



## **MINUTES RECORD**

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

**13 NOVEMBER, 2017 AND  
9 FEBRUARY, 2018**

This Record contains the minutes of meetings of Cabinet, Committees, Sub-Committees and Panels held between 13 November, 2017 and 9 February, 2018.

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)
Customers & Corporate Scrutiny Committee	Tuesday 14 November	7 – 12	4 – 9	Draft
Planning Control Committee	Wednesday 15 November	60 – 70	25 – 28	Final
Cabinet	Thursday 16 November	47 – 56	30 – 35	Final
Housing, Crime and Partnerships Scrutiny Committee	Thursday 23 November	11 – 17	5 – 9	Draft
Audit & Governance Committee	Tuesday 5 December	18 – 27	10 – 13	Draft
Planning Control Committee	Wednesday 6 December	71 – 82	29 – 38	Final
Economic Development and Town Centres	Tuesday 12 December	7 – 11	5 – 8	Draft
Cabinet	Thursday 14 December	57 – 66	36 – 41	Final
Appeals and Complaints Panel	Wednesday 20 December	1 – 4	1	Final
Planning Control Committee	Wednesday 3 January	83 – 90	39 – 41	Final
Planning Control Committee	Wednesday 24 January	91 – 97	42 – 47	Draft
Cabinet	Thursday 25 January	69 – 85	45 – 58	Draft
Appeals and Complaints Panel	Tuesday 6 February	1 – 4	1	Final

PART TWO MINUTES:

Meeting	Date	Minute Numbers	Page Numbers	Status (Draft / Final)
Cabinet	Thursday 14 December	67 – 68	42 – 44	Final
Appeals and Complaints Panel	Wednesday 20 December	5	2 – 3	Final
Appeals and Complaints Panel	Tuesday 6 February	5	2 – 3	Final

# **PART 1**

# **MINUTES**

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

# DRAFT

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**CUSTOMERS AND CORPORATE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY 14 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4.00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT:  
Councillors

Foley, D. (Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Snape, D.J. (substitute)
Cooper, Miss J.	Snape, P.A.
Grocott, M.R.	Sutherland, M.
Johnson, T.B.	Woodhead, P.E.
Martin, Mrs. C.E.	

**7. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillors Mrs. H.M. Sutton, Miss S. Whitehouse and P.T. Witton.

Councillor D.J. Snape was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Mrs. Sutton.

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

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

**9. Minutes**

Minute No.4 – End of Year 2016/17 Customers Priority Delivery Plan Performance Update

A Member raised concern that the strategic review of the Depot appeared to be an ongoing issue which had no signs of being resolved in the near future. The Head of Finance replied that an options appraisal had been undertaken, business cases produced as necessary and part of the site had been identified for development. Members were also advised that this matter now sat within the remit of the Economic Development and Town Centres Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 29 June, 2017 be approved as a correct record and signed.

# DRAFT

## 10. Quarters 1 and 2 2017/18 Customers & Corporate Priority Delivery Plan Update

Members considered and noted the latest performance information for the Customers & Corporate Priority Delivery Plan (PDP) 2017/18 (Item 4.1 – 4.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Governance and Corporate Services reported that of the seven actions included in the PDP, progress was delayed on the following for the reasons given in the update report:

- Development of the Customer Access Strategy – it was now expected that completion of this action would happen in 2018/19;
- Review of call-handling operation between the Contact Centre and Social Alarms Service – transfer of the Social Alarms team was due to happen in January 2018, with delivery of this action now expected to commence in 2018/19 instead.

A Member queried why reduced opening hours for the Hednesford and Rugeley Area Offices had been included in the PDP when the changes had already been made. The Head of Governance and Corporate Services replied that this action had been included as it would be necessary to review what impact the changes had on residents and the Council. Linked to this, another Member queried what was happening with regards future planned use of the Rugeley Office. The Head of Finance replied that a decision was awaited from Staffordshire County Council about its intentions for the part of the building which it currently occupied before any final options could be determined.

A Member asked for clarity as to what operational arrangements were in place for usage of office space at Hednesford Library for the four days a week the Council did not require access. The Head of Finance replied that as the library was run by volunteers, access was dependent on their availability each week, but he would check with the appropriate manager as to what the arrangements were.

A Member asked for information about what strategy had been agreed for implementation of the Apprenticeship Levy. The Head of Governance and Corporate Services replied that this strategy was to be implemented over two years, with the first year targeted at existing Council staff in team leader/supervisory positions and the second year focussed on succession planning and wider recruitment of apprentices.

## 11. Scrutiny Review of the Financial Recovery Plan

The Chairman outlined that the purpose of the review was for the Committee to look at: the changes made to Financial Recovery Plan (FRP) proposals as a result of the consultation process, including the comments made by the Customers & Corporate Scrutiny Committee; progress made in delivering the savings outlined in the FRP; and the impact/consequences of the savings proposals.

## DRAFT

Members considered the documents circulated with the agenda (Item 5.1 – 5.13 of the Official Minutes of the Council) and raised the following comments and queries, to which Officers responded in turn:

- Was this an actual review or just a paper exercise as a number of the savings options included in the FRP had already been completed, and other options included/withdrawn in contrast to whether or not they had public support, e.g. the reduction in operational costs of the Parks and Open Spaces Service and the reduced staffing budget in Environmental Health?

The Head of Governance and Corporate Services responded that it had not been expected Cabinet would agree with all of the responses received, however they needed to agree on which options to put forward for the 2017/18 Budget in order that the required savings could be achieved.

The Head of Finance further responded that the consultation survey could only provide limited information on each of the options proposed in order to make it as easy as possible to complete. Furthermore, of those options included which had either been or were about to be actioned, it was necessary to ask the question in order that an audit trail was in place.

- There was a need to learn for future consultations about how to phrase the questions asked and the relevance of each question to ensure they were appropriate and could be understood by consultees.

The Head of Governance and Corporate Services responded that at the time of the consultation more detailed information about each of the proposals was available to read on the Council's website, although it was accepted not all respondents could access it.

The Policy and Communications Manager further responded that the Council had a statutory duty to consult on any proposed service changes which would impact on residents.

- The consultation should only have included issues on key service provision which directly affected the public; matters of a day-to-day nature were not relevant.

The Head of Finance responded that each policy option included was assessed for how the public would be affected if the option was implemented. Of all the options proposed, only 10 were not considered to have a public impact.

- Withdrawal of funding for Christmas lights. This matter had a particularly adverse affect on non-parished areas as no consideration was given as to what alternative arrangements could be put in place.

The Head of Finance responded that as per the Committee's recommendation on this matter, a request was put to the MGDOV developers to provide funding/sponsorship for Christmas lights in Cannock town centre and

## DRAFT

Chadsmoor. The developers had advised that due to putting necessary resources into delivering the S106 agreement for the project they were unable to provide such funding at the present time.

- The consultation was undertaken due to the early closure of Rugeley Power Station (RPS) and the Council needing to seek views on what services could be reduced or cut entirely, regardless of whether those services had to be delivered or were nice things to provide (e.g. stopping floral displays in the town centres and on traffic islands).
- In spite of the reductions made, the Council had still managed to maintain services at a good level when compared to council areas of a similar size.
- What was the current position with regards to relocating the Cannock Citizens Advice Bureau (CAB) office?

The Head of Governance and Corporate Services responded that discussions were ongoing with CAB representatives to move their office into the Civic Centre which would help to reduce their considerable property costs.

- Was the savings option question for the Revenues and Benefits receptions in Hednesford and Rugeley asked of residents in just those areas or across the whole District?

The Policy and Communications Manager responded that as it was a District-wide consultation none of the questions had been targeted towards specific areas.

- A follow-up review of the changes to the Countryside Services resources should be undertaken to assess the financial and reputational impact on the Council as well as the impact on enjoyment of the District and quality of life for the public.

The Head of Governance and Corporate Services responded that a preliminary review was planned to take place at the end of 2017/18, but a full detailed review may be difficult to achieve. It would be for the appropriate Scrutiny Committee to decide if such a review was necessary.

- Once the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village (MGDOV) was open and redevelopment of the RPS site underway, it may be possible to reverse some of the cuts made as the Council's funding levels would start to increase again.

The Head of Finance responded that there was still great uncertainty about the future of local government finance, particularly in respect of Business Rates and receipts available from 2021/2022, which could be directly impacted by the MGDOV. Issues also continued to exist about potential changes to New Homes Bonus monies which the Council would continue to lobby the Government on.

## DRAFT

- As sponsorship of traffic islands by local businesses was an easy way of securing income, why did this no longer seem to be happening?

The Head of Finance replied that traffic islands were liable for Business Rates charges, which for the entire District came to approximately £27,000, therefore any such sponsorship raised would be negated by having to pay the charges.

- What impact would the proposed HS2 Depot on the RPS site have on the Council's Business Rates income?

The Head of Finance responded that as HS2 was a national project, the Depot would be placed on the national rating list rather than the local list, meaning no income would be received directly by the Council.

- Why was the review of the Local Strategic Partnership (LSP) withdrawn as a savings option?

The Head of Finance responded that the proposal would not have delivered sufficient savings to make it worthwhile being implemented and the LSP continued to play an important role for cross-partnership working.

The Policy and Communications Manager further responded that although nearly 50% of survey respondents had agreed with this option, it was important to note that the final options included in the budget were not based solely on the consultation feedback.

*(Councillor P.E. Woodhead left the meeting at this point and did not return.)*

- Were there any expectations from the forthcoming Autumn Budget in respect of local government funding?

The Head of Finance responded that at present it was difficult to know what to expect, however the situation would become clearer upon publication of the post-Budget Local Governance Finance Statement.

- What was the current income position for the Cannock Indoor Market Hall?

The Head of Finance responded that income was currently down compared to the 2016/17 outturn figure and the 2017/18 budget position. A report was due to be considered by Cabinet in December about the current financial position of the Market Hall and its future use.

- Were the agreed savings on track to be delivered?

The Head of Finance responded that most of the agreed options had been implemented; however the document did highlight those areas where further work was needed and impact reviews required. A report on Shared Services savings was going to be considered by Cabinet on 16 November.

## DRAFT

- If the RPS site was due to be used as a base for building of HS2 then the Council should seek compensation from the Government for loss of income as a result of development of the RPS site being delayed.

The Head of Finance responded that the Officers would pursue this course of action where appropriate to do so.

Members then agreed that the option to no longer fund or install Christmas illuminations be reviewed after 12 months to assess its impact on the areas affected.

It was also requested that for future consultations consideration be given to including questions targeted to specific residents/areas where appropriate.

### 12. Work Programme Update

The Head of Governance and Corporate Services advised that the review of Electoral Registration and Polling Stations would commence at the next meeting of the Committee scheduled for 12 March, 2018.

The meeting closed at 5:30pm

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**

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

**WEDNESDAY 15 NOVEMBER, 2017 AT 3:00 P.M.**

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

**PART 1**

PRESENT:  
Councillors

Pearson, A.R. (Vice-Chairman - in the Chair)

Allen, F.W.C.	Kraujalis, J.T.
Cartwright, Mrs. S.	Lea, C.I.
Cooper, Miss J.	Smith, C.D. (substitute for
Dean, A.	P. Snape)
Dudson, A.	Snape, D.J.
Grocott, M.R.	Sutherland, M
Hoare, M.W.A.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.

Prior to the commencement of the meeting the Vice-Chairman, Councillor A. Pearson advised that the Chairman, Councillor Mrs. S. Cartwright had asked that he Chair the meeting as she had to leave the meeting early.

Councillor Pearson also advised that the order of the agenda would be amended and the TPO application in respect of Lea Hall Miners Welfare and Social Club would be considered as the first item.

**60. Application CH/17/236, Land at Hednesford Football Club, Keys Park Road, Hednesford – Residential development comprising 123 no. dwellings including 22 no. affordable dwellings, open space and associated road and parking**

The Development Control Manager advised that following the publication of the agenda an issue had arisen in relation to this application. The applicant had raised concern regarding two proposed parking conditions; Officers had attempted to resolve these issues with Highways prior to the meeting but had not been able to do so. He suggested that the application should be deferred to allow Officers to discuss this matter with Highways.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to allow Officers to discuss the issue regarding the proposed parking conditions with Highways.

**61. Apologies**

An apology for absence was received from Councillor P.A. Snape.

(Councillor C.D. Smith was in attendance as substitute for Councillor P. Snape).

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

None.

**63. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

Councillor J. Kraujalis advised that he had been approached by a resident of Skipton Place at the site visit in relation to Application CH/17/377, 17 Southgate, Cannock – residential development:- erection of 1 no. one bed detached bungalow.

**64. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 25 October, 2017 be approved as a correct record.

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

None.

**66. Proposed Tree Preservation Order at Lea Hall Miners Welfare and Social Club, Sandy Lane, Rugeley. WS15 2LB – TPO No. 2017/02**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.111 – 6.116 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application, the Tree Preservation Officer addressed the Committee and outlined the reasons for the application.

RESOLVED:

That Tree Preservation Order No. 2017/02 be confirmed without modification unless it is established that the tree is situated on unregistered land in which case the description of the land in the TPO be modified to read land adjacent to Lea Hall Miners Welfare and Social Club, Sandy Lane, Rugeley. WS15 2LB.

**67. Application CH/17/333, Field adjacent to Ladyhill Terrace, 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**

Following a site visit by Members of the Committee consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application the Development Control Manager read out a letter in support of the application that had been received from the Applicant. She was unable to attend to speak on the application at today's meeting and requested that her letter be read out.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved.

**68. Application CH/17/364, 412 Rawnsley Road, Cannock WS12 1RB – Residential development:- erection of 1 three bedroom detached dwelling and 1 four bedroom detached dwelling**

Following a site visit by Members consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.18 – 6.26 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by the Applicant's agent, Chris Dwan, who was speaking in favour of the application.

RESOLVED:

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

**69. Application CH/17/377, 17 South Gate, Cannock - Residential development:- erection of 1 no. one bed detached bungalow**

The Committee Clerk left the meeting at this point in the proceedings as a close relative had submitted an objection to the application which was being read out by the Development Control Manager. The Principal Solicitor therefore took the minutes in relation to this application.

Following a site visit by Members consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.89 – 6.100 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application the Development Control Manager read out a letter of objection that had been received from a neighbour. She was unable to attend the meeting to speak on the application and had requested that her letter be read out.

