

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET

HELD ON THURSDAY, 24 MARCH, 2016 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
Dudson, A.	Environment Portfolio Leader
Davis, Mrs. M.A.	Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader
Allen, F.W.C.	Housing Portfolio Leader
Todd, Mrs. D.M.	Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader

Councillor G. Alcott, Deputy Leader of the Council and Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader, was in the Chair.

89. Apologies,

Apologies were received from Councillors G. Adamson, Leader of the Council, and A. Lovell, Corporate Improvement Portfolio Leader; and R. Kean, Deputy Managing Director and Head of Finance.

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

<u>Member</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Type</u>
-	-	-

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

91. Updates from Portfolio Leaders

None.

92. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 1 February, 2016

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 1 February, 2016, be approved as a correct record and signed.

93. Forward Plan

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

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period March to May, 2016 be noted.

94. Recommendations of Scrutiny Committees

Cabinet considered the below comments submitted by the Housing Scrutiny Committee held on 7 March, 2016:

“That Members of the Housing Scrutiny Committee express concern with the withdrawal of the Supporting People grant funding of £220,000 at the end of March 2016, and that the Committee intends to monitor the situation over the next 12 months and report back to Cabinet.”

RESOLVED:

That the comments of the Housing Scrutiny Committee made in respect of the withdrawal of Supporting People grant funding be noted.

95. Quarter 3 Performance Report

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 7.1 – 7.48 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The performance information and case studies relating to Priority Delivery Plans as detailed in Appendices 1 to 6 of the report be noted.
- (B) The actions and indicators which are rated red or amber be noted, and the remedial action or rescheduled delivery stated to address performance be confirmed.

Reason for Decisions

Information for performance actions and indicators for Quarter 3 (October – December) was included in Appendices 1 to 6 of the report. The ratings provided for these items indicated that 76.6% of actions had been achieved or were on target for success.

96. Priority Delivery Plans 2016/17

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 8.1 – 8.25 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That Council, at its meeting to be held on 6 April, 2016, be recommended to adopt the Priority Delivery Plans for 2016/17 and approve them for publication.

Reasons for Decision

The Corporate Plan 2015-18, approved by Cabinet in July 2015, superseded the Council's previous Corporate Plan 2011-14 and set out the revised mission, priorities and strategic objectives of Cannock Chase District Council for the following three years.

The supporting Priority Delivery Plans are the annual documents that set out how the Council will achieve progress against its strategic objectives; these plans establish the actions, performance measures and timetables for delivery that are the basis of the Council's quarterly and annual performance reporting framework.

Prior to consideration of the following matter, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Economic Regeneration and Planning Portfolio Leader and other Cabinet Members took the opportunity to place on record the Council's gratitude to Bob Phillips, LEP Consultant, and former Head of Planning and Regeneration, who was retiring on 31 March, 2016 after more than 40 years' service with the Council. Bob had been instrumental over this time in supporting and eventually leading at Officer level the economic regeneration of the district.

Cabinet also took the opportunity to record the Council's gratitude to John Heminsley, OBE, who would also be retiring shortly, after nearly 37 years of service. John had held a number of senior planning posts in this time and had been gradually reducing his hours over the last three and half years towards retirement.

Bob thanked the Cabinet for their kind words.

97. Civic Centre Car Park

Consideration was given to the Report of the LEP Consultant (Item 9.1 – 9.5 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Council, at its meeting to be held on 6 April, 2016 be recommended to allocate an additional £150,000 to the Civic Centre Car Park capital scheme.
- (B) Subject to Council agreeing to increase the sum in the capital programme for the conversion and extension of the Civic Centre car park, it be agreed that the scheme as generally shown in Appendix 1 to the report be implemented.
- (C) The Managing Director be authorised to act as necessary to implement the scheme, including entering into agreements and contracts with other bodies with an interest in the proposals; seeking consents as required including planning consent; making orders as required for the new public car park; making provision for alternative staff parking; entering into arrangements, including financial arrangements, for any off-site works

required, including any works to Brunswick Road.

