



# MINUTES RECORD

FOR MEETINGS OF  
CABINET, COMMITTEES,  
SUB-COMMITTEES AND  
PANELS HELD BETWEEN:

**7 OCTOBER AND  
10 NOVEMBER, 2017**

This Record contains the minutes of meetings of Cabinet, Committees, Sub-Committees and Panels held between 7 October and 10 November, 2017.

Any minutes contained within this Record which have not yet been approved as a correct Record by the relevant body are clearly marked as DRAFT (once approved, any such minutes shall not be included in a future edition of the Record, but will be published on the Council's website).

**Any Member who wishes to ask a question or make a comment on any item in the Record at the Council meeting must give written notice to the Managing Director at least 3 clear working days before the start of the meeting, giving the minute number of the item and setting out clearly the question to be asked or comment to be made.** Questions may be asked of the Leader, Cabinet member who holds the relevant portfolio, or the Chairman of the relevant meeting. Comments and questions shall be confined to the subject matter of that item.

(N.B. For a normal Council meeting held on a Wednesday the deadline is 5:00pm on the previous Thursday.)

A maximum of 10 questions or comments will be permitted for each meeting and no Member may submit more than 2 questions or comments for each Council meeting. Questions and Comments will be accepted in the order in which they are received.

A written response from the Leader, Cabinet Member or Chairman will be compiled. A document containing all questions and comments together with the responses will be circulated to all Members at or before the commencement of the Council meeting. For the avoidance of doubt, the response may be that the person declines to give a response to the question or comment.

The person chairing the Council meeting will call each of the Members who have submitted a question or comment in the order in which they appear in the document and that Member may ask a supplementary question or make a supplementary comment confined to the subject matter or the original question or comment or the content of the response. The Leader, Cabinet Member or Chairman who gave the original response may answer the supplementary question or respond to the supplementary comment but there shall be no further questions, comments or discussion.

This Rule is not intended to restrict Members access to information or to restrict their ability to ask questions or seek information by other means or at other times. Members should before using this Rule contact the Leader, Cabinet Members or the Chairmen of Committees or Officers to ask questions or seek information. Any questions or comments received after the deadline or which exceed the number allowed under this Rule will be passed to the appropriate person but will not be circulated at the Council meeting.

Any recommendations of the Cabinet, Committees, Sub-Committees, Panels or Forums which requires a decision by Council shall be considered as a separate agenda item on the Council agenda. Any questions or comments in relation to such an item will be taken with that item.

## CONTENTS

### PART ONE MINUTES:

Meeting	Date	Minute Numbers	Page Numbers	Status (Draft / Final)
Cabinet	Thursday 19 October	35 – 45	20 – 27	Final
Planning Control Committee	Wednesday 25 October	50 – 59	22 – 24	Final
Health, Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee	Monday 6 November	10 – 18	6 – 11	Draft

### PART TWO MINUTES:

Meeting	Date	Minute Numbers	Page Numbers	Status (Draft / Final)
Cabinet	Thursday 19 October	46	28 – 29	Final

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

# **PART 1**

# **MINUTES**

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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

**HELD ON THURSDAY 19 OCTOBER 2017 AT 4:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

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

**35. Apologies**

None received.

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

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

**37. Updates from Portfolio Leaders**

**Culture and Sport**

Cannock Stadium Site

The Portfolio Leader advised that redevelopment of the site was progressing well. Work on the car park and allotments had been completed, and work was underway on the footpaths and lighting schemes.

**Corporate Improvement**

Rising Brook Bridge, Rugeley

The Portfolio Leader advised that construction of the new footbridge was

underway and going well. The appearance and design of the new bridge was in keeping with the area and the project was being achieved within budget.

The Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader further advised that the official launch of the Rugeley Flood Alleviation Scheme had been arranged for 18 December, 2017 and Members had been invited. It was intended that as part of the launch attendees would be able to visit a grotto location within the scheme area, however this was subject to it first being made safe to access.

## **Crime and Partnerships**

### Taxi Liaison Forum

The Portfolio Leader advised that he had recently received positive impact about the Forum, specifically that it was well regarded and a model for other such Forums to follow.