RESOLVED:

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

The proposal, by virtue of the building to plot ratio would appear as a cramped form of development and hence constitute an overdevelopment of the site to the detriment of the character and appearance of the area and the residential amenity of the occupiers of the neighbouring residential properties. As such the proposal

would not be well-related to existing buildings and their surroundings contrary to Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1) and constitute poor design which should be refused in accordance with paragraphs 17(4) and 64 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

(Councillors F.W.C. Allen, A. Dean, M. Grocott, A. Pearson and Mrs. D. Todd requested that their names be recorded as having voted against this decision).

**70. Application CH/17/360, Land at western end of Brick Kiln Way, Brereton, Rugeley – Retention of children’s treehouse and stone gabion caged retaining structure**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.101 – 6.110 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. John Heminsley, speaking in favour of the application, on behalf of the applicant. He commented that should Members be minded to approve the application the applicant would be happy to accept an additional condition requiring the erection of a fence.

At this point in the proceedings Councillor Mrs. S. Cartwright left the meeting during the consideration of this application and therefore did not take part in the vote.

RESOLVED:

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

“Within 3 months of the date of this permission a 1.8m high palisade or palladin style fence with gate shall be erected on a line drawn along the top of the gabion and stretching to the perimeter fence on either side”.

The meeting closed at 4.00pm.

---

CHAIRMAN

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

**HELD ON THURSDAY 16 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

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

**47. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillor G. Adamson, Leader of the Council.

In the Leader's absence the meeting was chaired by the Deputy Leader.

Apologies were also noted for the Managing Director who was unable to be present due to attending a meeting of the Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBSLEP) Executive Board.

**48. 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.

**49. Updates from Portfolio Leaders**

**Crime and Partnerships**

Catch 22

The Portfolio Leader advised the meeting that he had attended a briefing about Catch 22, a 'social business', i.e. a not for profit business with a social mission. Catch 22's mission was to integrate with a variety of public services at every

stage of the social welfare cycle to build resilience and aspiration in people and communities.

**50. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 19 October 2017**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 October, 2017, be approved as a correct record and signed.

**51. Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period November, 2017 to January, 2018 (Item 5.1 – 5.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council) was considered.

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period November, 2017 to January, 2018 be noted.

**52. Shared Services – Phase 2**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance and Corporate Services (Item 6.1 – 6.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

(A) Sharing of the following services be approved:

(i) Information Governance – to be led by Cannock Chase District Council, and

(ii) Pest & Dog Control – to be led by Stafford Borough Council. A further report to be submitted in due course outlining the service level agreement and seeking permission to delegate the provision of the service to Stafford Borough Council.

(B) Agreement be given to widening the scope of services to be considered for sharing to include the wider remit of Environmental Services (this will include Streetscene, Grounds Maintenance, Parks & Open Spaces and Trees).

(C) Agreement be given to commissioning an independent options appraisal jointly with Stafford Borough Council to consider all options for the future delivery of Environmental Services.

Reasons for Decisions

Following the agreement of a Memorandum of Understanding between Cannock Chase District Council (CCDC) and Stafford Borough Council (SBC) in 2009, the first phase of Shared Services commenced in 2011.

As part of the Financial Recovery Plan (FRP), as reflected in the General Fund Revenue Budget Medium Term Financial Plan, agreed by Council in February 2017, it was agreed that consideration be given to sharing further services with SBC. Officers of the two councils have been exploring this and outline business cases developed for:

- (i) Environmental Health;
- (ii) Planning Services; and
- (iii) Information Governance.

The work done so far indicated that whilst savings could be achieved from the sharing of these services, more work was necessary before a final conclusion could be reached. The main issue was the scoping of the Environmental Health Service as there were significant differences in the service profile for the two councils which made it difficult to agree the parameters of the service to be shared. It was therefore necessary to widen the scope of the services to be considered for sharing to the broader remit of Environmental Services. This would also significantly increase the opportunities for savings to be delivered for both councils and other benefits such as increased resilience in service delivery.

Given the nature and scale of Environmental Services, it was proposed that an independent options appraisal, including service delivery options, be commissioned. The costs of the options appraisal would be met jointly from the Shared Services reserves of both councils.

Although it was proposed to delay the decision on sharing Environmental Health Services pending the outcome of the wider review of Environmental Services, it was proposed to proceed with the sharing of the Pest and Dog Control Service. Since CCDC's contractor, Mitie, decided to terminate its contract early, SBC had stepped in to provide the service. It was now proposed to establish this more permanently as a shared service between the two councils with SBC acting as the lead authority. This would allow greater opportunities to integrate the service provision.

A business case had been established for a shared Information Governance service on the basis that this was a specialist service with limited resources so it would seem sensible to share expertise. CCDC would act as the lead authority for this service as it had an appropriately experienced Data Protection Officer and SBC did not have an equivalent resource. SBC would contribute £20,000 per annum toward the cost of the provision of a comprehensive Information Governance service.

### **53. Quarter 2 Performance Report 2017-18**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance and Corporate Services (Item 7.1 – 7.34 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 2 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 and

indicated that 85.1% of actions/projects had been achieved or were on target to be achieved.

#### **54. Strategic Risk Register**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance and Corporate Services (Item 8.1 – 8.18 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

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

##### Reasons for Decisions

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

<b>Risk Colour</b>	<b>Number of Risks at 1 April 2017</b>	<b>Number of Risks at 1 Oct 2017</b>
Red	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>
Amber	<b>5</b>	<b>5</b>
Green	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>

#### **55. Publication of Part 1 Brownfield Land Register**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Interim Head of Economic Development (Item 9.1 – 9.34 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Publication of the Council's first Part 1 Brownfield Land Register be approved.
- (B) The Head of Economic Development, in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader, be delegated authority to approve any consultations related to the Brownfield Land Register and the publication of future versions of the Council's Part 1 Brownfield Land Register until such time as a Part 2 Register is produced.
- (C) The next steps in relation to producing the Part 2 Brownfield Land Register be noted, including the different approval mechanisms required and a further report being required.

##### Reasons for Decisions

The Housing and Planning Act 2016 introduced a requirement (Section 151) for Local Planning Authorities to produce and maintain a 'Register of Land' (Section 14A inserted into the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004). The Housing and Planning Act 2016 also introduced the ability for 'Permission in Principle' to be granted to residential-led development (Section 15) via a planning application route (for non-major development) or via a 'qualifying document' allocation i.e. within a Local Plan development document or the 'Register of Land' (Sections 58A and 59A inserted into the Town and Country

Planning Act 1990). The details followed in two sets of regulations.

The Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Register) Regulations 2017 (hereafter referred to as the Register Regulations) came into force on 16 April, 2017. They placed a duty on the Council to prepare, maintain and publish a register of previously developed land (commonly known as brownfield land) which was suitable for residential development. These set out the detailed requirements for Brownfield Land Registers including the requirement for a register to be kept in two parts; criteria for what sites should be entered; the information to be entered into the register; publicity, consultation and representation requirements for Part 2 of the register; exemptions from the register; and the requirement for the first Brownfield Land Register to be published by 31 December, 2017 and updated at least annually thereafter.

The Town and Country Planning (Permission in Principle) Order 2017 came into force on 15 April, 2017. In effect, this enabled sites on Part 2 of a Brownfield Land Register to be granted 'Permission in Principle' for residential development following mandatory publicity and consultation requirements being satisfied.

The Government recently published (28 July, 2017) within the National Planning Practice Guidance specific guidance to support Local Planning Authorities in the production of Brownfield Land Registers. This included a specified template for the Part 1 Register to be completed and submitted to Government, when requested.

The Council's first Part 1 Brownfield Register had been produced in accordance with the relevant regulations and guidance as detailed in Appendix 1 to the Report. The Register was recommended for approval to be published by 31 December, 2017 in order to meet the deadline set by the legislation.

The Council was not required to produce a Part 2 Register by 31 December, 2017. There was currently no deadline set for the production of Part 2. The next steps in relation to the production of a Part 2 Register were set out for information in the Report.

#### **56. Update on Cannock Chase Community Infrastructure Levy Financial Year Report**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Interim Head of Economic Development (Item 10.1 – 10.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) financial year report be noted.

#### Reasons for Decision

The Council approved the CIL Charging Scheduled and Regulation 123 List of infrastructure projects eligible to receive funding at its meeting on 15 April, 2015. CIL came into effect in relation to relevant chargeable development on 1 June, 2015.

CIL was intended to provide a funding stream for infrastructure needed to support the policies and proposals in the adopted Local Plan. It would partly replace funding previously obtained via Planning Obligations (Section 106 agreements and Unilateral Undertakings) which had become more limited in scope in relation to pooling of funds from 5 or more obligations as a result of the

regulations.

The Council was legally required to produce a financial year report on CIL receipt and spend in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010 (as amended) (the CIL Regulations). This was the second financial report since the adoption of CIL and it provided a summary of CIL receipts and expenditure for the financial 2016-17.

The meeting closed at 4.20 p.m.

---

LEADER

# DRAFT

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**HOUSING, CRIME AND PARTNERSHIPS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**HELD ON THURSDAY 23 NOVEMBER 2017 AT 4:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

## PART 1

**PRESENT:**

Councillors

Pearson, A.R. (Chairman)  
Grice, Mrs. D. (Vice-Chairman)

Buttery, M.S.	Lea, C.I.
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Molineux, G.N.
Crabtree, S.K.	Snape, D.J.
Hoare, M.W.A. (substitute)	Witton, P.T.
Johnson, T.B.	

Also in attendance: Chief Inspector Sarah Wainwright, Cannock Local Policing Team.

*Prior to the start of the formal business of the meeting Members were introduced to Chief Inspector Sarah Wainwright, Cannock Local Policing Team (LPT), who had taken up the post on 1 July, 2017 following the retirement of Geoff Knight.*

### **11. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillors Mrs. A. Allt and A. Dean.

Councillor M.W.A. Hoare was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Mrs. Allt.

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

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

### **13. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 July, 2017, be approved as a correct record and signed.

### **14. Anti-Social Behaviour Policy**

The Partnerships, Community Safety and CCTV Manager delivered a presentation on the development of an Anti-Social Behaviour Policy (ASB) for the Council, which covered the following:

# DRAFT

- What is ASB?
  - Conduct that has caused, or is likely to cause, harassment, alarm or distress to any person;
  - Conduct capable of causing nuisance or annoyance to a person in relation to that persons occupation of residential premises;
  - Conduct capable of causing housing-related nuisance or annoyance to any person.
- Three types of ASB:
  - *Personal* – an individual or family repeatedly having their windows broken, car vandalised, graffiti daubed on their property or being taunted or harassed by the same group of individuals on a regular basis;
  - *Nuisance* – neighbours causing distress by being noisy, rowdy, loud and inconsiderate. Inconsiderate use of vehicles, off-road bikes, quad bikes or groups of individuals hanging around in areas which are not suitable, e.g. outside shops, off-licences or drinking in public places and behaving in a rowdy manner;
  - *Environmental* – littering, fly-tipping, dog fouling and graffiti.
- Not every allegation reported to the Council will be accepted as being ASB (all cases were risked assessed and those not determined to be an ASB issue were dealt with separately)..
- Policy Principles:
  - No one should have to suffer from ASB;
  - Reports of ASB will be treated seriously and dealt with professionally;
  - ASB will be addressed firmly, fairly, and proportionately;
  - We will actively seek to prevent ASB;
  - We will work with partners in order to deliver an effective, value for money ASB service across our communities;
  - We will deliver high quality customer service.
- Action we can take:
  - *Early and Informal Interventions* – no action; verbal warnings/written warnings; mediation; good neighbour agreement; acceptable behaviour agreement/parenting contracts; surveillance/CCTV; community protection warnings; support and counselling; community resolution; Fixed Penalty Notices (FPNs).
  - *Legal Actions* – Community Protection Notices (CPN); Public Space Protection Orders (PSPO); Civil Injunction; Closure Notices and Orders; Prosecution; Criminal Behaviour Orders (CBO); Notice of Intention to Seek Possession; Possession Proceedings; Demotion Orders.
- Vulnerability:
  - *Hate Incidents and Hate Crime* – disability; gender; race; religion and belief; sexual orientation; transgender;
  - *Domestic Abuse* – controlling and coercive behaviour; physical abuse; sexual abuse; emotional abuse; honour based crimes; Female Genital Mutilation (FGM).

# DRAFT

- Community Trigger – the local threshold for activating a trigger will be:
  - Three separate incidents have been reported in the last 6 months to the Police, Council or social landlord;
  - The last report was within one month of the day of the trigger application.
  
- Next Steps:
  - *Consultation* – Housing, Environmental Health, Legal Services and Police – November/December 2017;
  - *Report to Operational Leadership Team* – February 2018;
  - *Housing, Crime and Partnerships Scrutiny Committee* – 22 March 2018;
  - *Joint Cabinet/DMT* – 5 April 2018;
  - *Cabinet* – 19 April 2018.

The Partnerships, Community Safety and CCTV Manager advised that the ASB Policy Working Group had met on 9 October and provided on a number of views and thoughts on what they considered ASB meant, which had helped to feed into the development of the draft policy.

Members were in agreement with the approach being used to develop the Policy and request a progress update be given at the next meeting of the Committee in March 2018.

## 15. Cannock Local Policing Team Update

Chief Inspector Wainwright updated Members on key activity undertaken over the past few months, forthcoming plans for the remainder of the year and the key crime statistics for the District.

Recent activities had included: supporting the recent Remembrance Day parades; 'Pumpkin Patrol' during the October half-term week; and dealing with ASB incidents in parks in Hednesford and Rugeley. Drugs warrants had also been issued across Cannock and Rugeley which had resulted in a firearm and £40,000 worth of drugs being seized and instances of modern day slavery being identified and dealt with. Work was also being carried out to target, disrupt and dismantle known crime groups across the District. Special Constables had been utilised to provide support to the LPT on a number of projects, including visits to licenced premises to deal with drug related issues and other matters. A recent problem involving a large group of young people which had the potential to disrupt the Cannock Town Centre Christmas lights switch on had been dealt with effectively by making contact with those known to be part of the group and making arrests where necessary.

In the run up to Christmas it was a common to see an increase shoppers having purses stolen, so offenders would be dealt with however possible, including putting them before the courts. Support was also being provide to Amazon in Rugeley on how to alleviate safety concerns of residents and improved vetting processes owing to their increased staffing numbers at this time year

The LPT had a positive working relationship with the Council's Partnerships, Community Safety and CCTV teams which meant intelligence and data could be shared to help identify which was the appropriate body to deal with problems and

# DRAFT

concerns reported.

For the current 12 months reporting period crime had increased by 9% across the District and 10% across the entire Staffordshire Police area.