Reasons for Decision

In April, 2015 Cabinet resolved to support the expansion of services planned at Cannock Hospital by the Royal Wolverhampton Hospital Trust (RWT) by the creation of additional public parking at the rear of the Civic Centre. The decision to create additional parking for patients and visitors to the hospital was based on the principle that this commitment to support local NHS services would not be at any increased cost to the Council tax payer. Pay and display income from the public car park would be used to fund the Council's costs.

Council at its meeting in May, 2015 resolved to include a capital scheme in the General Fund Capital Programme of £300,000 to convert and extend the Civic Centre staff car park.

This report sought approval to spend funds in the Capital Programme to implement the expanded car parking scheme. Whilst the scheme and its costs would be refined ahead of implementation, the scheme as planned was more extensive than that on which the original budget was based; and would require additional budget. It was, therefore, resolved that Council be recommended to approve a Capital Programme of £450,000 for the works.

The report sought approval for all the actions required to implement the scheme including seeking planning consent and entering into agreements as required.

98. Revised Local Development Scheme and Process for Overseeing the Development of the Local Plan Part 2

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Development (Item 10.1 – 10.26 of the Official Minutes of the Council). The Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader moved an amendment to Recommendation 2.2, which was agreed, that:

2.2 Cabinet delegates overseeing the production of Local Plan Part 2 to the Head of Economic Development, working in consultation with a cross-party Member / officer working group of seven elected Members, four of whom should be from the Labour Group; and three from the other Groups on Council, with nominated Cabinet Members including the portfolio holder for Economic Development and Planning, prior to approval of the relevant draft for public consultation by Cabinet and Council.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Council, at its meeting to be held on 6 April, 2016, be recommended to approve the revised Local Development Scheme (as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report) covering the period April, 2016 – March, 2019, so that it can be brought into effect on 6 April, 2016, under Section 15 of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended by the Localism Act 2011).
- (B) Oversight of the production of Local Plan Part 2 be delegated to the Head of Economic Development, working in consultation with a cross-party Member / Officer working group of seven elected Members, four of whom should be from the Labour Group; and three from the other Groups on Council, including the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio

Leader, prior to approval of the relevant draft for public consultation by Cabinet and Council.

- (C) The latest population and household projections which show that current local plan provision is not meeting Cannock Chase District's local housing need be noted. The implication of this is that provision over the plan period up to 2028 may need to increase by at least 986 dwellings. This will be tested through the process of developing Local Plan Part 2.

Reasons for Decisions

It was a requirement of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 that a planning authority must prepare a Local Development Scheme (LDS). This must be kept up to date, setting out which Local Development Documents (LDDs) the Council will be producing, the subject matter and geographical area which these covered, and the timetable for their production.

The previous LDS was adopted in October 2012, and hence an updated version was required, covering a three year period from April 2016 to March 2019.

The updated LDS covered the production of key documents including the Local Plan Part 2. Part 1 was adopted in June 2014 and set out the strategic direction and policies for development of the District up to 2028. Part 2 related to detailed site allocations and policy development and Cannock Town Centre Area Action Plan. For completeness, the timescales for production of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) were also included in this LDS. There was no statutory requirement for their inclusion but this approach illustrated how planning policy documents all related to one another.

Production of the Local Plan and other key policy documents was complex, and a number of statutory stages were involved including the need to prepare them for submission to the Secretary of State for independent examination by a Planning Inspector and the need for public consultation. Previously, key planning policy matters were reported to the Economic Development and Planning Policy Development Committee and where required they would also be reported to Cabinet and Full Council.

Since the Council restructured its committees, the process for overseeing the production of the LDDs (i.e. Local Plan Part 2 and the Cannock Town Centre Area Action Plan) needed reviewing, as the committees these matters would previously have been reported to no longer exist.

The replacement committee structure created a challenge for overseeing such policy development, as planning policy was cross cutting and therefore did not have a natural 'home', other than to report to each of the new scrutiny committees which would be a lengthy and unwieldy process. A more streamlined option was to form a cross-party Member / Officer working group who, in conjunction with the Portfolio Leader for Economic Development and Planning, could assist the Head of Economic Development in preparing documents ready for consultation, or, at an appropriately advance stage of the document's production, would be able to approve the document for referral to Cabinet.