### Mental Health in the Police Force

The Portfolio Leader advised that he had been looking into sickness absence amongst Police Officers, PCSOs and Police Staff, particularly in instances where stress was the reason for absence, and how this impacted on the mental health of those off sick and those still working who were thus experiencing an increased workload. He would be raising this matter at the next meeting of the Police and Crime Panel. Furthermore, the Staffordshire Police and Crime Commissioner was applying to the Home Office for more funding as Staffordshire Police was unable to cope with its workload at its current staffing levels.

## **38. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 24 August 2017**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 August, 2017, be approved as a correct record and signed.

## **39. Forward Plan**

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

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period October to December, 2017 be noted.

## **40. Quarter 1 Performance Report 2017-18**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance and Corporate Services (Item 6.1 – 6.28 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

(A) The performance information relating to the Priority Delivery Plans (PDPs) as detailed in Appendices 1 to 4 of the Report be noted.

(B) The actions which have been flagged as requiring amendment to the timescale, scope or timeline be noted.

### Reasons for Decisions

Information for performance actions and indicators for quarter 1 2017/18 was included for relevant items in Appendices 1 to 4 of the Report. The overall rankings for each Portfolio area were detailed in section 5 of the Report, indicating that 81.3% of actions/projects had been achieved or were on target to be achieved.

#### **41. Annual Report 2016-17**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Managing Director (Item 7.1 – 7.23 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) The information, achievements and investment in the District as detailed in the Annual Report be noted.
- (B) The Annual Report 2016/17 be approved for publication on the Council's website.

### Reasons for Decisions

The Annual Report 2016/17 presented a summary of the major events, developments and investments in Cannock Chase during the year. As such, it provided a user friendly digest of key information to be presented to the Council's residents, partners and communities.

#### **42. Housing Services Annual Report 2016-17**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 8.1 – 8.27 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The draft 2016/17 Housing Services Annual Report be agreed for circulation to all the Council's tenants.
- (B) If required, the Head of Housing and Partnerships, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, be authorised to make amendments to the draft 2016/17 Housing Services Annual Report prior to circulation.

### Reasons for Decisions

The Council was required to publish the 2016/17 Annual Housing Report as set out in the Regulatory Standards by the Homes and Communities Agency.

The Annual Report must be circulate to all tenants and this would be achieved as part of the Autumn edition of Hometalk.

#### **43. Mandatory and Discretionary Rates Relief Policy**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 9.1 – 9.21 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief Policy as detailed at Appendix 1 of the Report be adopted.
- (B) In particular, the Revaluation Support Scheme included in the policy be noted and adopted.
- (C) Officers award rate relief to affected organisations, in line with the Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief Policy.

#### Reasons for Decisions

The Council had a statutory duty to consider applications for Mandatory and Discretionary Rate Relief as part of its function to administer the National Non-Domestic Rates service.

The Council adopted its current policy in 2014 and the operation of that policy had worked well.

The revised draft policy did not substantially change the rate of relief afforded to current recipients. The changes to the policy would:

- Refresh the policy to account for any changes resulting from the 2017 revaluation of Business Rates;
- Introduce new relief schemes announced in the Chancellor's Spring 2017 budget;
- Remove previous, government funded, schemes which were time related and had expired;
- Make the application and award process as simple as it could be, so as to enable Officers to make awards to affected businesses quickly.

The draft policy was subject to an ongoing consultation process with the Council's major preceptors and other Billing Authorities within Staffordshire.

#### **44. Business Rates Pilot and Pooling Arrangements**

Consideration was given to the Joint Report of the Head of Finance and the Managing Director (Item 10.1 – 10.45 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Participation in the Expression of Interest to form a Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Pool based upon piloting a 100% Business Rates scheme based upon all of the eleven authorities covering the full Staffordshire geography be agreed.
- (B) Subject to (A) above:
  - (i) notification be given to the existing pools of the Council's intention to be part of a pilot application, and if successful to leave that pool;
  - (ii) in the event of the pilot application not being successful, that the pooling arrangements for 2018/19 be based on one of the following potential options:

- a) the current pool remain in place;
  - b) the existing pool be dissolved;
  - c) alternative pooling arrangements based upon a choice of the two existing pool.
- (C) Subject to the above, the Managing Director and Section 151 Officer, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, submit a firm Expression of Interest to be a member of the Staffordshire-wide pool.
- (D) For the reasons set out in the Report related to the timescale for responses, any decisions related to the determination of the proposed pool membership be not subject to call-in.