In respect of licensed premises, Members raised concerns about venues not using plastic glasses, licence holders not being willing to report incidents to the police and over-zealous door staff. Chief Inspector Wainwright replied that a dedicated Sergeant had been appointed to support Pubwatch, therefore such issues could be better dealt with than previously. The Partnerships, Community Safety and CCTV Manager further replied that she had attended meetings of Cannock Pubwatch and undertaken joint working with the Council's Licensing Unit and the Security Industry Association (SIA) to deal with problem door staff by working with staff and Designated Premises Supervisors to education and train staff on their duties and what is expected of them. Pubwatch also had a link into the CCTV team to help deal with any identified issues.

Members thanked the Chief Inspector for the update as presented and agreed that future updates should be delivered in the same style.

## **16. Quarters 1 and 2 2017/18 Housing, Crime and Partnerships Priority Delivery Plan Performance Update**

Members considered and noted the latest performance information for the Housing, Crime and Partnerships Priority Delivery Plan (PDP) 2017/18 (Item 6.1 – 6.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Housing and Partnerships provided the following specific updates:

- The delivery affordable housing/dwellings for the District was still on target to meet the year end total, however achievement of the target was reliant on social housing providers S106 agreements being agreed and delivered;
- Redevelopment of the Moss Road estate and former garage sites was on track and progressing well;
- Individual programmes of improvement works to Council-owned homes were all expected to complete their annual targets by the end of 2017/18;
- Crime and ASB data was presented for information only and so therefore did not having any progress ratings attributed to them;
- The Financial Recovery Plan (FRP) options related to the CCTV Service had been delayed due to the planned relocation of the team, however they were still expected to be completed by the end of the reporting year;
- The "Lets Work Together" project, development of the corporate ASB Policy and Community Trigger awareness work were all progressing well.

In respect of the stated Hate Crime figures on page 5 of the update, a Member queried if the reporting system was considered to be working as it should. Chief Inspector Wainwright replied that from looking at the Staffordshire wide figures incidents were being reported which was seen as a positive step. The Partnerships, Community Safety and CCTV Manager further replied that her team was also involved in providing awareness raising for hate crime report to support those persons who did not feel comfortable reporting incidents to the Police.

# DRAFT

## 17. Work Programme Review

The Head of Housing and Partnerships provided the following updates in respect of the Committee's 2017/18 work programme for Members to consider:

- Due to reduced resource and capacity within the Partnerships & Community Safety Team and the Police, production of the corporate ASB Policy had been focussed on as this piece of work was already underway;
- The Locality Policing review be removed from the work programme as Members did not have the power to direct the work of the Police and there was also a lack of clarity about what the review wanted to achieve;
- The Prevent Action Plan be removed from the work programme as its progress was monitored as part of the Housing, Crime and Partnerships Priority Delivery Plan;
- The Housing Voids Action Plan be removed from the work programme as work was underway to complete the Plan. Members could instead use the Plan to monitor progress of achieving the identified actions;
- Due to their be only further meeting of the Committee scheduled for 2017/18, Members be asked to start thinking about proposed topics for the 2018/19 work programme to discuss at the next meeting in March 2018.

In respect of Locality Policing, Members discussed with the Chief Inspector concerns regarding staffing numbers, morale, budget reductions and the differing roles of Special Constables and PCSOs.

Members discussed the proposed amendments to the work programme and agreed the following:

- (A) The Locality Policing review, Prevent Action Plan and Housing Voids Action Plan be removed from the 2017/18 work programme for the reasons stated above.
- (B) Members consider potential items for the 2018/19 work programme ready for discussion at the March 2018 meeting of the Committee.

The meeting closed at 5:07 p.m.

---

CHAIRMAN

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

# DRAFT

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**  
**HELD ON TUESDAY 5 DECEMBER 2017 AT 4:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT:  
Councillors

Bowater, J.	Stretton, Mrs. P.Z.
Dean, A.	Tait, Ms. L.
Dudson, A.	

Also Present:

Richard Percival, Engagement Lead, Grant Thornton (External Auditors);  
Jim McLarnon, Engagement Manager, Grant Thornton (External Auditors).

**18. Appointment of Chairman**

Councillor A. Dudson was appointed as Chairman for the meeting.

**19. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. D. Grice (Chairman) and J.P. Johnson (Vice-Chairman).

Apologies were also noted for the Head of Governance and Corporate Services.

**20. 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.

**21. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 19 September 2017, be approved as a correct record and signed.

# DRAFT

## 22. Internal Audit Quarter 2 Report 2017/18

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Internal Auditor and Risk Manager (Item 4.1 – 4.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chief Internal Auditor and Risk Manager advised Members that at the end of quarter two the number of completed audits was behind plan. Owing to a number of vacant posts within the Internal Audit team it was possible that the full year's plan may not be achieved. To mitigate the impact of the vacancies a specialist contractor had been appointed to help deliver some of the planned audits. It was intended to recruit to the vacant posts; however a number of options were being considered with regards to the structure of the team.

In respect of the follow-up audits completed in quarter 2 not enough progress had been made to revise the original assurance ratings, although work was ongoing to complete the agreed actions.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the Internal Audit Report for Quarter 2, 2017/18, be noted.

## 23. Strategic Risk Register

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance and Corporate Services (Item 5.1 – 5.18 the Official Minutes of the Council) (*presented by the Chief Internal Auditor and Risk Manager*).

The Chief Internal Auditor and Risk Manager advised Members that as at 30 September 2017 the number of strategic risks remained unchanged, as did the rating for each risk. Risk 18, '*vulnerability of Cannock Chase Council's financial stability as a result of public expenditure reductions and changes to the Government's funding regime*', was still rated as a red risk owing to continued uncertainty and lack of clarity over the future impact of the New Homes Bonus and Business Rates Retention.

A Member queried if there had been any recent updates regarding the planned 100% retention of Business Rates funding. The Head of Finance replied that the Chancellor's Autumn Budget confirmed that 100% retention was still intended, but due to the proposed Local Government Finance Bill not featuring in the Government's legislative programme for 2017/18 and 2018/19 the position remained unclear. At this stage it was expected that any changes would now be implemented from 2020/21.

RESOLVED:

That the progress made in the identification and management of the strategic risks be noted.

# DRAFT

## 24. Annual Governance Statement – Progress Report

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance and Corporate Services (Item 6.1 – 6.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council) (*presented by the Chief Internal Auditor and Risk Manager*).

The Chief Internal Auditor and Risk Manager advised Members that of the 8 significant governance issues identified in the Annual Governance Statement (AGS), progress on completion was as follows:

- Significant progress had been made on the delivery and completion of 1 issue;
- Some progress had been made on the delivery and completion of 6 issues;
- No action had yet been taken on 1 issue – ‘*Employees’ Code of Conduct and Embedding Values*’. It was expected that work on this issue would now not commence until 2018/19 due to other projects taking priority.

RESOLVED:

That the contents of the progress report on the Annual Governance Statement 2016/17 be noted.

## 25. Treasury Management Mid-Year Report 2017/18

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 7.1 – 7.13 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Finance advised Members that the report provided an update on the Council’s treasury management activity and performance for the period 1 April to 30 September, 2017. The capital expenditure prudential indicators had increased since the budget approved in February 2017, primarily because of changes in the Housing Revenue Account and Housing General Fund, and the external debt/operational boundary prudential indicators had remained unchanged since the budget.

RESOLVED:

That the Report, treasury activity and prudential indicators for the first half of the 2017/18 financial year be noted.

## 26. Annual Audit Letter for Cannock Chase District Council 2016/17

Consideration was given to the Report of the External Auditors (Item 8.1 – 8.15 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Richard Percival advised Members that the Letter summarised the key findings which had arisen from the work undertaken by the external auditors for the year ended 31 March 2017. In respect of certification work on the Council’s Housing Benefits subsidy claim, a number of errors had been identified which resulted in the work not being completed until 1 December 2017, a day after the set deadline. Discussions were already underway with Officers on how to make the process

## DRAFT

smoother for future years to ensure deadlines would not be missed. Work was now taking place to prepare for the audit of 2017/18 accounts and it was expected that all relevant deadlines would be met.

RESOLVED:

That the Report of the External Auditors be noted.

### **27. Progress Report and Emerging Issues & Developments for Cannock Chase District Council**

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

Jim McLarnon advised Members that the purpose of the Report was to provide an update on progress in delivering the responsibilities of the external auditors to the Council. In respect of work to certify the pooling of capital receipts the deadline for completion had been deferred until 31 December 2017, however required guidance had not yet been issued, therefore it was uncertain at this stage whether the revised deadline would be achievable. Work to undertake an interim accounts audit, final accounts audit and value for money conclusion were planned to take place between January and July 2018.

RESOLVED:

That the Report of the External Auditors be noted.

The meeting closed at 4:30 p.m.

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY 6 DECEMBER, 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)

Allen, F.W.C.	Snape, P.A.
Cooper, Miss J.	Sutherland, M
Dean, A.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Kraujalis, J.T.	Witton, P. (substitute for Grice, Mrs D.)
Lea, C.I.	
Snape, D.J.	

(The Chairman altered the agenda order slightly and the application listed second on the agenda was considered first).

**71. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors A. Dudson, Mrs. D. Grice, M. Grocott and M.W.A. Hoare.

(Councillor P.T. Witton was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Mrs. D. Grice).

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

<b>Member</b>	<b>Interest</b>	<b>Type</b>
Pearson, A.R.	Application CH/17/212, 414 Rugeley Road, Hednesford, Cannock, WS12 0QP, Proposed front extension with internal alterations (resubmission of CH/15/0273) – Member lives next door to the application site. He would be speaking on the application as a member of the public and would then leave the room during the deliberations.	Personal and Pecuniary

**73. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

Nothing declared.

**74. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 15 November, 2017 be approved as a correct record.

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

None.

**76. Application CH/16/470, Land rear of 854 & 856 Pye Green Road, Hednesford – Proposed erection of 3 no. dwellings with new access road and demolition of garage (resubmission of CH/15/0395)**

Following a site visit by Members of the Committee consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.19 – 6.40 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager circulated an update advising that the applicant has revised Plot 3 to provide an obscure glazed window adjacent the shared boundary with No. 856a to protect this neighbours privacy.

The owner at No 856a is in the process of building a wall to the front of his property and feels that this will affect the visibility splay. The vis-splays approved by Highways are achievable without crossing third party land regardless of whether there is a wall in situ or not.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Westnidge, an objector, speaking against the application and Mr. Adam Price, speaking in support of the application.

In response to concerns raised regarding works to the drive and the effect on the tree the Development Control Manager advised that an additional condition could be added, should the application be approved, so that the Local Planning Authority was given 7 days notice of any works being carried out to the root protection area of the tree. The Council's Tree Protection Officer would then have the opportunity to be on site and monitor the works being undertaken. The Officer agreed that Members would be advised once the 7 day notice had been served.

RESOLVED:

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

“No works shall commence within the root protection zone of the sycamore tree on site until the developer has served notice on the Local Planning Authority that works within the root protection zone are due to commence and a period of 7 days has

elapsed”.

Reason: To allow the Local Planning Authority the opportunity to monitor works undertaken that could have an impact on the health of the tree.

**77. Application CH/17/358, Land at Brereton Fields, 37 Gorse Lane, Rugeley – Residential development:- Erection of 1 no. detached 4 bedroom house (outline application including appearance and scale)**

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

The Development Control Manager circulated an update advising that Brereton & Ravenhill Parish Council had no objection to the amended plans subject to the District Council being satisfied that there was no adverse impact on No. 7 Gorse Lane.

RESOLVED:

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

**78. Application CH/17/236, Land at Hednesford Football Club, Keys Park Road, Hednesford – Residential development comprising 123 no. dwellings including 22 no. affordable dwellings, open space and associated road and parking**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.41 – 6.105 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager circulated an update which advised the following:-

“A further representation has been received from the Landscape Trees and Countryside Officer which makes the following statement: -

For some time (certainly between 1990 and 2008) this Council has adopted and exceeded the National Playing Fields Standard (CCDC used 7ac) of providing outdoor space/Leisure facilities as part of the Development proposals in the District. This standard known as the 6 ac per 1000 population standard has been seen as the minimum standards required by Local Authorities and some authorities exceed it – Stratford use 3.0 ac per 1000 population. The point is that the provision whatever the quantity should aim to provide informal casual playing space, sports pitches and play areas. This is broken down in the old standard enclosed and of the 0.8 Ha of children’s play space 0.2-0.3 Ha of this should be equipped play areas. In 2009 Planning amended these to reduce it to 0.048Ha/1000 population but changed the classification to equipped Local Areas for Play-known as LAPS. According to the NPFA (now known as the Fields in Trust). I shall come back to this important classification in a while as this is what is being proposed for the Keys Park development. The key issue here is that we are dealing with children (up to the age of 18), young people and adults as all three use outdoor space and equipped play areas all of which are free to use. The standards vary depending on what else is available locally and I use the Ward as a local area. The Councils supplementary

Planning Document 2008 does make the case for issues around viability/space issues around smaller developments and allows for a viability test to either reduce the planning obligation for play and/ or allow for an off site contribution to upgrade another site either in the Ward or locally to the Ward where it can be shown that people will be able to get to. The viability test is subject to independent assessment.

Turning to what is been offered is a LAP- local area for play. These are generally small areas of open space laid out for very young children (up to age 6) to play close to where they live i.e. within 1 minute of where they live. It contains no equipment and is generally used for imaginative play. The activity zone where most children congregate must be a minimum of 100 sq. m. They were originally designed into developments where there were other play areas for older children so there was no conflict between the users. As part of the 2009 reworking of the CCDC standards we presumed against their use as they are impossible to police in terms of age use and generally get used by older children for ball games, which creates animosity with residents around the site, and for that reason have not been used for over 15 years. Planning also concluded in 2009 that developments with 100+ houses would automatically generate the minimum NPFA standards that would be a NEAP- a Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play-such as you see at Park Farm, Kingswood Lakes-larger play areas with at least 8 pieces of equipment measuring at least 1000sqm of activity zone.

To put this into context of your Ward-it is 6Ha + plus deficient in POS and has no play areas, allotments or football pitches. It does have a kick about area at Littleworth Road and a play area in Arthur Street but this is not in the Ward and is 0.5 m away on the other side of main roads. The other main open spaces are Anglesey Park and The Brickworks, which are both, managed for their environmental/ecological attributes as opposed to informal/formal play.

The report also contains a viability statement that costs the play area and seeks recompense for these houses when in fact it includes ecological mitigation works and does not start from the point of incorporating a NEAP as per the SPD. The report also lists other areas close to the Ward such as the SBI which are not allowable as POS by the NPFA as you cannot formalise recreation in the general sense without impacting on their objectives of nature conservation.