99. Design Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Local List

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Development

(Item 11.1 – 11.148 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The proposed amendments to the Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) contained in Appendix 2 to the report be approved.
- (B) Authority for any further minor 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 design SPD (as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report) be adopted.

Reason for Decisions

The National Planning Policy Framework 2012 (NPPF) placed a strong emphasis on good design in development. One of the core planning principles was that planning should always seek to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity for all existing and future occupants. Furthermore, the NPPF defined heritage as including assets identified by the Council e.g. through Local Listing, and national good practice guidance issued by English Heritage in 2012 confirmed the important role of a Local List in celebrating heritage valued by the community. The Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1) 2014 which included Policy CP3 Chase Shaping – Design, indicated the intention of producing a Design SPD, and Policy CP15 Historic Environments referred to the preparation of a Local List of locally significant heritage assets. These documents emphasised the need to encourage the local distinctiveness of places which allowed a more local emphasis to design and heritage to be adopted.

A District Characterisation Study was carried out in 2011 and it was resolved at Cabinet in December 2011 (Minute 109 refers) to adopt the Study as part of the Core Strategy Evidence Base, to be used to inform preparation of a Design SPD. In addition, suggestions of buildings to include on a Local List received during the consultation period were resolved to be added to previous suggestions from the community and support be given to preparation of a Local List.

The Draft Design SPD was then considered by Cabinet on 23 April, 2015 when it was resolved that it be approved for consultation and that the consultation responses be reported back to a future meeting to allow for the finalisations and adoption of the Document. The Draft SPD was subject to consultation over a six week period from 12 June to 24 July, 2015. Town and Parish Councils, local developers and agents, local history groups and relevant planning consultees with the Council, the County Council, Staffordshire Police and the Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB) Unit were all consulted. The Draft SPD was further publicised via a press notice and the Council's website.

Consultees expressed their support for the Document and its objectives, suggesting a number of minor alterations. Appendix 2 set out the main issues raised during consultation and the proposed amendments to the text. Amendments were also made in response to changes to national and local policy contexts; these were also detailed in Appendix 2 to this report. In addition, the format of the Document was updated to improve ease of use and additional illustrations were added.

A number of existing local planning guidance documents will be superseded upon final adoption of this Design SPD including the House Extensions Design Guide 2003 and the Trees, Landscape and Development SPG 1998. The Staffordshire Residential Design Guide (2001) will also be largely superseded by this Design SPD, however Staffordshire County Council Highways could still utilise the 'Access Layout' aspects of the Guide in relation to residential road layouts.

100. Department for Transport / West Midlands Rail Consultation – West Midlands Rail Franchise, December 2015 and Chase Line 'Gateway' Stations Upgrade

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Development (Item 12.1 – 12.17 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The actions of the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader, in conjunction with the Head of Economic Development, in responding to the Department for Transport (DfT) Rail Executive on the DfT/West Midlands Rail Consultation – West Midlands Rail Franchise, December 2015, by 22 March 2016, be endorsed.
- (B) A further report be submitted to Cabinet in the event that the DfT do not approve Centro's request to assume funding responsibility for the incremental services under the current funding partnership with Centro and Staffordshire County Council.
- (C) Centro/West Midlands Integrated Transport Authority (WMITA), West Midlands Rail (WMR), Greater Birmingham and Solihull Local Enterprise Partnership (GBLSEP), Stoke-on-Trent and Staffordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (SSLEP), Staffordshire County Council and franchise bidders be asked to support the Council's aspirations for the West Midlands rail franchise detailed in this report.
- (D) The proposed 'Gateway' station strategy to secure additional infrastructure and improved facilities at Cannock, Hednesford and Rugeley Town stations, as detailed in this report, be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

West Midlands Rail Franchise

The DfT, working in partnership with WMR, had sought comments on rail services, station and supporting services running in the West Midlands franchise area and were considering what the next West Midlands franchise operator should deliver.