### Reasons for Decisions

The Department for Communities and Local Government (DCLG) published on 1 September, 2017 an “Invitation to pilot 100% Business Rates Retention in 2018/19 and to pioneer new pooling and tier split models”.

The prospectus provided a framework for the extension of the existing voluntary pooling of business rates revenues to two tier authorities, following the establishment of pilots for Devolution areas only in 2017/18. A pilot enabled 100% of future growth to be retained by the pilot area as compared to the current 50% subject to Fiscal Neutrality. Tariffs or Top Up’s were adjusted to reflect the 100% share and the relevant government grants consolidated within the Business Rates Regime.

“Fiscal Neutrality” was based upon the initial (notional) baselines created at the commencement of the 50% scheme in 2013/14. There was a clear and simple financial advantage therefore if the combined current amount of Actual Business Rates Income (ABR) was in excess of the Government determined Business Rates Baseline as contained within the 50% scheme.

All Staffordshire authorities were in a “growth position” with growth ranging from 1% to 14% with an average of 7% being achieved across the wider Staffordshire proposed pool for 2017/18. This net growth position was at least likely to be maintained for 2018/19 but more likely to increase. Growth within the two tier (County Council) area was estimated to be £13.7m whereas growth in Stoke on Trent City Council was forecast to be £11m. At present only 50% of such growth was retained within Staffordshire and hence an additional £12.35 Million could be retained under pilot arrangements.

The creation of a pilot would see each authority receive a minimum of £200,000 additional resources in 2018/19. The actual direct benefit was based upon proposed locally agreed tier splits. The Tier splits for districts/boroughs had been maintained at 40% with this Council forecast to receive in the region of £241,000 in 2018/19.

Pilots were designated for one year only however it was more than likely that pilots would remain in operation until the full 100% Business Rates Scheme was implemented.

In accordance for the selection criteria for a new pilot there were three potential models for Staffordshire authorities:

- a) Existing Staffordshire & Stoke on Trent Pool

- b) Two Tier Only – County Council & Districts ;or
- c) All eleven authorities covering the full Staffordshire Geography

However it was considered that only c) All eleven authorities covering the full Staffordshire Geography would fully meet the prospectus criteria.

The terms of the new pilots may be slightly different from the 2017/18 pilots with Government yet to determine whether the “no detriment” clause would still apply. This clause ensured that collectively the authorities in the pilot were no worse off than if they remained in the 50% scheme. Prospective Pilots had been asked to indicate if they would wish to proceed with a pilot if this clause was not in place.

The “No Detriment Policy” was felt essential by initial pilots to mitigate the impact of volatility in relation to the transfer of existing funding streams and additional responsibilities into the Business Rates funding regime. This in itself has been mitigated by only Revenue Support Grant and Rural Services grant being foregone under the 2018/19 arrangements.

In order for a “No Detriment” clause to be triggered, in relation to not being worse off as compared to the current 50% scheme for the Staffordshire wide pilot, there would need to be a loss of Business Rates income of in excess of 7% (£12 million) in 2018/19.

Nevertheless the greatest risk in relation to net Business Rates Income was the impact of Appeals following the 2017 revaluation, and future changes in Government Policy. It was therefore proposed that the Expression of Interest was caveated with a No Detriment Clause for:

- The consolidation of hereditaments as a single assessment e.g. Virgin Media;
- Transfer from the Local Rating List/Central Rating Lists;
- Changes in Mandatory Relief Policy / outstanding claims for Charitable Status;
- Changes in the methodology of determining the basis of Rateable Values e.g. GP Surgeries;
- Change in Government/Valuation Office agency (VOA) policy;
- The backdated cost of new appeals post 1 April 2018.

The pool itself would operate a “No Detriment / loss” policy funded as first call against additional growth retained in Staffordshire.

“No loss” was determined to be that a Member would be no worse off:

- by being a Member of the Pool than they would have been if they had not been a Member of the Pool. Each Member would retain the income they would have received if they were not a member of the Pool;
- No Member would be worse off as compared with previous pool arrangements for Staffordshire and Stoke-on-Trent Business Rates Pool (2012) or Greater Birmingham and Solihull Business Rates Pool;
- No Member would be worse off as a result of the increased retained % arising from Tier Splits of the Pilot Scheme.