Officers would comment that this site is a very complex site with a number of competing demands of particular importance being the Government's stated commitment to boost significantly the supply of housing, including the provision of affordable housing, and to encourage effective use of previously developed land and the ecological constraints of the SBI.

The provision of recreational open space is only one of a number of these competing factors and the issue is addressed at Section 4.15 of the Officer Report. Of particular relevance is that the SPD states that "larger scale development may give rise to the need for further on-site facilities" and as such it should not be automatically concluded that all large scale development will give rise to as need. In addition the SPD also makes it clear that the "exact nature of the on-site provision required will take into account the nature of the development (including site constraints)".

It should be noted that initially the applicant did provide for a path through the SBI to

allow for a measure of formal access. This was removed at the request of the ecologist but should members consider that on balance it would be beneficial a path could be incorporated and this could be controlled through an appropriately worded condition.

Ultimately the policy test with which to assess the proposal is: -

Whether any adverse impact of granting permission would significantly and demonstrably outweigh the benefits, when assessed against the policies in the NPPF, taken as a whole.

This exercise of weighing the social, economic and environmental aspects of the proposal is set out in Section 4.18 of the Officer Report which gives a summary of the planning balance of the various benefits and adverse impacts.

As such the further comments raised by the Landscape, Trees and Countryside Officer do not change the overall recommendation in the Officer report.

The following changes to the conditions schedule are recommended (changes shown in bold): -

6. Prior to first occupation of any of the new dwelling units a revised Travel Plan, **including measures to encourage sustainable travel to and from the development**, shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.
  
11. The Local Area of Play shall not be brought into use until clean cover to a depth of 300mm has been provided and certification that the cover is suitable for use provided and validation that the works have been undertaken have been submitted to the Local Planning Authority. All verges and amenity areas (**excluding those areas within the SBI**) shall be provided with clean cover to a depth of 300mm and certification that the cover is suitable for use provided and validation that the works have been undertaken shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority before they are made available for public use.
  
22. Notwithstanding the details of the approved plans: -
  - (i) that part of the southern boundary to Plots 50-51 running between the car park to the football ground to the access strip to the Site of Biological Importance shall be comprised of **ranch style fencing and defensible planting**.
  - (ii) a revised scheme for the planting of trees along the entrance to the site shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority and implemented in accordance with approved time table for the implementation of the wider landscape scheme.
  - (iii) the knee rail running along the boundary of the approved estate and the Site of Biological Interest shall run along the rear of the bin collection points so as to allow unfettered access to the storage areas.
  - (iv) the height of the acoustic fence along the boundary of plots 22- 38 and 39-50 shall be increased to at least 2.2m.
  
29. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the

following approved plans and documents:

PL-01	Planning Layout Rev F.
MP0-01	Material Plan Rev F.
BTP0-01	Boundary Treatments Rev G.
17-15-06	Tree Retention / Removal plan Rev A.
17-15-07	Tree Constraints Plan.
17-15-03A	Landscaping Sheet 1 Rev A.
17-015-04A	Landscaping Sheet 2 Rev A.
17-015-05B	Landscaping Strategy Rev B.
SLP-01	Slab Levels Rev C.
20093-801	Sections.
20093	UCP Utility Corridor Routes.
22881/08-17/5090	Parking Study Rev B.
22881/05-17/4802	Transport Assessment Rev B.
17015/DP/AIA001	Arboricultural Report Rev A.
WM11069	Site Investigations.
LEMP A	
17015/TGW/TS001	Tree Report Rev A
17443-1	Noise Report.
LE13883	Air Quality
	Design and Access Statement RevB.
	Travel Plan, August 2017.
	Preliminary Ecological Appraisal, dated August 2015, prepared by ADAS.
	Reptile Survey, dated November 2015, prepared by ADAS.
	Great Crested Newt Survey, dated July 2016, prepared by ADAS.
	Final Invertebrate Survey, prepared by ADAS.
	Landscape and Ecological Management Plan, dated October 2017, prepared by ADAS.
	Botanical Survey.
22881/03-17/4818	Flood Risk Assessment.
2281/09-17/5156	Flood Risk Assessment Addendum.
1001-HT-A A -	
1001-HT-C C -	
1001-HT-D D -	
1001-HT-E E -	
1001-HT-F F -	
1001-HT-G G -	
1001-HT-H H -	
1001-HT-L L -	
1001-HT-W W -	
1001-HT-X X -	
1001-HT-Y Y -	
1001-HT-Z Z -	
1001-GAR-1	Garages

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. John Williams, the applicant, speaking in support of the application.

Members raised concern regarding the affordable housing contribution, the numbers of houses proposed for the site and parking/highways issues. A Member moved that the application should be deferred to allow Officers to discuss these concerns with the applicant. This was seconded.

The Development Control Manager suggested that the meeting adjourn for a short period to enable him to speak with the applicant regarding this proposal. The meeting then adjourned for 5 minutes.

The meeting re-convened and the Development Control Manager advised that the applicant would prefer the Committee to defer the application rather than to refuse it. This would enable Officers to work with the applicant and reach a compromise.

Following a vote this proposal was carried.

RESOLVED:

That the application be deferred to allow Officers to enter into further discussions with the applicant in respect of the affordable housing contribution, overdevelopment of the site and highways/parking issues.

**79. Application CH/17/325, Land adjacent to 15 Cannock Wood Street, Cannock – Residential development:- erection of 4 no. dwellings**

Following a site visit by Members consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.106 – 6.122 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager circulated an update which advised the following:-

“The agent has submitted further information on 1 December 2017 (Drawing Nos. 2017:385:01A & 02A), to update the plans showing the existing trees, finished floor levels of the houses, landscaping and mitigation measures as suggested by their ecologist’s Ecolocation.

The client has also agreed to give up part of the undeveloped part of the site to become part of the nature reserve at the rear and to make a £10,000 S106 contribution for maintenance and works to the new dedicated area, as was previously stated in the Design and Access Statement.

Statutory Consultation Responses To Additional Plan Information:

Council Ecologist Response

The mitigation proposals are insufficient to avoid significant harm to the reptiles present on the site. The remaining part of the site would not be capable of supporting the displaced animals in its current or proposed state. This would result in a significant adverse impact on Priority Species that is not being adequately mitigated or compensated rendering the application contrary to Local Plan Policy CP12.

Although the incursion is fairly minor in nature it is noted that drawings

(2017:385:01A and 2017:385:02A) show a 1.8 metre high close board fence within the designated Local Nature Reserve boundary. It is unlikely that Cannock Chase Council as landowner will agree to fencing being located in the position shown. All fencing must be on the applicant's own land. It should be noted that the existing post and rail fence and LNR boundary hedge are in the ownership of Cannock Chase Council and not the applicant.

#### Tree Officer Response

No objections, subject to the imposition of suitable tree and landscaping conditions.

#### Additional Neighbour Objection

A further neighbour objection has been received, after the end of the neighbour consultation period and after the report was written, raising the following issues:

- The introduction of another vehicle access would cause safety issues.
- The refusal reasons of CH/13/401 refused in 2015 should be carried forward to the current application.
- The site notice was not posted on a lamp post immediately in front of the site.

#### Officer Response

- The Highways Officer was consulted on the application and had no objection to the proposal, subject to conditions to provide visibility splay, parking area and cycle spaces, therefore there would be no detriment to highway safety.
- The refusal reasons from the 2015 decision have been carried forward, as suggested onto the current refusal recommendation..
- The additional information received on 1 December 2017 does not alter the Council's Ecologist, or Planning Officer's recommendation, nor the refusal reasons as stated within the agenda report.
- The site notice was attached to the nearest accessible lamp post directly adjacent to the edge of the site, due to the other lamp post being located within the front hedgerow. This is considered within closest proximity to the relevant site, as there are not always accessible lamp posts directly in front of the proposal site".

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. John Heminsley, on behalf of the applicant, speaking in favour of the application.

RESOLVED:

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

**80. Application CH/17/349, Holme, Kingsley Wood Road, Rugeley - Residential development:- demolition of existing dwellinghouse down to dpc level and erection of new dwellinghouse on same footprint but with raised eaves level and re-modelling of roofspace**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.123 – 6.138 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.

**81. Application CH/17/389, Pye Green Valley between Greenheath Road and Cannock Road, Hednesford - Application to vary Condition 26 to substitute house types to incorporate the revised housing mix and to remove Condition 25 which required revised drawing to be submitted in respect of the apartment block of Planning Permission CH/14/0268**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.139 – 6.155 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein and subject to the completion of a new Section 106 Agreement to reflect the changes of the revised housing mix and affordable housing provision and subject to no additional material issues arising as a result of the extended period of consultation.

**82. Application CH/16/212, 414 Rugeley Road, Hednesford - Proposed front extension and chimney**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.156 – 6.173 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Councillor A. Pearson had declared a personal and pecuniary interest in this application and would leave the meeting. However, prior to leaving the meeting he made representations against the application as a member of the public. He then left the room and did not take part in the debate or vote on the application.

RESOLVED:

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

1. The proposed extension, by virtue of the use of a render finish on a brick built building would be out of character with the host property and the wider streetscene and hence with the immediate character of that part of the streetscene within the Cannock Chase Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty, contrary to Policies CP3 and CP14 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.
2. The proposal, by virtue of the height and location of the chimney would exacerbate existing problems of smoke and odour that have arisen from the use of a wood burning stove on site and hence would fail to secure a high quality design and a good standard of amenity for the occupants of the neighbouring property at No 416 Rugeley Road, Hednesford, contrary to Paragraph 17 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

The meeting closed at 17:05 pm.

---

CHAIRMAN

# DRAFT

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND TOWN CENTRES SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**  
**TUESDAY 12 DECEMBER, 2017 AT 4.00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

## PART 1

PRESENT: Martin, Mrs. C. (Chairman)

Councillors

Buttery, M.S.

Sutton, Mrs. H.M.

Foley, D.

Tait, Ms. L.

Johnson, T.B.

Witton, P.T.

### 7. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. P.Z. Stretton (Vice-Chairman), Miss J. Cooper, W.T.A. Hardman, M. Sutherland and Miss S. Whitehouse.

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

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

### 9. Minutes

RESOLVED:

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

### 10. Scrutiny Review of Transport and Update on Work Programme 2017/18

The Chairman advised that items 4 and 5 on the agenda would be considered together.

The Interim Head of Economic Development explained that at the previous meeting on 4 July, 2017 Members had agreed to undertake an in depth review of transport, including buses and rail, to determine whether it was fit for purpose. He also explained that at the last meeting Members had noted that Staffordshire County Council was undertaking a consultation on bus services across the County and Members had requested that a representative from Arriva attend the next Scrutiny meeting. Arising from the last meeting it had been agreed that a Working Group of four Members of the Scrutiny Committee should be

## DRAFT

established.

The Working Group met on 22 November, 2017 and Jeff Tucker from Staffordshire County Council attended. Arriva had been invited to the Working Group but they were unable to attend that meeting or the Scrutiny meeting today. However, a further Working Group meeting had been arranged for 18 January, 2018 and a representative from Arriva would be attending along with Jeff Tucker from Staffordshire County Council.

At the Working Group meeting Jeff Tucker had explained that Staffordshire County Council's consultation on bus services across the County was undertaken between 24 July - 17 September, 2017. As part of the process Cannock Chase Council had been consulted on the four options which were outlined in the document attached to the Agenda (Item 4.1 - 4.2 refers). Cannock Chase Council had supported Option 1 of the County's consultation; although their preference would have been to have "no cuts". It was also the preferred option of the County Council.

It had been anticipated that the County would have approved the revised supported bus funding by the time the Working Group meeting was held. However, the Cabinet decision had been called in and this was not considered by the County's Corporate Scrutiny until 5 December, 2017. At this meeting Members had upheld the Cabinet decision; therefore Option 1 would be progressed and the revised supported bus funding would be in place by April 2018.

The Interim Head of Economic Development explained that Officers from the County Council had been in discussions with Arriva who had been asked to confirm which bus routes would continue to be provided and which would be withdrawn. Additionally, County Officers would be engaging with District and Parish Council's, Community Transport Operators and businesses to ascertain whether any of the withdrawn bus routes could be provided by them. All options would be explored.

The Working Group had also noted that the use of Section 106 monies to support the revised budget was being considered. The Interim Head of Economic Development commented that the development of Tesco in Rugeley had a Section 106 attached for a contribution of £30,000 towards public transport. There was potential that this money could be used but further work would need to be undertaken. He would provide an update on this at the next Working Group on 18 January, 2018 and then at the next Scrutiny Committee meeting.

The Committee noted that a representative from Arriva would be attending the Working Group on 18 January and this would be an opportunity for Members to ask questions about their plans for which bus routes they would continue to provide and which they would be withdrawing. Jeff Tucker from the County Council would also be in attendance and Members may wish to ask about how the delay due to the call in of the Cabinet decision would affect the delivery of the new revised budget. Members who were not on the Working Group and wished to ask any questions should email the Interim Head of Economic Development direct.

## DRAFT

John Morgan, Planning Policy Officer added that it was likely that it would be around February/March when Arriva had decided which bus routes would be maintained or withdrawn. He added that the approval of Option 1 (outlined in the document attached to the agenda) would mean that there would be no bus service at all to Longford Estate/Shoal Hill area of Cannock or Slitting Mill in Rugeley unless alternative provision via Community Transport could be developed. However, evidence suggested this would be difficult to secure due to profitability.

The Chairman commented that the Working Group meeting had been useful and she was pleased Jeff Tucker from the County would be in attendance at the next Working Group to clarify how things would be progressing following discussions with the various partners.

Members noted that the details of the bus routes that would be maintained or withdrawn would not be known when the Working Group met in January. The Planning Policy Officer confirmed that the West Midlands Traffic Commissioner published proposed bus service changes on a weekly basis and 6 weeks notice had to be given to register or de-register bus routes. He would be able to advise Members of any changes that were registered.

With regard to rail transport the Interim Head of Economic Development advised Members that the electrification of the Chase Line was continuing following a short delay. On 10 December 2017 Abellio, West Midlands Trains, took over the franchise from London Midland. The new operator would be improving stations and investing in new carriages; trains would have 4 carriages creating more space for passengers.