The views of the public and stakeholders on rail services and stations, for the next West Midlands rail franchise, were being sought on all services currently operated by London Midland under the existing franchise arrangement. This included the 'Chase Line', Birmingham-Walsall-Cannock-Hednesford-Rugeley services (jointly specified by the DfT/WMR) as well as Crewe-Rugeley Trent Valley-Euston, via the West Coast Main Line (specified by the DfT).

WMR represented the region's metropolitan, shire and unitary authorities, and

planned to gain greater influence and control over local rail services from 2017, leading to the creation of a fully devolved West Midlands Rail Contract. It was a partnership of fourteen Metropolitan District, Shire and Unitary local transport authorities, including Staffordshire County Council (Chair), which covered the proposed area of the devolved rail services and would have a greater role in the specification, management and delivery of local rail services in collaboration with the DfT. It was a limited company with a board of directors made up of the leaders or cabinet members of the local transport authorities involved. Representatives from the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs) also attended meetings of the board.

WMR was also going to work alongside the new West Midlands Combined Authority (WMCA) on a wider local devolution package agreed by the West Midlands' Local Authorities and Government in November 2015. This package included a growth deal with an £8 billion, ten year investment plan to drive economic growth and improve local transport.

Rail passenger numbers in the West Midlands had more than doubled from 37 million in 2005/06 to over 78 million in 2013/14, the highest rail growth of any region in the UK. This growth was expected to continue.

The GBSLEP Strategic Economic Plan 2014 included an £8.4m Chase Line Electrification Package, which included linespeed improvement, Gateway station upgrades and improved services. The Chase Line was a strategic priority for the District, and the Council wished to promote upgrades to Cannock, Hednesford and Rugeley Town as 'Gateway' stations through LEP, National Station Improvement Programme (NSIP) and Access for All and other funding streams. A partnership approach was needed, the franchise offering such an opportunity to develop this strategy further. The Council had been funding the Chase Line services, in partnership with Centro and Staffordshire County Council since 1997 to 2007 and from 2010 to the present time.

Station Gateways

The upgrade of Cannock, Hednesford and Rugeley Town stations was included in the GBSLEP Strategic Economic Plan, Programme 2, 2014, as part of the Chase Line Electrification Package.

The package included three elements based on completion of the current £76m Walsall-Rugeley electrification scheme, in December 2017, namely; i) the linespeed upgrade (now fully funded), ii) station Gateways and iii) restoration of half-hourly off peak services.

Cannock station in particular was a priority following the resolution to grant planning permission for the £110m, Mill Green Retail Outlet Village in December 2015. The Council therefore wished to promote this scheme as a partnership with transport stakeholders through a LEP Growth Deal bid or other funding sources that arise.

101. Affordable Housing Delivery

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 13.1 – 13.8 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The development of homes for affordable rent (that do not exceed the relevant Local Housing Allowance) on sites that are subject to a S106 agreement for affordable housing be allowed.
- (B) A further report be received when the Housing and Planning Bill has passed through Parliament.
- (C) The current delivery mechanisms that secure the delivery of affordable housing be noted.

Reasons for Decisions

The Developer Contributions and Housing Choices Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was adopted in June 2015 and was consulted on widely following a high level review of development viability undertaken by Adams Integra in July 2012, which was subsequently updated in July 2014.

The report identified seven key recommendations to inform future affordable housing policy that will were widely consulted on to develop the SPD for Affordable Housing:

- On S106 sites the affordable housing target should be to seek 20% on sites of 15 or more dwellings.
- It is considered appropriate to lower the affordable housing policy threshold and for sites of between 1 and 14 units (inclusive), a financial contribution should be sought and these monies used to fund affordable housing provision elsewhere in the District in partnership with Registered Providers.
- The starting point for negotiation on S106 sites will generally be an expectation of 80% social rent and 20% intermediate tenure.
- Policy should be clearly worded so as to set out genuine targets with the approach acknowledging the role of viability and application of flexibility where required.
- Where a developer considers a site has particular viability issues the developer should put forward a case which will then be subject to independent assessment (the cost of any assessment to be funded by the developer).
- Adams Integra assumed that the majority of schemes in the District should be able to absorb a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) rate of £40 per m2 and deliver 20% affordable housing.

