of 270,000 (132,000 in Cannock Chase area, i.e. CCDC plus Huntington; Cheslyn Hay and Great Wyrley).

Mr. Donald confirmed that the CCGs were not responsible for commissioning GP services; dentists; optometrists; or specialised care services. All the CCG's monies would be spent on services in hospitals.

In response to a request for clarification about the CCG's role in not re-opening Stafford A&E on a 24 hour basis, he advised that the consultant doctors and GP's had agreed that, while it was possible to re-open 24/7, it was not considered 100% clinically safe to do so. As it stood, it was possible to provide 100% consultant coverage across the 14 hrs per day that A&E was open. Monitoring of patient numbers since 1 December, 2012 indicated that patient numbers had not changed, and the same number attended during the 14 hours period as had attended when open for 24 hours. This suggested that people may have attended when it suited them, and not for any other critical reason. It was also noted that alternative provision had been made for admission, where necessary, other than via A&E.

In respect of the future of Cannock and Stafford hospitals, Mr. Donald assured the forum that the hospitals would not close, though they may be required to review the services offered at each, to take account of the £20m funding shortfall that was faced. The CCG's aspirations were for as many services as possible to be retained locally where it was clinically safe and financially viable to do so. Personally, he believed that what would be provided would be more than people anticipated.

**10. Mid-Staffordshire NHS Foundation Trust**

Because of the ongoing Trust Special Administration, nobody was in attendance. However, the Chairman read out the dates of the proposed public meeting, including one in Rugeley scheduled for Wednesday, 3 July, at 7.00pm at the Leahall Miners Welfare Club.

Members and members of the public present all expressed concerns about the futures of the hospitals, and commented that the Stafford crisis had been shown to be the thin end of the wedge with a further 10 hospitals within a 50 mile radius in a broadly similar situation.

## AMENDED NOTES (ITEM 13)

For the CCG's, Mr. Donald reiterated that they did not want the hospitals to close, and the challenge was to get the best possible services that could be afforded, taking account of the £20m funding gap.

### **11. Questions for Staffordshire County Council (Highways)**

Mrs. Hazel Southwell of Arch Street, Rugeley, had enquired why (utilities) works had stopped on Armitage Road in Rugeley. Residents were concerned at a lack of progress; inconvenience caused as a result (no through access to pedestrians); and the site being in a dangerous state (a "chasm" had opened.). Apparently, work men had appeared and then disappeared and not been back since (as at 31/05/13).

Mark Keeling, Community Infrastructure Liaison Manager, SCC (Highways), advised that the works were being undertaken by Western Power Distribution who had discovered a void under the road surface (the "chasm"), which had probably been caused by a water leak. There had been some dispute between WPD and Severn Trent as to who was responsible for its repair, and the County had decided to take over the site to effect a repair and get things moving. SCC would then bill the respective utilities companies. Unfortunately, it was unclear the extent of the repair required, though it was expected to be substantial and could last throughout the summer.

Members enquired about repairs to the wall at the entrance to the Lower Birches estate. Mr. Keeling advised that the damaged wall and hedge remained in the ownership of the developer.

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

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

No other matters were raised for referral back to the Fire and Rescue Service.

### **13. Any Other Business**

Councillor N. Stanley, Rugeley Town Council, raised the following matters:

Contribution to Christmas Lights - Confirmation was sought as to whether or not CCDC would be contributing to the Christmas lights in Rugeley (and also in Brereton and the other parishes), as in previous years. Cllr. Stanley had written asking this question earlier in the year, but was still awaiting a formal reply.

AMENDED NOTES (ITEM 13)

*(An Officer had previously replied by e-mail, but, unfortunately, had inadvertently used the Town Council's "contact us" web link. However, to avoid confusion, Mr. S. Schofield, Senior Technical Officer had subsequently written back to confirm that the allocation would be £2,310.66 per ward, thus totalling £6,931.98 for the 3 wards.)*

Localisation of Support for Council Tax - Cllr. Stanley asked when RTC and the other parishes could expect 'their' monies to be forwarded to them? (£34K for RTC; £8.5K for B&R; and a total of £14.5K for the others.) He referred to a letter from the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government advising that the Government's clear intention was that billing authorities should collect and pass on monies collected on behalf of parishes.

CCDC Cllr. A. Lovell promised to look into the matter, and expressed concern at the apparent lack of effective communication between CCDC and the parishes. (For information, the Democratic Services Manager advised that the Chief Executive had a scheduled meeting with the Parish Clerks arranged for 27 June, 2013.)

CCDC Cllr. J. Toth, who was also present, said that he believed that CCDC had not taken up the Government's offer in this regard, so may not be required to do what Cllr. Stanley was asking for.

Officers were unable to respond to the specific matters raised, but advised that they would seek clarification, and ask appropriate colleagues to respond to the Town Council.

*(The following response was subsequently provided to the Town Council by Mr. R. Kean, Head of Finance:*

**"Question re: Localisation of Support for Council Tax & payment of Government Grant**

*The precepts for Parishes/ Town Councils are made in two equal instalments in April and September of each year.*

*The first payment for 2013-14 was made on the 8 April 2013 and included 50% of the Government Grant as detailed in the Table below.*

<b><u>Parish/ Town Council</u></b>	<b><u>Total amount of Precept</u></b>	<b><u>Amount Raised by Council Tax</u></b>	<b><u>Government Grant allocation</u></b>	<b><u>First Instalment 50%</u></b>
	<b><u>£</u></b>	<b><u>£</u></b>	<b><u>£</u></b>	<b><u>£</u></b>
<i>Rugeley</i>	<i>319,920</i>	<i>285,552</i>	<i>34,368</i>	<i>159,960</i>
<i>Brereton &amp; Ravenhill</i>	<i>50,647</i>	<i>42,212</i>	<i>8,435</i>	<i>25,324</i>

AMENDED NOTES (ITEM 13)

<b><i>Analysis of First instalment</i></b>				
<i>Rugeley</i>		<i>142,776</i>	<i>17,184</i>	<i>159,960</i>
<i>Brereton &amp; Ravenhill</i>		<i>21,106</i>	<i>4,218</i>	<i>25,324</i>

*I hope this resolves the question raised at the Forum but please do not hesitate to contact me if you require any further clarification.”)*

Redbrook Lane: Illegal Dumping and Insect Infestation – A Member thanked Cllr. C. Bennett, Environment Portfolio Leader, and Officers for the work that had been undertaken to resolve the problems arising from the illegal dumping in Redbrook Lane. The Portfolio Leader advised that the Council had issued a statutory notice on the site owner giving them 48 hours to commence works. Failing this, the Council would begin a disinfestation programme and legal proceedings would be instigated against the owner of the premises, with a charge laid against the property to recover costs incurred from any future sale.

Mobile Units Outside Morrisons – Councillor R. Jones advised of a potential problem that could arise in the event of an emergency evacuation from Morrison’s as a result of mobile units used to display plants for sale. The issue was acknowledged, though it was unclear whose jurisdiction it might fall into, and the matter would be kept under a watching brief.

**14. Next Meeting**

Tuesday, 10 September, 2013. Venue: Rugeley Rose Theatre.

**15. Forward Agenda for Future Meetings**

The Chairman reminded those present that pro formas were attached to their agendas for questions / items to be raised at the next meeting.

The meeting closed at 9.00 pm.

---

CHAIRMAN