The Planning Policy Officer confirmed that Network Rail would be completing the line speed upgrade and trains would travel at 60 mph instead of 45 mph. This would produce a saving of 4 minutes from Rugeley to Birmingham and allow the trains to return to Birmingham rather than sit at the station for 34 minutes. This would create a two trains per hour service between Rugeley and Birmingham via the Chase Line (stopping at all stations). Additionally there would be a service from Rugeley to London along the Chase Line which would provide direct services beyond Birmingham New Street to Birmingham International/Airport/NEC, Coventry, Rugby and Northampton.

The Interim Head of Economic Development added that the new operator was to improve customer train information and ticket machines as part of the new franchise.

Members welcomed the news of the new operator and the planned improvements.

RESOLVED:

That the Interim Head of Economic Development provide an update to the Working Group on 18 January 2018 and to the next Economic Development and Town Centres Scrutiny Committee on 22 March, 2018 on the potential use of the

## DRAFT

Section 106 monies in relation to the Tesco development in Rugeley.

### 11. **Quarters 1 and 2 Performance – Economic Development and Town Centres PDP 2017/18**

Consideration was given to the performance information (Item 6.1 - 6.10 refers).

The Interim Head of Economic Development led Members through the information advising on those actions where targets had not been met. Members noted that the action to set up a Retail Skills Academy for the Mill Green Designer Village was being reviewed as the Cannock College campus had now closed. Officers would be reviewing the strategy and delivery arrangements with the developer and would be having discussions with South Staffordshire College and Walsall College. If the Academy could not be provided within the Cannock Chase District area it would need to be accessible by those who lived in the District.

The Committee noted that the action in relation to developing an Asset Management Plan had been transferred to the Head of Housing and Partnerships due to changes in the Senior Management Structure. It would therefore be removed from the performance information in relation to this Committee.

With regard to the action to start charging for pre-application advice on major planning applications Members noted that this would be in place by Quarter 4 and included in next years fees and charges.

The action to deliver the Civic Centre car parking scheme had been delayed; however a contractor would be appointed via a tender process and it was anticipated the scheme would be delivered in 2018 within the approved budget.

The meeting closed at 4.30pm.

---

CHAIRMAN

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

**HELD ON THURSDAY 14 DECEMBER 2017 AT 4:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

Adamson, G.	Leader of the Council
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

**57. Apologies**

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillor G. Alcott, Deputy Leader of the Council and Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader, who was representing the Council at a European Social Investment Fund meeting in Birmingham.

**58. 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.

**59. Updates from Portfolio Leaders**

**Crime and Partnerships**

Safer Neighbourhood Panels

The Portfolio Leader advised that at a meeting he attended earlier in the day, Matthew Ellis, Staffordshire Police and Crime Commissioner, had announced that training would be given to existing members of Safer Neighbourhood Panels to help develop their roles. It was also expected that local Chief Inspectors should more accountable to the Panels, and on a more regular basis. Where Panels were not considered to be performing as expected by Mr Ellis, he would seek to reclaim funds provided to councils for the purpose of supporting the work of the Panels.

**60. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 16 November 2017**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 16 November, 2017, be approved as a correct record and signed.

**61. Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period December, 2017 to February, 2018 (Item 5.1 – 5.2 of the Official Minutes of the Council) was considered.

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period December, 2017 to February, 2018 be noted.

**62. Financial Plan 2017/18 to 2020/21**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 6.1 – 6.17 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Finance advised that since the Report had been published, an average pay award of 2.7% for local government staff in 2018/19 and 2019/20 had been proposed, which would have the effect of reducing the Council's projected budget surplus in 2020/21. Details of the 2018/19 Local Government Finance Settlement were expected to be published week commencing 11 December, 2017, but as at 14 December the Settlement was still unknown. An announcement regarding the Business Rates Retention Pilots was also still awaited.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The Financial Plan 2017/18 to 2020/21 be noted.
- (B) The forecast outturn for 2017/18 be approved.
- (C) The General Fund working balances be determined as part of the Risk Analysis undertaken in finalising the preparation of the 2018/19 budget.
- (D) The draft Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2020/21 and available resources be noted.
- (E) The principles set out in the Council's Financial Plan be adopted in finalising preparation of the 2018/19 budget.

Reasons for Decisions

The report set out the Council's forecast financial position for the next three years, incorporating anticipated spending pressures and savings already identified. Financial resources available to the Council over the three year period were also set out. The Financial Plan reflected the Government's current funding regime.

Council, at its meeting on 8 February 2017, approved the General Fund Revenue Budget and Capital Programme for 2017/18 to 2019/20. The General Fund Revenue Budget reflected the implementation of the comprehensive Financial Recovery Plan to set a balanced budget by 2019/20. A small deficit of

£0.181 million was forecast for 2019/20, however a number of savings strands existed to address this deficit.

A great deal of uncertainty existed at the time of the Budget Report in relation to the Government's Funding Regime and this still remained the same as at today. In particular, the proposed 100% Business Rates Retention Scheme, which was originally planned for implementation in 2019/20, was not included in the current legislative programme of Government, whereas the New Homes Bonus Scheme was subject to annual review. Further clarification was being sought on the timeline for changes to the Local Government Funding however it was likely that the current regime would remain in place until 2020/21 at the earliest.

The Financial Plan therefore represented a refresh of the assumptions as contained in the Approved Financial Plan (Council, 8 February 2017), taking into account the outturn for the last financial year and the first seven months of the current financial year.

In accordance with the Financial Plan a balanced budget now existed in 2020/21, pending any changes to the Government's Funding Regime, with a contribution from working balances required in 2018/19 and 2019/20.

Subject to approval, the Financial Plan, together with the current Council's Budget Strategy, would provide the framework for preparation of detailed budgets for consideration by Cabinet in January 2018.

**63. Hawks Green Depot Vehicle Workshop Replacement Roof – Application for Permission to Spend**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 7.1 – 7.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That permission to spend £70,000 on a replacement roof and essential works on the Vehicle Workshop located at the Hawks Green Depot be granted.

Reason for Decision

The Council's Vehicle Workshop required extensive essential building works to the roof and structure in order to make it fully safe and operational. The works were estimated to cost in the region of £65,000 to £70,000.

**64. Cannock Indoor Market Hall**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 8.1 – 8.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That

- (A) The impact of the savings options on Cannock Indoor Market Hall be noted.
- (B) The existing rental discounts given to new and existing traders, together with the current income received from Cannock Market Hall be noted.
- (C) No further rental discounts be awarded.

## Reasons for Decisions

At its meeting on 22 September 2016, Cabinet considered a range of savings options related to the Council's Financial Recovery Plan and made a decision to go out to public consultation on a number of them including options related to Cannock Market Hall.

Following a review of the public consultation results, Cabinet met on 15 December 2016 and agreed a draft budget that included the following proposals:

- (i) An increase of 3% in Cannock Market Hall Fees;
- (ii) An increase in Cannock Market Hall trading days from 3 days per week to 4 days per week;
- (iii) Creation of a new entrance and additional stalls at Cannock Market Hall utilising vacant shop unit 1 Market Hall Precinct.

The increases in stall fees and trading days were implemented on 1 April 2017, with Thursdays becoming a trading day in addition to Tuesdays, Fridays and Saturdays.

Whilst there were few objections from existing traders to the increase in stall rents which had not been increased for a number of years, the majority of existing traders were against the increase in the number of trading days. The immediate result of the changes was that 24% of existing traders left the Market Hall at the end of March 2017, which resulted in a 29% drop in the number of open stalls. However, some of the stallholders that left were senior in years and were already contemplating retirement prior to the implementation of the Council's decision.

The creation of the new entrance off Littleton Square, incorporating four new stalls, was completed in time for a Cannock Indoor Market relaunch event on 19 May 2017. New bright and welcoming signage had also been installed at all of the Market entrances raising the profile of the Market Hall within the town centre.

Marketing and promotion of the Market Hall was ongoing and the attraction of new traders was a priority. The Council currently offered the following discounts to new traders:

- Food traders – 50% rent discount for their first six months of trading;
- Non-food traders – 25% discount for their first six months of trading.

In addition, existing traders were encouraged to work with the Council using their own stalls to generate a positive and vibrant atmosphere within the Market Hall.

Notwithstanding Officers' commitment to marketing and promotion of the Market Hall, there had been very little interest from prospective new traders. Where potential new traders had expressed an interest the reasons given for not taking a stall included the number of vacant stalls within the Market Hall. The proportion of vacant stalls had consistently been greater on a Thursday (the additional trading day) as a number of existing traders declined to attend the Market Hall on the additional day. The traders in question were charged rent for the stall whether or not they opened for trade on a Thursday however this proved insufficient to persuade them to open for trade.

Following a meeting with the indoor market traders in July, it was agreed that for a period of six months, traders would receive a rent free day on a Thursday provided that they opened their stall for business. This equated to a 25% rent discount. Traders that still failed to trade on a Thursday paid full rent. The

justification for the grant of the discount to existing traders was to achieve the same level of occupancy on Thursdays as on the other market days. Unfortunately there were still two traders within the Market Hall that do not open for trade on a Thursday.

There had been no noticeable increase in rental arrears in respect of the indoor market since the implementation of the savings options. However the indoor market traders considered the additional trading day to be a significant threat to the viability of their business and to the future of the Indoor Market, and have asked that the Council give them further rent discounts above the 25% discount described above.

The Market Hall footfall figures had been analysed for the six months period since the implementation of the savings options and compared to the footfall figures for the same period in the year before when the Market enjoyed an average 85% occupancy level. The figures demonstrated that from 1 April to 30 September 2017 there had been a 10% reduction in footfall into the Market since the same period last year. However the footfall figures for the same time period in 2016 show a reduction of 16% over the same period in 2015. There was no evidence therefore that the decline in footfall was attributable solely to the implementation of the savings options.

Due to the loss of stallholders as a result of the additional trading day being implemented the rental income received by the Council from the Market Hall has reduced considerably. In the financial year 2016/17 the shortfall of actual income compared to target income was 9.2%. Based on income received during the first six months since implementation of the savings options the forecast shortfall in income compared to target would be 33.6%. The grant of further rent discounts to existing and/or new traders would result in a greater loss of income to the Council. Whilst the Market Hall was still forecast to be in profit by the end of this financial year it would be less than half the profit achieved by the Market Hall in the previous financial year.

**65. Proposed Amendments to the Scheme of Delegations for Neighbourhood Planning and Supplementary Planning Documents**

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

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Authority be delegated to the Head of Economic Development to take all steps in the preparation of a Neighbourhood Plan except for the final making (adoption) of a Neighbourhood Plan by the Council, and that the Council's Scheme of Delegations be amended by the insertion of a new paragraph stating this.
- (B) The Scheme of Delegations paragraph 26.5.20 be amended to say: 'To make non-substantive amendments to adopted Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader.'

## Reasons for Decisions

Neighbourhood Planning was a way in which communities could shape the future of the places where they lived and worked. Neighbourhood Planning allowed communities, should they wish to do so, to set planning policies through a Neighbourhood Plan or grant planning permission through a Neighbourhood Development Order or Community Right to Build Order. Neighbourhood Plans could not be used to prevent or stifle development and had to meet a number of Basic Conditions which included being in broad conformity with the Local Plan. They had to be independently examined to ensure they conformed to the relevant conditions and were then subject to referendum. Should the vote be in favour of the plan, then this could be made (adopted) by the Local Authority and it would then become part of the Development Plan and this a material consideration in decision making for planning applications.

The Council had a statutory duty to support Neighbourhood Plans. Their production involved a number of formal stages, some of which required formal action by the Council to some strict deadline, many of which were not likely to be achievable taking into account committee cycles and lead-in times. Further detail was set out in section 5 of the report, but in order to ensure that the Council fulfilled its legal obligations it was considered necessary that responsibility for these key functions, with the exception of the final making (adoption) of the plan, be delegated to the Head of Economic Development in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader.

Cannock Chase District currently had two Neighbourhood Plans in preparation: Hednesford Neighbourhood Plan which had reached the formal, statutory consultation stages; and Brereton and Ravenhill which was in the early stages of formulation.

In relation to Supplementary Planning Documents, section 26.5.20 of the current Scheme of Delegations referred very specifically to the delegated powers of the Head of Economic Development to make any further minor amendments to the Design SPD in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader. There were other SPDs produced by the Planning Policy service, so, for the purposes of consistency, it would be pragmatic to update the wording to state 'to make non-substantive amendments to adopted SPDs in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader.'

### **66. 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 of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).

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

**WEDNESDAY 20 DECEMBER 2017 AT 10:00 A.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

Adamson, G.  
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.  
Lea, C.I.  
Snape, D.J.

**1. Appointment of Chairman**

Councillor G. Adamson was appointed Chairman for the meeting.

**2. Apologies**

Councillor T. Johnson had previously submitted an apology for the meeting.

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

No declarations of interest were made.

**4. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

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

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE**  
**WEDNESDAY 3 JANUARY, 2018 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)

Allen, F.W.C.	Kraujalis, J.T.
Cooper, Miss J.	Lea, C.I.
Dean, A.	Snape, D.J.
Dudson, A.	Snape, P.A.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Sutherland, M.
Grocott, M.R.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Hoare, M.W.A.	

Prior to the commencement of the meeting the Development Control Manager advised that with regard to Application CH/17/236, Land at Hednesford Football Club, Keys Park Road, Hednesford, the applicant had responded to the concerns raised by Members at the previous meeting and submitted amendments. These amendments had been consulted upon and the comments from Staffordshire County Highways had only been received today due to the Christmas break. As there were a number of issues requiring clarification he suggested that the application should be deferred to enable Officers to work with the applicant to try and resolve these issues. The application would then be submitted to the next Planning Control Committee meeting at the end of January.

**83. Apologies**

There were no apologies for absence.

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

There were no declarations of interests submitted.

**85. Disclosure of lobbying of Members**

All Members declared that they had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/17/236, Land at Hednesford Town Football Club, Keys Park Road, Hednesford WS12 2DZ – Residential development comprising 125 no. dwellings including 25 no. affordable dwellings, open space and associated road and parking.

**86. Minutes**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 6 December, 2017 be approved as a correct record.

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

None.

**88. Application CH/17/251, 53 Gorse Lane, Cannock WS11 1EY, Residential development: Conversion of the existing detached single garage to form a one bedroom bungalow Annex property only**

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).

The Development Control Manager took the Committee through the plans as outlined in the agenda.

Prior to the determination of the application representations were made by Mrs. D. Shirley, who had objections to the application.

RESOLVED:

That the application be approved subject to the conditions and informatives as outlined in the report for the reasons stated therein and to the following additional conditions:-

1. The annex hereby approved shall not be brought into use until the velux windows have been fitted with obscure glazing, non-opening units.