As the viability evidence stated that social rent was a viable option on S106 sites the Council had continued to request this tenure. Officers did not have the authority to accept affordable rent as an option even if viability evidence supported the applicants' argument that the site was unviable with social rent or if Registered Providers were unwilling to deliver this product.

Although to date there had only been one request to vary a S106 agreement from provision of social rent to affordable rent there were likely to be more requests in the future. Registered Providers were also facing a 1% rent reduction following the Budget 2015 announcement and reviewing their business plans which may result in them becoming increasingly hesitant to deliver social rent.

If affordable rent did not become an accepted tenure on S106 sites there was a possibility that sites could stall as social rent became increasingly difficult for Registered Providers to deliver.

In November 2015 Brandon Lewis MP, the Minister of State for Housing and Planning wrote to Local Authority Leaders and Chief Planning Officers (as attached as Appendix 1) concerning the delivery of affordable housing. He urged local planning authorities to respond constructively and positively to requests for renegotiations on S106 sites and to take a pragmatic and proportionate approach to viability. The letter also states that:

‘Where it is simply proposed that the tenure mix is adjusted, with the overall affordable housing contribution remaining the same, it is our view that this is unlikely to justify reopening viability by either side’.

Affordable rent units were already being delivered in the District on sites where all of the units are affordable and the site was therefore not subject to a S106 agreement. To date approximately 35 units had been delivered (excluding supported accommodation).

The table below showed the average rents in the District for both social and affordable rent and the Local Housing Allowance.

Property Bed Size	Council Rent per week (District average)	Registered Provider social rent per week (District wide average from HCA data)	Registered Provider affordable rent per week (District wide average from HCA data)	Local Housing Allowance (per week)
1	68.24	74.31	No figures available *	90.90
2	77.43	93.33	100.35	113.92
3	81.40	101.17	111.36	129.47
4	88.15	108.57	No figures available *	170.67

** There are no figures available from the Homes and Communities Agency for 1 beds and 4 beds as no properties of that type have been converted to affordable rent or built in the District for affordable rent to date.*

It was proposed that Officers could agree affordable rent units on S106 sites without the need for a viability assessment but with the commitment from the Registered Provider that the rent to be charged did not exceed the relevant Local Housing Allowance rate (excluding supported housing), applicable for the property at the time of rent setting.

Consideration should also be given by Registered Providers to setting rent levels at below 80 per cent of market rent to take into account local circumstances.

102. Impact of Supporting People Cuts on Housing and the Wider Community

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 14.1 – 14.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the contents of this report be noted in relation to the financial impact of the withdrawal of Supporting People grant funding and the mitigating measures that

partner agencies and the Council have taken to keep services operational.

Reason for Decisions

Supporting People grant funding of £220,000 was going to be withdrawn by Staffordshire County Council at the end of March 2016. This was in addition to the £300,000 that was withdrawn in 2014/15.

Withdrawal of Supporting People funding affected the most vulnerable people in the District. Those with the highest needs such as single homeless with support needs or teenage parents could potentially lose their accommodation and support networks.

Partner agencies who manage the affected services in the District have had to re-evaluate their business plans and try and find alternative funding to maintain their projects and support provision. This had not been possible in all cases.

Bromford Housing had confirmed that they will not be in a position to provide a floating support service, post March 2016. To maintain a floating support service to socially excluded groups the Council will provide £30,000 from within the Tenancy Services budget to fund a Tenancy Sustainment Officer. Staffordshire County Council had confirmed that they can match fund the Council's contribution so two Tenancy Sustainment Officers could be recruited. Their funding would link in with the Building Resilient Families and Communities (BRFC) Programme, which was Staffordshire's response to the Government's 'Troubled Families' initiative. As the funding linked with the BRFC programme it would need to be reviewed annually as part of the Payments by Results commissioning process.

103. Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED:

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

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET

HELD ON THURSDAY, 24 MARCH, 2016 AT 4:00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

104. Waste Collection Service and Treatment of Organic Waste

Consideration was given to the Not for Publication Report of the Deputy Managing Director (Item 16.1 – 16.4).

RESOLVED:

That Bloomfield Composting Limited be approved as the preferred contractor for the disposal and treatment of organic garden waste.

Reasons for Decision

Cabinet at its meeting on the 12 November 2015 resolved that:

- (a) Option 2 be approved as the preferred option for the collection / disposal of Organic Waste, with Green Waste being collected separately (all year round) and Food Waste being collected in the residual bin (on an alternate weekly basis).
- (b) In accordance with (A) above:
- (c) Jack Moody Ltd is the preferred contractor for the disposal and treatment of organic garden waste;

The award of the contractor was subject to the statutory 10 day standstill period.

During the standstill period an issue was raised in relation to the tender bid documents. An investigation was undertaken in conjunction with Staffordshire County Council Procurement team and due to an omission of relevant and material information by Jack Moody Recycling Limited it was resolved that their tender should be excluded from the evaluation and award process.

Bloomfield Composting Ltd, who originally came second, as part of the tender process have therefore been awarded the Contract. The annual cost for disposal amounts to £159,440 per annum and is only some £3,440 more than figures approved by Cabinet in November 2015.

The meeting closed at 4.50 p.m.

LEADER

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CABINET

HELD ON THURSDAY, 21 APRIL, 2016 AT 4:00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors:

Adamson, G.	Leader of the Council
Alcott, G.	Deputy Leader of the Council and Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader
Mitchell, Mrs. C.	Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader
Dudson, A.	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

105. Apologies

None.

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

<u>Member</u>	<u>Interest</u>	<u>Type</u>
-	-	-

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

107. Updates from Portfolio Leaders

None.

108. Minutes of Cabinet Meeting of 24 March, 2016

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 March, 2016, be approved as a correct record and signed.

109. Forward Plan

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

RESOLVED:

That the Forward Plan of Decisions for the period April to June, 2016 be noted.

110. Recommendations of Scrutiny Committees

None received.

111. Risk Management Policy & Strategy

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 7.1 – 7.17 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

(A) The Council's risk appetite be agreed.

(B) The Risk Management Policy and Strategy be approved.

Reasons for Decisions

The Accounts & Audit Regulations 2015 state that:

“The relevant body is responsible for ensuring that the financial management of the body is adequate and effective and that the body has a sound system of internal control which facilitates the effective exercise of that body's functions and which includes arrangements for the management of risk.”

The effective management of risks required a policy and strategy which has been approved by, and has clear support of, leading members and senior officers.

112. Local Plan (Part 1) Authority Monitoring Report

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Development (Item 8.1 – 8.62 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader recommended that the outcomes 'improved health/longevity of residents' and 'reduce health inequalities gap' which were both rated in the monitoring report as not being achieved, be put forward for inclusion as part of the Health Scrutiny Committee's work programme for the 2016/17 municipal year.

RESOLVED:

That:

(A) Publication of the Cannock Chase Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) 2014-15 be approved.

(B) The Head of Economic Development, in consultation with the Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader, be authorised to approve the publication of future Cannock Chase AMRs, including minor revisions to

the format and content of the AMR as required.

Reasons for Decisions

Cannock Chase Council was required to publish monitoring information under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004), as amended via the Localism Act (2011). A key role of the Authority Monitoring Report (AMR) was to monitor the implementation and performance of local planning policy against its objectives. It demonstrated through the use of indicators, the degree to which policies were being successfully implemented. It also formed an important part of the Local Plan evidence base and helped identify the need to bring forward new or amended policies or to produce a Development Plan Document.

The AMR provided a 'snapshot picture' of progress made in implementing the Local Plan policies and proposals. The AMR also informed progress made in production of the Cannock Chase Local Plan documents, including Neighbourhood Plans and Supplementary Planning Documents. As per the new legislative requirements it also reported on the Council's activities under the Duty to Co-operate and monitoring of the Community Infrastructure Levy.