Membership of the pilot would not affect the sovereignty of each authority. Each authority would still receive separate allocations from Government; would set its

own budget and collect and retain Business Rates.

To be accepted as a new pilot for 2018/19 all parties must be designated as a pool to share business rates income. However Authorities could not be members of two pools.

Authorities would therefore need to determine whether they would wish to be part of the proposed Staffordshire wide Pilot.

If the pilot application was successful there would be a requirement to leave the current pools. Two pooling arrangements existed in Staffordshire. Cannock Chase; East Staffs; Lichfield and Tamworth were members of the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Pool (GBSP) with Newcastle Under Lyme; South Staffs; Stafford; Staffordshire Moorlands; Stoke on Trent; Staffordshire Fire and Rescue and Staffordshire County Council members of the Staffordshire and Stoke on Trent Business Rates Pool (S&SOTP).

Given the timetable for pilot applications and the proximity to the finalisation of the local government finance settlement, all applications must outline, with agreement from all participating authorities, what pooling arrangements they would like to see if their application to become a pilot were unsuccessful.

The rationale of the existing pools, in addition to sharing the risk and reward, was to provide a local incentive so that a proportion of additional resources was retained by the generating authority and to provide a mechanism to support economic growth at a Local Enterprise Partnership or at a Pool area level.

The adoption of the proposed “no loss” basis as compared to the 50% scheme, would maintain the status quo at a financial level. The current levy passed to the pool would be retained by each authority at the outset. The contribution to the Economic Developments partnerships i.e. LEP’S could be maintained either by:

- Re-designation of the existing pools as Economic Development Growth Pools to be funded by the equivalent amount of levy as now (virtual pool);
- Direct contributions to the relevant LEP based upon:
  - a) 40% of retained levy (Current pool arrangements)
  - b) Fixed contribution
  - c) Lump sum / % contribution
- Determined alternative arrangements with the relevant Pool/LEP.

Informal discussions had taken place with the existing Pools and LEP’s and the potential creation of a pilot was not considered a barrier to current membership / working relationships. The DCLG had confirmed that the GBS pool would remain open to current members in the event that the pilot application was unsuccessful.

Expressions of Interest (EOI) were required by the 27 October, 2017 and subject to determination of whether the Council wished to proceed with an EOI, delegated authority to the Managing Director and Section 151 Officer was required to meet this tight deadline.

Appendix D detailed the draft Governance Arrangements for the proposed pilot /pool and delegated authority was required to agree the final pooling Agreement in accordance with the principles as contained in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Successful pilots would be announced as part of the Draft Local Government Settlement in late November/Early December and come into effect from the 1 April, 2018.

**45. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

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

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY 25 OCTOBER, 2017 AT 3:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT:  
Councillors

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

Cooper, Miss J.	Lea, C.I.
Dean, A.	Smith, C.D. (substitute)
Dudson, A.	Snape, D.J.
Grocott, M.R.	Snape, P.A.
Hoare, M.W.A.	Witton, P.T. (substitute)

**50. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors F.W.C. Allen, Mrs. D. Grice, J.T. Kraujalis, M. Sutherland and Mrs. D.M. Todd.

Councillors C.D. Smith and P.T. Witton were in attendance as substitutes for Councillors Sutherland and Kraujalis, respectively.

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

None.

**52. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

None.

**53. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 October, 2017 be approved as a correct record.

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

RESOLVED:

That the following site visits be undertaken by the Committee:

- (A) CH/17/333 – Field adjacent to Ladyhill Cottage, Penkridge Bank Road, Slitting Mill, Rugeley, WS15 2YD: Section 73 application to remove condition 1 of planning permission CH/11/0265 to allow permanent retention of building for use as a tack room, hay and feed store.

Reason:- to assess the visual amenity of the site and impact on the local area.

- (B) 13 Chancery Drive, Hednesford – building of extension following removal of existing conservatory.

Reason: to assess the visual amenity of the site.

*The Development Control Manager advised that it may be the case that an application in respect of this property had not yet been received, but would take note of the site visit request should an application be submitted.*

#### **55. Application CH/17/268, 36 Yew Tree Road, Rugeley, WS15 1AL – Residential Development:- Erection of 1 no. dwelling (outline application including access**

Following a site visit by Members of the Committee consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.15 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr J. Imber, speaking in favour of the application on behalf of the Applicant.