Reason:

In the interests of protecting the amenities of the future occupiers of the annex and the amenity of the occupiers of the adjacent residential property in accordance with Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan and the National Planning Policy Framework.

2. The development shall not commence until a scheme for the disposal of foul water has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.

Reason:

In the interests of protecting the roots of the adjacent oak in accordance with Policy CP3 of the Cannock Chase Local Plan.

**89. Application CH/17/236, Land at Hednesford Football Club, Keys Park Road, Hednesford, Residential development comprising 119 no. dwellings including 21 no. affordable dwellings, open space and associated road and parking**

Consideration of this application was deferred to enable Officers to work with the applicant to try and resolve the issues raised by Staffordshire County Highways and the application be submitted to the next Planning Control Committee at the end of January (see comments at the top of page 39)

**90. Application CH/17/385, 68-70 Market Street, Cannock, WS12 1AG, Change of use from furniture store to restaurant and takeaway**

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.110 – 6.120 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. J. Stewart who was speaking in support of the application on behalf of the applicant.

Members discussed the application and debated conditions that could be attached to any permission granted, which included the following:

- (i) limiting the opening hours until 1am;
- (ii) a scheme to ensure ventilation, the control of odours and the position of the flue;
- (iii) suitable noise protection methods being included in the works to protect the occupiers of the flats above.

The Development Control Manager advised that should Members wish to approve the application the conditions that should be attached to any permission granted should be as follows:

- (i) three year commencement condition;
- (ii) limiting the opening hours until 1am;
- (iii) notwithstanding the details of the approved plans the development shall not commence until a scheme for the control of ventilation and odour has been submitted in writing to the Local Planning Authority.

Members voted on this and resolved to approve the application and to give the Development Control Manager delegated powers in consultation with the Chair to compile the conditions with appropriate wording.

**RESOLVED:**

That the application, which was recommended for refusal, be approved subject to appropriate conditions being added and these be delegated to Development Control Manager in consultation with the Chair.

The meeting closed at 4.20pm.

---

CHAIRMAN

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

# DRAFT

## CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL

### MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE

WEDNESDAY 24 JANUARY, 2018 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)

Allen, F.W.C.	Snape, P.A.
Cooper, Miss J.	Smith, C.D.
Dean, A.	(substitute
Dudson, A.	for D.J. Snape)
Grice, Mrs. D.	Sutherland, M.
Grocott, M.R.	Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Hoare, M.W.A.	Witton, P. (substitute
Lea, C.I.	for J. Kraujalis)

#### 91. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors J.T. Kraujalis and D.J. Snape.

Notification had been received that Councillor P. Witton would substitute for Councillor J.T. Kraujalis and Councillor C.D. Smith would substitute for Councillor D.J. Snape.

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

There were no declarations of interests submitted.

#### 93. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillor Mrs. S. Cartwright declared that she had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/17/236, Land at Hednesford Football Club, Keys Park Road, Hednesford, Residential development comprising 119 no. dwellings including 21 no. affordable dwellings, open space and associated road and parking.

## DRAFT

### 94. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 3 January, 2018 be approved as a correct record.

### 95. Members' Requests for Site Visits

Councillor A. Pearson requested that a site visit be undertaken in respect of an application that was due to be considered at the meeting today - Application CH/17/419, Oakenway, Kingsley Wood Road, Cannock – Residential development, demolition of existing bungalow, garage and outbuilding and erection of 1 no. house (resubmission of approved application CH/16/275). The reason for the site visit would be to allow Members to assess how the development would impact on the street scene.

RESOLVED:

That Application CH/17/419, Oakenway, Kingsley Wood Road, Cannock – Residential development, demolition of existing bungalow, garage and outbuilding and erection of 1 no. house (resubmission of approved application CH/16/275) be deferred to enable a site visit to be undertaken in order to assess how the development would impact on the street scene.

### 96. Application CH/17/419, Oakenway, Kingsley Wood Road, Cannock – Residential development, demolition of existing bungalow, garage and outbuilding and erection of 1 no. house (resubmission of approved application CH/16/275)

This application was deferred for a site visit (see Minute no. 95 above)

### 97. Application CH/17/236, Land at Hednesford Football Club, Keys Park Road, Hednesford, Residential development comprising 119 no. dwellings including 21 no. affordable dwellings, open space and associated road and parking

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.22 – 6.121 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to the meeting an update to the application had been circulated to Members advising that the plan shown on report page 6.26 had been superseded by Drawings PP01-20096-EX1 "Football Club Parking Layout" and Drawing CPA-01 Rev C. In addition an addenda to the report had also circulated.

The Development Control Manager circulated an update to the Committee which read as follows:-

"Following publication of the agenda five further letters of objection have been received raising the following points [note these summarise only new issues raised that are not within the officer report or addendum]: -

## DRAFT

The Planning committee should be aware of some possible information should the football club achieve promotion to the next level of the football pyramid. This would involve them playing in the National League North, a division which contains some traditionally 'big' former football league clubs and also financially backed clubs who are much better supported the clubs Hednesford are currently playing against.

At the moment these clubs have the following average home attendances:

Stockport County	3,157
York City	2,825
FC United	1,808
Salford City	1,640
Darlington	1,542
Kidderminster	1,506
AFC Telford	1,102
Harrogate Town	1,099
Chorley	1,091
Boston United	998
Southport	956
Blyth Spartans	922

Generally, most teams bring a minimum of 10-15% of their home attendance to away games which would mean that the top 12 supported teams (above) could bring a minimum of between 138 and 474 supporters to their respective fixtures. Also playing in a higher ranked league would increase the average home support and there would also be more local derbies with the likes of Tamworth, Leamington and Nuneaton which would show increased gates. As such Taylor Wimpey's proposed 251 designated spaces would still be insufficient and not fit for purpose.

Also disagrees that the land is currently used is 'informal overspill parking' as this has always been used by the club since the ground was built. Also the suggestion that this arrangement is not effectively managed and is there very inefficient is incorrect as there are volunteers which work as car park stewards on match days.

Whilst 250 spaces is probably adequate for the average game then I would ask planning committee to consider what happens for the non average games. Which happen with attendances of over 1000 or in the case of a cup run attendances over 3000. This has and will continue to happen.

With development at Pye Green valley and off Pye green Road to count 2, then I would ask that you ensure that this plan is considered in the whole.

HTFC has been around since 1880 and we need to ensure that the club is around in 2080 and beyond.

Hednesford Town Football Club has a capacity of approximately six thousand and this means that any spectators that attend a match that has large attendance will have virtually no chance of parking in the vicinity.

Issuing parking permits to the occupiers of the new builds will discriminate against older supporters many of whom are long standing council taxpayers in the district.

## DRAFT

The resulting congestion on match days has the potential to increase road traffic accidents.

I am still active but like many regular attenders at keys Park [I am] at times in need of car parking facilities due to my long-term disability. I know many supporters of the club are becoming older and also use the car to attend home games.

I have experienced and so have many others the calamity of parking restrictions at AFC Telford and more recently at Shrewsbury FC with match day limitations and times.

It is also worth considering that attendances were down to around 400 recently but an increase in home form as seen this rise with the prospect of possible play off places, could within the next few seasons bring back crowds of upto 1000 which again could cause problems.

The application should be turned down until a more appropriate plan is submitted to provide space for around 500m spaces to be provided.

Currently up to 400 parking spaces are available and included within the Match Day Risk Assessment report and have been agreed by the SCC SAG (Sports Ground Advisory Group) as part of the football clubs safety certificate. Have they been consulted and their views made known about the loss of these numbers of parking spaces.

With the football club almost certain to move into the Midlands Premier League from August 2018 which will mean the football matches will likely to attract a larger number of supporters from opposition clubs that will now have to travel less of a distance to witness their team competing against more local opposition. With the closure, proximity of visiting teams it will also mean that the likelihood of opposition teams travelling to the game by coach will also decrease with more players and officials arriving by car. This could mean that the players and officials from both teams and Keys Park staff up to 50 parking spaces could be occupied at games before the public/ supporters begin to arrive.

Should the team be promoted to a higher level for the 2018/19 season then again its success may again see crowds and a greater number of cars looking to use the site.

This success last left a record crowd of 4,000 attending the ground just a few years ago and the parking that day also allowed for the parking of 12 supporters coaches.

The ground suggested is very waterlogged at best and to provide a suitable surface would require collective drainage and surfacing. Would the applicant be held accountable for the work.

Can it be made a stipulation that the new parking is completed before the development begins, as the existing parking will be lost once this starts.

I note that the recent press reports that supporters will be encouraged to travel by public transport to the match. How can this occur when no bus route even passes the extremities of the ground?

## DRAFT

The monies from the sale of the land would not go directly to the football club, as the club is owned by a private individual. If he was to leave the club would not be able to afford the works.

The proviso that no other football related events will take place until two hours after the end of the game will also impact on the finances of they club.

### Equality Act 2010

Issues such as parking have the potential to impact on people with disabilities. Disability, age and religion are protected characteristic under the Equalities Act.

By virtue of Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, in exercising of its function, the Council must have due regard to the need to:

- (a) Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and other conduct that is prohibited'
- (b) Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and person who do not share it
- (c) Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share it

It is therefore acknowledged that the Council needs to have due regard to the effect of its decision on persons with the protected characteristics mentioned.

Such considerations should be balanced along with other material planning considerations.

In this particular case it is noted hat the needs of people with disabilities has been taken into account when looking that the parking arrangements for the football club and the design of the housing estate.

This application has therefore been determined with regard to the Council's duties and obligations under the Equality Act 2010. However it is considered that the recommendation made in this report is proportionate taking into account the conflicting matters of the public and private interest so that there is no violation of those rights.

### Conclusion

The above comments do not alter the recommendation to Planning Control Committee".

Prior to the determination of the application representations were made by Mr. Raybould and Councillor P. Woodhead (Ward Councillor) who had objections to the application and John Williams who spoke in favour of the application.

The Development Control Manager stated that should Members be minded to approve the application the recommendation would be amended to remove item (v) Future management of the sustainable drainage scheme (as outlined on page no. 6.46 of the report) from the Section 106 agreement as this was covered by a Condition.

# DRAFT

## RESOLVED:

- (A) That the applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 to secure
- (i) The provision of 18% affordable housing comprising 4 (19%) affordable rent and 17 (81%) for social rent; and
  - (ii) A £8k contribution towards the provision of a traffic regulation order to be paid and implemented before the first occupation of the dwellings; and
  - (iii) Provision of the future management of the Site of Biological Interest in accordance with the approved ecological management plan; and
  - (iv) Arrangements for the future access by vehicles for management of the Site of Biological Interest; and
  - (v) Future management and maintenance of the Local Area of Play and communal landscaped areas (either by transfer of land together with any monies or by management company); and
  - (vi) Implementation of the Travel Plan and Travel Management Plan; and
- (B) On completion of the Agreement the application be approved subject to the conditions contained in the report for the reasons stated therein and to the following additional condition:-

“That each household be allocated 2 parking permits”

The meeting closed at 4.20pm.

---

CHAIRMAN

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

**HELD ON THURSDAY 25 JANUARY 2018 AT 4:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**

**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors:

Alcott, G.	Deputy Leader of the Council and Economic Development and Planning 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

**69. Apologies**

Apologies were submitted for Councillors G. Adamson, Leader of the Council and J.T. Kraujalis, Corporate Improvement Portfolio Leader.

In the Leader's absence the meeting was chaired by the Deputy Leader.

**70. 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.

**71. Updates from Portfolio Leaders**

**Crime and Partnerships**

Safer Neighbourhood Panels Recruitment

The Portfolio Leader advised that during the summer the Police and Crime Commissioner would be launching an advertising campaign aimed at increasing public involvement in the Staffordshire-wide Safer Neighbourhood Panels.

Concerns were also noted about lack of Police involvement in some of the meetings, but this was due to reduced capacity of front line police officers.

# DRAFT

## **Culture and Sport**

### Cannock Stadium Site

The Portfolio Leader advised that the redevelopment was progressing well, with work currently focussed on the HUB, play area, footpaths, lighting and outdoor gym.

Videos of the redevelopment could also be viewed on the Council's website.

#### **72. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 14 December 2017**

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 14 December, 2017, be approved as a correct record and signed.

#### **73. Forward Plan**

The Forward Plan of Decisions for the period January to March, 2018 (Item 5.1 – 5.2 of the Official Minutes of the Council) was considered.

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period January to March, 2018 be noted.

#### **74. General Fund Budget and Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2020/21**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 6.1 – 6.70 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The following be recommended to Council, at its meeting to be held on 7 February, 2018, as part of the formal budget setting process:-
  - (a) The level of net spending for the General Fund Revenue Budget for 2018-19 be set at £11.645 million; with indicative net spending for 2019-20 and 2020-21 of £12.265 million and £12.764 million, respectively.
  - (b) The detailed portfolio budgets as set out in Appendix 2 of the Report.
  - (c) The forecast outturn net budget of £10.994 million be approved.
  - (d) The use of Government Grants in 2018-19 of £1.093 million, with indicative figures of £1.198 million and £1.282 million for 2019-20 and 2020-21, respectively.
  - (e) The working balances be set at £0.638 million; £0.672 million and £1.032 million for 2018-19 to 2020-21, respectively.
  - (f) A Council Tax of £212.94 for 2018-19, with indicative increases of £1.95% to the level of Council Tax for 2019-20 and 2020-21.
  - (g) The Council's Tax Base be set at 28,396.76.
  - (h) The revised Capital Programme, including new schemes, as set out in Appendices 3 and 4 of the Report.

## DRAFT

- (B) It be noted that the Government has indicated that an amendment will be made to Provisional Local Government Finance Settlement for all authorities in relation to the Business Rates Tariff adjustment.

### Reason for Decisions

The Report set out a draft standstill budget for 2018-19, as well as indicative budgets for 2019-20 and 2020-21 and associated issues, and also included current indications of the impact this would have on Council Tax. It also set out the updated Capital Programme, and set out the capital resources available to the Authority to finance the Capital Programme.

The Business Rates Tariff adjustment amounted to a reduction in Business Rates of £4,700 in 2017/18, rising to £4,900 in 2020/21. The adjustment impacted upon the transfer to/from Working Balances but did not require any change to the recommendations to 7 February Council.