The Council had produced monitoring reports on the Local Plan for a number of years, dating back to 1997 when the previous Local Plan was adopted. Since then annual reports have been produced and made available publicly. Prior to the Localism Act 2011 the Council was also required to submit its annual monitoring reports to Government Office. Under previous delegated powers (approved via Cabinet report 22.01.2009) this publication and submission was approved by the Deputy Chief Executive, in consultation with the relevant Portfolio Leader.

A change in the management structure of the Council since then has required a revision of the publication process for the AMR. Whilst the Council no longer had to submit its AMR to Government, it still had a statutory duty to make monitoring information publicly available on a yearly basis as a minimum. As this was the first AMR for the recently adopted new Local Plan (Part 1) 2014, it also set a new format for the document and monitored a different series of outcomes, using different indicators to the old 1997 Local Plan AMRs. It also incorporated the new legislative requirements to report on specific topics.

113. Establishment of a Property Partnership

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Economic Development (Item 9.1 – 9.11 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The creation of a limited liability partnership (LLP) between the Council and Public Sector Plc Facilitating Limited (PSP) be approved.
- (B) The final terms of the necessary agreements be agreed by the Council Solicitor and the Head of Economic Development in consultation with the Portfolio Leader for Corporate Improvement, provided that all due diligence checks have been carried out successfully.
- (C) It be noted that the LLP requires the establishment of an LLP Members Board with equal Council and private sector representation, supported by

an Operations Board for Officers.

- (D) The Council representation on these Boards be agreed by the Council Solicitor following consultation with the Portfolio Leader for Corporate Improvement once the format of these Boards has been established as part of the final terms of the agreement; and that the Council representation on the LLP Board will be from members of the Cabinet.
- (E) All projects be assessed by an internal Council team before going forward to the LLP to decide on their suitability for further development.
- (F) It be noted that the LLP will be an additional option for the Council to use to deal with its property portfolio.
- (G) It be noted that further reports will be submitted to Cabinet in respect of relevant proposals to pursue a property related project through the LLP.

Reasons for Decisions

The Council had been invited to express an interest in the establishment of a joint venture Limited Liability Partnership (LLP) with a private sector partner, Public Sector Plc Ltd (PSP). PSP was a joint venture formed in 2007 between the Winston and William Pears Groups (first called BVSF). In its first phase of development PSP secured partnerships with 10 local authorities including Dudley MBC. The Council investigated the feasibility and value of establishing an LLP joint venture with PSP, and they in turned carried out a review of property opportunities with the Council. On this basis both parties believed there to be benefit in forming an LLP.

The purpose of the LLP would be to facilitate property related projects for the Council, making use of private sector funding, resources and skills in addition to those available through the Council and paid for by the LLP. The Council will be able to use the Strategic Partnership created to a achieve wide-range of property opportunities for the Council, including regeneration, redevelopment, rationalisation, property portfolio reductions and property related investment.

The Council and PSP would each own 50% of the shares of the LLP whose main purpose would be to:-

- Invest private sector funds in projects of mutual benefit;
- Facilitate regeneration projects;
- Provide potential capital receipts and/or revenue income streams to the Council from the development of surplus land and buildings;
- Support the Council in the development of its strategic review of the property portfolio, including:-
 - The delivery of a property portfolio strategy for the Council involving, where appropriate, a partnership approach to the management of the Council's property assets;
 - The acquisition of private property or land by PSP to facilitate development and potentially to develop income streams.

Projects were developed by the LLP using PSP resources, but the final decision as to whether or not to proceed with a project would sit with the Council. The profit share on each project would vary depending on the resources committed to the project and PSP guarantee at least the income currently derived from an

asset, with the profit share element relating only to amount above this level. The option might also be available to the Council to put additional resources into a project in order to achieve a larger percentage of the profit share.

In order to ensure that the land and property portfolio of the Council was maximised into the future, there needed to be a review of these assets. The utilisation of an LLP model and approach would facilitate this and allow the Council a large amount of flexibility to be able to manage the portfolio differently into the future.