RESOLVED:

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

#### **56. Application CH/17/221, 6 Coppice Court, Cannock, WS11 1PB – Residential Development: Two Storey Side Extension**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.16 – 6.29 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr J. Toth, objecting to the application and Mr A. Nolan, speaking in favour of the application on behalf of the applicant.

RESOLVED:

That the application which was recommended for approval, be refused for the following reasons:

The proposed development would result in the development of the whole of the grass strip between the existing dwelling and the entrance to Coppice Court and as such would constitute an overdevelopment of the site and an intrusion into the sense of openness that was part of the design concept of the original estate to the significant detriment of the street scene contrary to Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan and the NPPF.

**57. Application CH/17/330, Footbridge located adjacent to Hagley Playing Fields, Western Springs Road, Rugeley, WS15 2AS – Construction of a new footbridge to replace former collapsed bridge**

*Councillor Grocott left the meeting for the duration of this item having predetermined this matter.*

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.30 – 6.41 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.

*Councillor Grocott returned to the meeting at the end of this item.*

**58. Application CH/17/333 Field adjacent to Ladyhill Cottage, Penkrige Bank Road, Slitting Mill, Rugeley, WS15 2YD – Section 73 application to remove condition 1 of planning permission CH/11/0265 to allow permanent retention of building for use as a tack room, hay and feed store**

Consideration of this application was deferred until the next meeting of the Committee to allow a site visit to be undertaken (Minute no. 54 above refers).

**59. Application CH/17/351 Vacant site north of 385 Norton Road, Heath Hayes, Cannock WS12 3HJ – Outline application with all matters reserved for residential development**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.49 – 6.63 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.

The meeting closed at 3:55 p.m.

---

CHAIRMAN

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

# DRAFT

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**HEALTH, CULTURE AND ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**HELD ON MONDAY 6 NOVEMBER, 2017 AT 4.00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

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

Crabtree, S.K.	Smith, C.D.
Freeman, Miss. M.A.	Stretton, Mrs. P.Z.
Johnson, J.P.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.
Johnson, T.B.	Tait, Ms. L.
Martin, Mrs. C.E.	

By invitation:

Staffordshire County Council Co-Opted Member, Councillor P. Hewitt

Prior to the meeting the Chairman requested that an update be circulated to all Members of the Committee in respect of Item 5 on the Agenda.

## **10. Apologies**

No apologies received.

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

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

## **12. Minutes**

A Member referred to Page 2, Minute 7 and the parking situation outside the new development and asked if parking on the football field had been explored.

Mike Edmonds, Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles indicated that discussions had been held but had proved unsuccessful, therefore alternative ideas were being considered.

A Member referred to Page 2, Minute 7 and asked for an update with regard to the Green Flag accreditation as there were issues at some of the parks.

# DRAFT

Mike Edmonds indicated that he would discuss the Green Flag accreditation issue under item 6 and any parks issues under item 8.

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Health, Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee held on 10 July, 2017 be approved as a correct record.

## **13. Healthwatch Staffordshire - Update**

There was no update for Members of the Committee as the representative from Healthwatch Staffordshire was not in attendance.

## **14. Staffordshire County Council's Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee - Update**

The Chairman gave an update from the following meetings:

- 7 August, 2017
- 18 September, 2017
- 13 October, 2017
- 6 November, 2017

A Member referred to the meeting held on 7 August, 2017 and expressed concern with care packages being offered to patients. She indicated that there had been failings within the District as some patients had been sent home either without a care package, or the incorrect one.

Members discussed this and expressed the same concerns indicating that sending patients' home was more about freeing up beds and whilst social care funding was being cut, the situation would not get any better.

A Member then referred to the meeting held on 6 November, 2017 with regard to community beds being reduced and the lack of focus on the South of the County. She felt this area needed to be addressed in much more detail.

However, County Councillor P. Hewitt recalled that he thought there were more community beds. The Chairman of the Committee would check the number of beds for both the North and South of the County and report back.

## **15. Quarters 1 and 2 Performance Report 2017-18 – Health, Culture and Environment PDP 2017-18**

Consideration was given to the Quarters 1 and 2 Performance Report 2017-18 – Health, Culture and Environment PDP 2017-18 (Item 6.1 – 6.10 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

### Achieve a Green Flag for Hednesford Park

A Member reported that the Green Flag status had been awarded for Cannock

# DRAFT

Park in July; however she asked if the pole would remain in the park as there was no flag being displayed due to a problem with the flag plate and there was no certificate on display on the public noticeboard.