### **75. Housing Revenue Account Budgets 2017/18 to 2020/21**

Consideration was given to the Joint Report of the Head of Finance and the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 7.1 – 7.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The revised position with regard to estimated income and expenditure in respect of the 2017-18 Housing Revenue Account Budget and Housing Revenue Account Budgets for the period 2018-19 to 2020-21 as summarised in Appendix 1 of the Report be noted.
- (B) Council, at its meeting to be held on 7 February, 2018, be recommended to:
- (i) Determine a minimum level of working balances of £1.671 million for 2018-19 and indicative working balances of £1.706 million and £1.731 million for 2019-20 and 2020-21, respectively.
  - (ii) To note the further 1% reduction in rents in 2018-19 in accordance with the Government's Social Rent Policy.
  - (iii) Approve the Housing Revenue Account Budgets for 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21 (and note the estimated outturn for 2017-18) as summarised in Appendix 1 of the Report.

### Reasons for Decisions

The Report considered the proposed three-year Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Budgets for 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21, which were formulated within the framework provided by the Approved HRA Business Plan.

A review of the 2017-18 HRA Budget, together with base HRA Budgets for the period 2018-19 to 2020-21 were attached to the Report as Appendix 1. The Budgets were formulated in accordance with the assumption set out in the HRA Business Plan, with projected levels of income and expenditure as summarised In Report paragraph 3.2.

Rent income continued to reflect an annual rent reduction of 1% per annum for

## DRAFT

2018-19 and 2019-20, reflecting the revised national rent policy as determined by the Government's 2015 Summer Budget (the rent policy was due to revert to the Consumer Price Index plus 1% with effect from 2020-21).

No material changes were made in relation to inflation and cost pressures, with the exception of pay awards. Provision of 1% existed within the indicative budgets for 2018-19 and 2019-20, however as a result of the National Employers for Local Government offer, made of 5 December 2017, the provision now amounted to 2.47% in 2018-19, rising to a combined impact of 4.9% in 2019-20 as compared to the 2% originally provided.

No direct account had been taken at this stage for the impact of Vacant High Value Housing Payments associated with the Housing and Planning Act 2016. The Council was still awaiting details re. the threshold for High Value Vacant Payments however it was considered that its implementation would not impact until after the 2018-19 financial year. The full impact of the actual High Value Baseline would be assessed following publication of the proposed regulations and would then be subject to a further report.

In considering the HRA Revenue Account, consideration also needed to be given to the HRA Capital Programme and the level of Working Balances. A key consideration of the Capital Programme was the Revenue Contribution to Capital Outlay (RCCO) and Major Repairs Allowance (MRA). The latter had been replaced with a Depreciation Charge and although this was lower than the previous MRA a compensating increase in RCCO had been made. In accordance with the Approved Business Plan the RCCO also represented the net surplus on the Revenue Account after determining the level of Working Balances.

In view of the risks associated with the management of the HRA under self-financing, minimum working balances of 10% of net operating expenditure had been assumed throughout the three-year budget period.

### **76. Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme 2017/18 to 2022/23**

Consideration was given to the Joint Report of the Head of Finance and the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 8.1 – 7.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The estimated availability of Housing Revenue Account capital resources for the period 2018-19 to 2022-23, as set out in Appendix 1 of the Report, be noted.
- (B) It be noted that the Capital Programme now also included an allocation of £12 million for new social housing.
- (C) Options to increase social housing based upon the housing needs of the District and land availability be developed and the subject of a separate Cabinet report as soon as practically possible.
- (D) Council, at its meeting to be held on 7 February, 2018, be recommended to approve the five-year Housing Revenue Account Capital Programme for the period 2018-19 to 2022-23 (as set out in Appendix 2 of the Report).

## Reasons for Decisions

The Report considered the draft proposed five-year HRA Capital Programme for the period 2018-19 to 2022-23, together with the forecast outturn for 2017-18, compiled within the financial framework provided by the Approved HRA Business Plan.

Details of the estimated availability of HRA capital resources during the five-year period were set out in Appendix 1 of the Report, whilst a five-year Capital Programme was set out in Appendix 2.

A comparison of estimated resource availability with the proposed HRA capital expenditure programmes was set out in Report paragraph 3.3.

In addition to the above, the voluntary Minimum Revenue Provision (Debt Repayment) set aside from 2017-18 will by 2022-23 have effectively created a headroom in capital financing of £9.672 million that could be used in the medium term to supplement resources available without impacting upon long term sustainability.

The use of the Minimum Revenue Provision headroom together with the uncommitted capital resources provided in excess of £12.0 million for new council build / estate regeneration.

### **77. Treasury Management Strategy, Minimum Revenue Provision Policy and Annual Investment Strategy 2018/19**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Finance (Item 9.1 – 9.28 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That Council, at its meeting to be held on 7 February, 2018, be recommended to approve:

- (a) The Prudential and Treasury Indicators;
- (b) The Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Policy Statement;
- (c) The Treasury Management Policy;
- (d) The Annual Investment Strategy for 2018-19.

#### Reason for Decision

The Council was required to approve its treasury management and investment strategies to ensure that cash flow was adequately planned and that surplus monies were invested appropriately.

### **78. Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2018-2023**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 10.1 – 10.22 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the proposed Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2018-2023 (attached as Appendix 1 to the Report) and the actions contained within it be approved.

## Reasons for Decision

The Council's previous Housing and Homelessness Strategies were now out of date.

Whilst there was no longer a statutory requirement to produce a housing strategy, there remained a statutory duty to produce a homelessness strategy. A new combined housing and homelessness strategy would ensure that residents, Registered Providers and other stakeholders could continue to refer to a document which outlined the housing and homelessness issues facing the District and presented the actions which were being put in place to address them.

### **79. Shared Accommodation – Pilot Project**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 11.1 – 11.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The Head of Housing and Partnerships, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, be authorised to circulate the Project Brief (attached at Appendix 1 to the Report) to a minimum of two Registered Providers and be authorised to make amendments to the Project Brief if necessary.
- (B) The Head of Housing and Partnerships, following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader, be authorised to appoint the most suitable Registered Provider following the receipt and assessment of bid submissions.
- (C) The Head of Housing and Partnerships be authorised to agree Terms and Conditions to let a Council Flat to a Registered Provider for the provision of flat share accommodation for single people under the age of 35.
- (D) A review of the pilot project be undertaken following a 12 month operational period and if successful, the project may be extended and other difficult to let flat would be considered for flat share accommodation (up to a maximum of 5 flats over a 5 year period).

## Reasons for Decisions

The Council had a number of flats that could be difficult to let and it was proposed to use one of those properties for the pilot project. If successful, other difficult to let Council flats could be utilised to help meet the needs of single people aged under 35 and prevent Council stock remaining empty for lengthy periods of time.

The Council would agree terms via either a lease or management agreement to enable a Registered Provider to take over the management of the flat for an initial period of 18 months. The Council would receive full rental income from the Registered Provider during this time, including during any void periods. The Registered Provider would charge rent to the tenants occupying the flat and an additional intensive housing management cost to cover any support needs. The Council would also receive £20-£30 per month, in addition to the rent attributable

## DRAFT

to the property for the increase in maintenance costs that may occur.

The Council would maintain and insure the property and have 100% nomination rights to the property. Referrals would be made from the Allocations or Housing Options teams.

### 80. Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 – Homelessness Funding

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

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The contents of the Report be noted.
- (B) Delegated authority be given to the Head of Housing and Partnerships following consultation with the Housing Portfolio Leader to approve expenditure of the New Burdens and Flexible Homelessness Support Grant Funding as set out in Report paragraphs 5.5 and 5.11, and in accordance with the delivery of the Council's homelessness priorities as set out within the Council's Housing and Homelessness Strategies.

#### Reasons for Decisions

The Homelessness Reduction Act (HRA) was passed by Parliament in 2017 and was due to commence in April 2018. The Act was designed to significantly reform England's homelessness legislation by placing duties on local authorities to intervene at earlier stages to prevent homelessness, irrespective of whether or not an applicant had 'priority need' or may be 'intentionally homeless'.

Preparations were being made to ensure the Council would be in a position to discharge the new duty including attending Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) briefing sessions, undertaking training of staff, further developments of the Housing IT System (Northgate), and assessment of the new duties and their implications for future service delivery.

MHCLG (formerly the Department for Communities and Local Government) modelling estimated that there would be initial costs associated with the Act, namely from additional people presenting to authorities for assistance with homelessness.

The MHCLG had therefore estimated that the Council would face new burdens as a result of the following duties:

- Duties to help secure accommodation;
- Duty to provide advisory services;
- Right to request a review;
- Suitability of accommodation;
- Providing accommodation for cases being reviewed;
- Providing assessments and personalised housing plans.

As a result of the MHCLG estimation the total of New Burdens Funding for the Council totalled £85,763 for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20.

The MHCLG had advised that the new 'flexible homelessness support grant' was

## DRAFT

a radical replacement of the tightly controlled funding currently given to source and manage temporary accommodation for homeless individuals and their families under which the Council would have received £978.43 for 2017-18.

The Flexible Homelessness Support Grant allocation for the period 2017/18 to 2019/20 was £147,064.80.

It was considered that there would be a significant increase in demand for homelessness services and prevention support work. It was therefore proposed that the New Burdens funding for the years 2017-18 to 2019-20 be allocated to ensuring the Council discharged its new duty through the provision of Homelessness Services and Prevention Support work as described above.

Cabinet on 7 April, 2005 agreed that delegated authority be given to the Head of Regeneration (now Head of Housing and Partnerships) following consultation with the Social Inclusion and Housing Portfolio Leader (now the Housing Portfolio Leader) to approve expenditure in relation to Central Government Homelessness Prevention Grant allocations, in accordance with the delivery of the Council's homelessness priorities as set out within the Council's revised Housing and Homelessness Strategy 2018-23.

### **81. Revised Local Development Scheme and Local Plan Review**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Interim Head of Economic Development (Item 13.1 – 13.27 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That Council, at its meeting to be held on 21 February, 2018 be recommended to:

- (A) Cease work on the preparation of Local Plan Part 2.
- (B) Subject to decision (A), trigger the process of undertaking a Local Plan review, which upon adoption will replace the adopted Local Plan Part 1 and will address (amongst other issues) those matters which Part 1 identified as needing to be covered in Local Plan Part 2.
- (C) Approve the revised Local Development Scheme detailed in Appendix 1 of the Report covering the three year period February 2018 to February 2021 so that it can be brought into effect on 21 February, 2018 under Section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).

#### Reasons for Decisions

Local Plan Part 1, adopted in 2014, contained the strategy for growth and environmental protection in the District to 2028, including the timescale, quantum and distribution of development and policies for its delivery. Local Plan Part 2 was intended to contain the detailed site allocations to deliver the requirements set out in Part 1.

Work on Local Plan Part 2 had been overtaken by events due to a variety of reasons as set out in the main body of the Report. In summary, Local Plan Part 1 (which Part 2 delivered) was becoming out of date due to changes in Government policy and ongoing work across the West Midlands to address the housing shortfall in the Housing Market Area. These were strategic changes which could not be addressed via a Part 2 Plan. The changes cumulatively

## DRAFT

diminished the value of the Part 2 Plan, which would now be limited to delivering site allocations (many sites already had planning permission in any case), in line with a housing requirement figure which may shortly be out of date based on the Government's proposed changes to the way in which this was calculated.

There was an opportunity to make more efficient use of limited resources by ceasing work being undertaken on Local Plan Part 2 and instead triggering a review of the Local Plan as a whole. Taking Part 2 forward would involve considerable staff time and financial resource to take through an examination, in the full knowledge that a review would still be required once Part 2 was adopted.

Work undertaken on Part 2 to date could be carried forward to help inform the process of a review, and those participants in the consultation process would continue to be engaged and kept up to date with any changes the process as set out in the Report detail.

Any changes to the Local Plan timetable and nature of the documents being produced must be set out in an updated Local Development Scheme (LDS).

It was a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that a Planning Authority must prepare an LDS. It must be kept up to date, setting out which Local Development Documents the Council would be producing, the subject matter and geographical area they would cover, and the timetable for their production.

The previous LDS was adopted in April 2016. The updated LDS covered the production of key documents including the proposed Local Plan review. It also set out revised timescales for the Cannock Town Centre Area Action Plan. The format of the LDS had been changed from previous iterations to reflect the streamlined planning system and legal requirements which apply to it.

### **82. Rugeley Power Station Supplementary Planning Document**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Interim Head of Economic Development (Item 14.1 – 14.54).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The amended Rugeley Power Station Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) attached as Appendix 1 to the Report be approved.
- (B) Authority for further minor (non-substantive) amendments to the SPD be delegated to the Head of Economic Development in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader.
- (C) The amended Rugeley Power Station SPD be adopted in accordance with the provisions of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended).

#### Reasons for Decisions

As set out in the Cabinet report of 15 June, 2017, joint work with Lichfield District Council had been ongoing to produce an SPD to provide the framework for the future redevelopment of Rugeley Power Station, which stopped generating electricity in June 2016, had since been decommissioned and was now awaiting demolition.

## DRAFT

SPDs provided further policy elaboration to adopted Local Plans. SPDs were intended to build upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on the policies in the Local Plan, had to be prepared in line with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and comply with the requirements as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraph 153.

The draft SPD was consulted on in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, with the formal consultation stage taking place for a period of six weeks between 24 July and 4 September, 2017.

The SPD was amended to take account of the representations received by each Council. A Consultation Statement was published on the Council's website at [www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/planningpolicy](http://www.cannockchasedc.gov.uk/planningpolicy) and included a schedule of summarised responses and the officer responses to those, setting out how each representation had been addressed.

### **83. Application for Permission to Spend – Mill Green**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Interim Head of Economic Development (Item 15.1 – 15.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

#### RESOLVED:

That subject to the receipt of the appropriate Section 106 sums from the Developer, the following permissions to spend be approved:

- (i) £150,000 towards Cannock Town Centre Improvements (breakdown as detailed in Report paragraphs 3.6 and 3.7).
- (ii) £32,300 annually towards maintenance of Mill Green Nature Park.
- (iii) £28,000 on Mill Green Nature Park.
- (iv) £90,000 towards Cannock Railway Station improvements.
- (v) £5,000 towards an Employment and Skills Action Plan.
- (vi) £65,000 towards the Retail and Skills Academy.

#### Reasons for Decisions

The Council entered into an agreement with Development Securities (Cannock) Limited and U+I Group PLC for the sale of Council owned land at Mill Green, Lichfield Road, Cannock. The agreement was originally dated 13 November, 2013 and had been varied subsequently by supplemental agreements in 2014, 2016 and 2017.

Outline planning consent was granted for a Retail Outlet Village on the Mill Green site in July 2016. The Council subsequently received an application under Section 73 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) to vary conditions attached to the permission. That application was approved and a further planning permission was issued in October 2017. The purchasers had covenanted that upon acquiring any legal interest in the Council land they would enter into an associated planning agreement (i.e. the Section 106 Agreement), the terms of which were agreed as part of the application.

Once the Section 106 had been completed numerous payments would be due to the Council at various trigger points ranging from prior to Commencement of Development through to Occupation. The Council would covenant in the Section

## DRAFT

106 Agreement to only use the money received for the purposes set out in the Section 106 Agreement.

The Council needed to be in a position to spend quickly once payments were received, in order to fulfil its Section 106 obligations. Payback provisions for any unspent monies were included and ranged from 5 to 10 years.

The current programme indicated a timeframe of entering into a construction contract circa December 2017 and Commencement of Development (start on site) in February 2018, with a planned Spring 2020 opening.

Spend was anticipated against the Section 106 and included proposed activities for Cannock Town Centre improvements, such as:

- The production of a Cannock Town Centre Investment Prospectus to help raise the profile and identify opportunities available in Cannock Town Centre;
- The provision of free Wi-Fi in Cannock Town Centre;
- The implementation of a Cannock Town Centre Rewards Scheme to encourage retail customer loyalty;
- Improvements to Cannock Town Centre markets, including improvements to the entrance to Cannock Town Centre Indoor Market to provide an improved environment for shoppers;
- Promotional events and festivals including those planned by the Cannock Traders' Association;
- Funding the position of a Cannock Town Centre Partnership Officer for 2 years to assist in delivering the improvements to Cannock Town Centre.

The funding of the position of a Cannock Town Centre Partnership Officer for 2 years had been job evaluated as a salary grade E (i.e. £20,138 to £22,658 p.a.).

In addition to the above, spend was also itemised for the maintenance of Mill Green Nature Park, which included additional management and maintenance costs incurred by the Council, payable on each anniversary of Occupation for the life of the development.

In addition to the above, spend was also itemised for Mill Green Nature Park, which included:

- Improvements to the Mill Green Nature Park, including refurbishment of ladder board signs and installation of an additional ladder board;
- Felling and replanting of trees within the beech wood.

In addition to the above, spend was also itemised for Cannock Railway Station improvements, which included:

- Improvements to passenger waiting and general station facilities and/or the lengthening and widening of existing platforms;
- Improved access to the Railway Station including being made compliant with the Equality Act 2010.

The funds could form part of a wider funding strategy to deliver an enhanced improvement scheme at Cannock Railway Station.

In addition to the above, spend was also itemised for an Employment and Skills

# DRAFT

Plan, which included:

- A plan, which included, details of how the owner should co-operate with the Council's Head of Economic Development from the start of the tendering process for the construction of the Development and throughout the construction of the Development;
- Details of how the owner should work with the Council to identify target groups within local communities to deliver training, ranging from pre-employment to skills development in partnership with the public sector and voluntary organisations;
- A commitment from the owner to use their reasonable endeavours to employ local people in the construction and operation of the Development;
- The procedure by which the owner should notify employment vacancies to local employment agencies.

In addition to the above, spend was also itemised for the Retail and Skills Academy, which included how the Development operator and the Development tenants working in partnership with the Council and South Staffordshire College (or alternative provider of higher education in the Cannock Chase District) would deliver training on the Development site and at a College Campus, as well as details about how the Retail and Skills Academy monies would be spent.

## **84. Sheep Fair / Bow Street, Rugeley Conservation Area: Appraisal and Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Interim Head of Economic Development (Item 16.1 – 16.12 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The proposed amendments to the Draft Appraisal and Draft Management Plan Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) for Sheep Fair/Bow Street, Rugeley Conservation Area, as detailed in Appendix 2 of the Report, be approved.
- (B) Authority for any further minor amendments to the above documents be delegated to the Head of Economic Development in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader.
- (C) The Appraisal and Management Plan SPD for Sheep Fair / Bow Street, Rugeley Conservation Area (as amended), be adopted, the latter as a Supplementary Planning Document.

### Reasons for Decisions

Each Conservation Area in the District was supported by two policy documents, an Appraisal seeking to provide a clear definition of the special architectural or historic interest that warranted its designation as a Conservation Area, and a Management Plan SPD following on from the Appraisal which set out in more detail the means by which the preservation and enhancement of the character and appearance of that Conservation Area might be pursued.

A series of such documents covering each of the District's eight Conservation Areas had been adopted in recent years and the documents for Sheep Fair /

## DRAFT

Bow Street completed the Appraisal coverage, leaving several Management Plans still in progress, together with some updates of earlier Appraisals which would form the subject of future Cabinet reports.

The Draft Sheep Fair / Bow Street, Rugeley, Appraisal and Management Plan were considered by Cabinet on 17 April, 2014 when it was resolved that the documents be approved for consultation and that the consultation responses be reported to a future meeting to allow for the finalisation and adoption of the documents as part of the evidence base for the Local Plan.

Consultees expressed their support for the documents and their objectives, suggesting a number of minor alterations and courses of action. Appendix 1 to the Report set out the main issues raised during the consultation and Appendix 2 the proposed amendments to the text.

### **85. Additional Capital Investment into Culture and Leisure Services as Part of the Council's Financial Recovery Plan**

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles (Item 17.1 – 17.6 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The preferred capital investment option proposed by Inspiring Healthy Lifestyles (IHL) (as detailed in Report paragraph 3.7) be agreed to in order to deliver the minimum required level of savings of £50,000 per annum from 2019-20.
- (B) Authority be delegated to the Head of Environment and Healthy Lifestyles in consultation with the Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader to agree and facilitate all actions required to implement the preferred option.

#### Reasons for Decisions

Cabinet, at its meeting held on 15 December, 2016, proposed a series of savings options to deliver a balanced budget in 2019-20 in accordance with the £1.6 million savings requirement identified as part of the Financial Recovery Plan (FRP) process.

Part of the FRP process included reviewing the existing contract for culture and leisure with the Council's provider, IHL, in order to deliver significant savings, circa £210,000 through a reduction in its management fee up to 2019-20.

Part of the management fee reduction, circa £70,000 per annum, was identified by improvements to and streamlining IHL's operational budgets. Those savings were delivered in 2017-18 as proposed.

The balance of the savings to be achieved required IHL to develop their preferred capital investment proposal to deliver a minimum of £50,000 revenue savings by 2019-20 for the extended contract term.

Over the proposed extended contract period this equated to a savings target of £650,000.

IHL focussed investment at Cannock Chase Leisure Centre and considered four possible options which were set out in section 5 of the Report.

IHL's options appraisal informed by the capital cost assessments and business

# DRAFT

plan projections through to the end of the extended contract term taking into account operational expenditure and income alongside capital funding solutions identified a clear preference for option 2.

Option 2 – gym refurbishment, introduction of virtual fitness to the existing studio, conversion of the bowling green to an indoor cycling studio, functional studio and multi-purpose studio. It also included the provision of bowling mats to provide a programme within the sports hall. The capital cost was estimated to be £521,891 and projected savings of £902,987.

This option would create a high quality and unique fitness experience which delivered the savings required by the Council and the risk would sit with IHL. IHL would be responsible for identifying any additional operational efficiencies to bridge and gap between the revenue impact of the project and the management fee reduction required by the Council.

There was a requirement for the Council to act as a Guarantor for IHL in order to provide the capital funding solution to deliver the project, and for providing a Waiver, the implications of which were set out in the legal implications of the Report.

The meeting closed at 4:45 p.m.

---

LEADER

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**  
**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE**  
**APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL**  
**TUESDAY 6 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 2:00 P.M.**  
**IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK**  
**PART 1**

PRESENT: Councillors

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.  
Lea, C.I.  
Pearson, A.R.  
Snape, P.A.  
Todd, Mrs. D.M.

**1. Appointment of Chairman**

Councillor A.R. Pearson was appointed Chairman for the meeting.

**2. Apologies**

None.

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

No declarations of interest were made.

**4. Exclusion of the Public**

RESOLVED:

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

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

# **PART 2 MINUTES**

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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

**HELD ON THURSDAY 14 DECEMBER 2017 AT 4:00 P.M.**

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

**PART 2**

**67. Former Tenants' Arrears Debt Recommended for Write-Off**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 11.1 – 11.11 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The former tenants' arrears as detailed in Appendix 1 to the Report be approved for write-off.
- (B) The revised Former Tenant Debt Recovery Policy, attached as Appendix 2 to the Report, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

Appendix 1 to the Report presented twelve former tenants' arrears cases of £1,000 or above which could not be collected for the reasons identified in Report paragraphs 5.1(a)-(d). The arrears totalled £17,603.29.

In relation to former tenants' arrears cases of £1,000 or above for the period up to 31 March 2017 which could not be collected for reasons identified in Report paragraph 5.1(d), the Council's external auditors reported to the Audit & Governance Committee on 19 September 2017 that "During the course of our audit we noted that former tenants' arrears total £1,025k for which a provision of £0.974 million exists. Our discussions with management confirmed that Council Policy is not to write off debt until all potential collection methods have been exhausted however there is a significant proportion of this debt £0.409 million which is highly unlikely to be collectable due to the debt being 6 years old or greater. A large proportion of this debt has been brought forward from the previous Housing System (Navision) and will create a bottleneck in the Management Information system. We concluded that there is a need for management to critically review this balance and undertake housekeeping by writing off old debt that is highly unlikely to be collectable and focusing attention on current and collectable arrears."

In order to improve performance of the recovery of the form tenants' debt a revised Former Tenant Debt Recovery Policy was attached at Appendix 2 of the Report. The revised policy aimed to ensure that approval for write-off was sought promptly as soon as debt became uncollectable.

# DRAFT

## 68. Rugeley Boxing Club

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 12.1 – 12.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Minute no. 84 of Cabinet held on 15 December, 2016 be rescinded, that approved the recommendation set out in paragraph 5.6 of the related Cabinet report of the same date for the grant of a lease extension at a favourable (non-market) rent, with fixed five-yearly rent increases to be agreed, having regard to the community benefits provided by this club and its charity status.
- (B) The grant of a lease extension of an additional 19 years at a favourable (non-market) rent of £300 per annum for the full 19 year term of the extended lease be approved.
- (C) Authority be delegated to the Head of Housing and Partnerships to agree terms and conditions and all other actions required to implement the decisions.

### Reasons for Decisions

The Rugeley Boxing Club was located on a Council-owned land site of some 650 square metres in Wellington Road, Rugeley, and moved to this site in 1986 following the constructions of the existing buildings by the club in accordance with the terms of a lease from the Council for 21 years from 25 December, 1983.

The current lease to the 'Trustees of Rugeley (Police) Community and A.B.C.' was for a term of 14 years from 25 December, 2004 to 24 December, 2018 at an annual rent of £150.

Rugeley Boxing Club was a registered charity, operated on a 'voluntary donation' approach by its users and was open to both males and females and to all ages.

The only registered members of the Club were those that competed but otherwise all those who used the Club for exercise/fitness purposes did this on a 'drop-in' basis so that the Club offered both health and social benefits to people of all ages using the facilities. The weekly attendance averaged 60 to 70 attendees which was considered to be full capacity. Historically the Club had a strong police connection with several serving police understood to attend and a serving police sergeant being on the Club committee.

Rugeley Boxing Club was seeking an extended lease term of sufficient duration to allow the Club to secure further funds to finance the construction of a building extension for which planning permission was obtained on 12 August, 2015. The proposed extension was indicative of the Club's need for additional capacity to meet the needs of the community.

Extension of the lease term would need to be on favourable 'non-commercial' terms in order to enable the Rugeley Boxing Club to secure finance, build the proposed extension and continue to operate the Club in its existing form.

**DRAFT**

The meeting closed at 4:18 p.m.

---

LEADER

DRAFT

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

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

**WEDNESDAY 20 DECEMBER 2017 AT 10:00 A.M.**

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

**PART 2**

**5. Succession Policy**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 5.1 – 5.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chairman invited all parties present to introduce themselves and then confirmed the procedure for the Hearing.

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

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

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

The Panel then deliberated in private, accompanied by the Council's Legal Advisor and Secretary to the Panel. Following a vote there was an equal number of votes (2 for and 2 against), therefore, the Chairman exercised his right to use a casting vote in accordance with Rule 15(2) of the Council's Procedure Rules.

At the conclusion of the deliberations and voting the Appellant, Appellant's Representative and Officers representing the Council returned to the meeting and the Chairman announced the decision of the Panel:-

**RESOLVED:**

That the Panel allow the Appellant's appeal in so far as he would be granted an Introductory Tenancy for the property he currently resides at.

### Reasons for Decision

The Panel carefully considered all the relevant factors of the case and the representations made by all parties.

Whilst acknowledging that the Appellant was not entitled to succeed to the tenancy, the Panel were mindful that this was an unusual and exceptional case and was sympathetic to the particular needs and circumstances.

Therefore, on balance it would be appropriate for the Appellant to be allowed to remain at the property.

The meeting closed at 10:45 a.m.

---

CHAIRMAN

**CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL**

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
APPEALS AND COMPLAINTS PANEL**

**TUESDAY 6 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 2:00 P.M.**

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

**PART 2**

**5. Stage 3 Complaint**

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Head of Housing and Partnerships (Item 5.1 – 5.23 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Chairman invited all parties present to introduce themselves and then confirmed the procedure for the Hearing.

The Officer representing the Council presented the Council's case by taking the Panel and Complainant through the report. The Complainant and Members of the Panel were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Officer representing the Council. At this point the Officer who had recently been involved with the case attended the Hearing at the Panel's request to respond to questions raised by the Complainant and Members of the Panel, and then left the Hearing.

The Complainant then presented their case to the Panel. The Officer representing the Council and Members of the Panel were afforded the opportunity to ask questions of the Complainant. Questions were asked by Members of the Panel only.

The Officer representing the Council and the Complainant were then given the opportunity to sum up their respective cases to the Panel. No summations were given.

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

At the conclusion of the deliberations the Complainant, Complainant's Supporter and Officer representing the Council returned to the meeting and the Chairman announced the decision of the Panel:-

**RESOLVED (UNANIMOUS):**

That the Complaint not be upheld.

**Reasons for Decision**

The Panel was of the view that Officers had dealt with the matter in a professional manner and in the Council's best interests, although it was acknowledged that there

had been some delays in dealing with correspondence for which the Council had formally apologised.

The Council had an obligation under Section 123 of the Local Government Act 1972 to obtain a best possible price when dealing with land sales. Officers had applied this test appropriately in the circumstances.

The Chairman advised that should the Complainant be dissatisfied with the decision taken then a further complaint could be made to the Local Government & Social Care Ombudsman.

The meeting closed at 3:12 p.m.

---

CHAIRMAN