Mike Edmonds indicated that the flags had not been displayed as new flag poles were currently on order, and although discussions had been had, the location of the flag pole would remain in the park.

Tom Walsh, Parks and Open Spaces Manager reported that all of the memorial flag poles also needed to be renewed and therefore the Council had to obtain a number of quotes for this. He also advised that all of the old certificates would be renewed but this would be done at the same time.

## “Start Peddling” – Cycle Sessions will be provided in Hednesford Park, including inclusive cycling

In response to a question raised by a Member concerning moving the cycling initiative from Cannock Park to Hednesford, Mike Edmonds advised that he would need to liaise with the leisure provider, however he understood that there was no intention to move it from the park, however delivery may need to be rotated across other sites - within the district.

## **16. Update on New Cemetery Proposals and Agree Core Requirements**

Tom Walsh gave a presentation on the New Cemetery Proposals.

### Background

- No new burials at Cannock since 2005
- Stile Cop extended in 2011-12 – burials until 2025
- The Council has been looking at other site option since 2000
- Investigation into 15 sites, eventually Norton Road purchased in 2015
- Planning permission obtained and further investigations in 2016
- Capital shortfall to deliver current proposal

### Cabinet August, 2016

- Agreed to procure a private sector partner to address the funding shortfall in the Capital

### PDP Actions 2017-18

- Determine core requirements for new cemetery before exploring delivery options
- Explore delivery options and review way forward

### New Cemetery Site

- 50 ac site burying into 6 ac
- 1 ha at 1750 graves
- Green belt and adjacent to SSSI
- Accessed from underneath highway
- Pylons/flooding on part of site
- Burials will be on tiers

# DRAFT

## Suggested Core Requirements of the Service

- Council's minimum standards must be met
- Opening hours and cemetery layout
- Exclusive rights of burial proof
- Hours of internment 9am-3pm Monday to Friday
- Lawned sections
- 915mm (3') Ht\*width\*455mm
- Depth on base >(18')
- NAMM fixings

## Core Requirements of the Service

- Provide affordable choices for the community – costs of burial
  - Increases in line with annual CCDC % unless agreed with CCDC
  - CCDC rate including multiplier?
  - Children/stillborn free of charge
- Investment strategy
- Pre-purchase strategy – should we allow?
- Woodland/natural burials

## Way Forward

### Private Sector Partnership

- Soft market testing
- Advert in specialist journal
- Bidders day
- Develop questionnaire
- Shape the service through open dialogue
- No commitment

## Risk

Risk: There may be no interest and the Council may need to consider other options

- Release required capital to deliver scheme
- Reduce scheme
- Commercial opportunity

Members of the Committee were then given the opportunity to ask questions.

Mike Edmonds commented that he was seeking to gauge what was considered important to both Members and the Council. He explained that the purpose of agreeing the core requirements was to test the market and see what was viable for those that may invest capital in the site. He indicated that if procurement was an option, then this could be explored.

A Member commented that if the Council was managing the site, the aesthetic aspect of the site would need to be pleasant.

Mike Edmonds responded and suggested that something could be included in the requirements; however discussions would need to take place first with potential operators.

## DRAFT

A Member commented that if an operator was maintaining the site, there was a risk that they would try and profit in some way. She also referred to those that had lived in the District most of their lives but may have been living away as a consequence of being in a care home and asked what impact it would have on these people.

Tom Walsh advised that allowances would be made, for example an allowance of 4 years would be made for someone who had resided in a care home and 2 years generally, however this would need to be built into the core requirements and he added that there was a multiplier applied to charges if the person had resided outside of the District.

Members also discussed other areas including green burials and purchasing of plots, where a Member asked about the core requirements for block purchases of plots as he expressed concern that third parties could sell these on.

Tom Walsh explained that historically there were some difficulties with third parties selling on plots; however they would be required to have the relevant documents to prove they had exclusive rights of burial.

Mike Edmonds reported that he would feed information back to Members of the Committee in March following the bidder's day.

Members of the Committee were happy to accept the core requirements provided the multiplier was included and green burials as discussed.

### **17. Update on Review of Parks Proposal**

Mike Edmonds explained that the service would be brought back in-house as of 1 April, 2018. Discussions were ongoing and the service would be monitored over the next 12-18 months.

A Member asked if Members of the Committee could view documentation of what the setup was likely to be and how the contract would operate, given that she expressed concern that she had never seen a copy of the current contract and operating arrangements. She also questioned whether it was providing value for money particularly for Cannock Park.

The Member expressed concern that she had requested information about the contract at the last meeting in July and nothing had advanced since then. She commented that the Committee should be in a position to scrutinise the new arrangements before the contract is brought back in-house in April, 2018.

Members of the Committee also expressed concern that there was only one meeting of the Committee in March and that a meeting was needed in between in order to discuss this issue.

Mike Edmonds advised Members of the Committee that there would be no changes to the way the contract was currently run when brought back in-house, although it had been agreed to carry out a review in 12 months. He agreed that he would circulate the information requested to Members by the end of January,

# DRAFT

2018 and then make the necessary arrangements for an additional Committee meeting, if needed.

A Member reported that he had received many complaints regarding the poor state of play equipment in Cannock Park. He circulated pictures of the equipment and asked if it was condemned or still accessible to the public as he was concerned that a child could suffer an injury and commented that the state of the equipment did not put the Council in a good light.

A Member also commented that the climbing net play equipment at Cannock Park appeared to have been taped up and was not acceptable. She expressed concern that Members were trustees and a meeting had been held last year with officers to discuss the non-submission of returns to the Charity Commission; however it appeared that the Council was in the same position again.

The Member expressed concern that there was no up to date management plan and no park protocol in respect of anti-social behaviour across the District. She reported that she was approached by the local Police asking about the park protocol; however it was out of date which was not ideal considering the training that people had undertaken in order for it to be used.

Tom Walsh referred to and explained how Cannock Park was not included under the Streetscene contract which was in-house. He referred to the pictures and indicated that the climbing net had been modified and a small net removed which would be replaced and discussed the wearing of the wooden laminate on the other piece of equipment.

Mike Edmonds advised that there would be a full inspection of this play equipment tomorrow. He would circulate a copy of the current contract, management plans, Park Protocol and schedule of playground inspections to all Members of the Committee and following this, if Members still felt that another meeting was required, he would organise this. He would also ensure the Charity Commission returns were submitted.

## **18. Update on Task and Finish Group – Hot Food Takeaways**

Dave Prosser-Davies, Food Safety and Licensing Manager reported that the Task and Finish Group had met today and agreed the Terms of Reference and Action Plan with completion of the project by March, 2018.

He indicated that the Group would engage with stakeholders and look at lines of inquiry with a view to holding an enquiry day where a brief presentation would be given and views sought. A final report would then be submitted to the Health, Culture and Environment Scrutiny Committee.

---

CHAIRMAN

The meeting closed at 5.35 pm

# **PART 2**

# **MINUTES**

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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

**HELD ON THURSDAY 19 OCTOBER 2017 AT 4:00 P.M.**

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

**PART 2**

**46. Debt Recovery**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Finance (Item 12.1 – 12.24 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The amounts detailed in Appendices 1 and 2 of the Report be written off.
- (B) The actions of the Head of Finance in writing off the irrecoverable debts, below £1,000, be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

*Council Tax*

Set out at Appendix 1 to the Report was a list of arrears over £1,000 which could not be collected for the reasons stated. Included in the Appendix were 38 cases with arrears totalling £69,463.06

All of the amounts written off would be charged against the provision for bad debts.

*Non-Domestic Rates*

Set out at Appendix 2 to the Report was a list of Non-Domestic arrears over £1,000 which could not be collected for the reasons stated. Included in the Appendix were 28 cases with arrears totalling £179,882.33.

Some of the Business Rates debts were being recommended for write-off on the grounds of insolvency of the companies that previously occupied properties. It was not uncommon in these circumstances for the properties concerned to be re-occupied, fairly quickly, by new companies often with similar names to the insolvent organisation. It often therefore appeared that the company had continued to trade, though this was not the case.

Where this situation occurred, the new occupier was an entirely separate legal entity to the previous occupant and could not be held liable for rates due from the insolvent company. Members were assured that such debts were only submitted for write-off when the Council was sure that the debts could not be recovered.

The meeting closed at 4:37 p.m.

---

LEADER