The LLP between PSP and the Council was an additional option for maximising the value from property assets and did not remove the Council's ability to consider alternatives.

The meeting closed at 4:17 p.m.

LEADER

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY 23 MARCH, 2016 AT 3.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

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

Allen, F.W.C.	Hardman, B.
Burnett, G.	Kraujalis, J.T.
Dean, A.	Lea, C.
Dudson, Miss M.	Pearson, A.
Foley, D.	Snape, P.A.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Sutherland, M.
Grocott, M.R.	

134. Apologies

No apologies for absence were received.

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

Member	Interest	Type
Lea, C.I.	Application CH/16/032, Proposed first floor extension to front and garage conversion, 2 Horns Croft, Rugeley – Member is a former colleague of the objector who lives next door to the applicant	Personal

136. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillor P.A. Snape advised that he had been lobbied in respect of TPO 2015/05, Proposed Tree Preservation Order, 36 New Penkridge Road, Cannock

137. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 March, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed subject to the reference to “roof” contained in Minute No. 131 be amended to read “root”.

138. Members' Requests for Site Visits

None

139. Application CH/16/032, Proposed first floor extension to front and garage conversion, 2 Horns Croft, Rugeley

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.3 – 6.19 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Applicant, Suzan Roberts, had applied to make representations at the meeting. However, she indicated that she did not wish to speak and asked the Development Control Manager to read out a letter on her behalf supporting the application.

The Development Control Manager showed the Committee a plan of the previous application (approved on appeal in 1991) along with a set of drawings for this application.

RESOLVED:

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

140. Application CH/16/006, Proposed erection of 24 no. new houses and 15 no. new apartments with associated landscaping and parking, Edgemoor Trade Centre, Park Street, Cannock

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.20 – 6.47 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager circulated the following update to the Committee:-

Further information on Affordable Housing component of development

Item No. 6.45 – Paragraph 5.30. On sites of 15 units and above the Council requires a 20% affordable housing contribution. This is as set out in the Cannock Chase Adopted Local Plan (Part 1) – Policy CP7. The tenure requirement expected on such sites is 80% social rent and 20% shared ownership; as set out in the Council's Developer Contributions and Housing Supplementary Planning Document.

However, Walsall Housing Group is proposing to deliver 100% affordable homes on the site, but to achieve this they need to provide the units for affordable rent instead of social rent.

The Government's definition of both affordable rent and social rent is as set out in national planning policy states that:

- **Social Rented Housing** – Rented housing owned by local authorities and private registered providers, for which guideline target rents are determined through the national rent regime.

- **Affordable Rented Housing** – Rented housing let by local authorities or private registered providers of social housing to households who are eligible for social rented housing. Affordable Rent is subject to rent controls that require a rent of no more than 80% of the local market rent (including service charges, where applicable).

As such, the provision of Affordable Rented Housing does not conform with the Districts aspirations for Affordable Housing as in certain cases rent levels can be higher.

However, in this instance Affordable Rented Housing is considered acceptable because:

- The entire development (100%) would be affordable;
- The applicant has stated that their financial appraisals and bid submission for grant to the Homes and Communities Agency are based on achieving those rents and the scheme isn't viable without that level of income;
- Allows the development of a redundant brownfield site.

Item 6.34 – Paragraph 5.60 – Update from Staffordshire County Highways

Withdraw initial objection and recommend approval subject to the following conditions and informatives:-

Conditions:

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

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

2. Before the development hereby approved is commenced, drainage details for the disposal of foul sewage and surface water shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the dwellings hereby approved are first occupied.

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

3. Before any of the dwellings hereby approved are first occupied, the parking and turning areas serving those dwellings, as shown on approved plan reference PO2 (sq.) revision C shall be provided and surfaced in a porous bound material. The parking and turning areas shall thereafter be retained for the life of the development.

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

4. Prior to first use of the new site access the visibility splays to the site shall

be provided and maintained in accordance with submitted details Drawing No. 6734-106 revision PO and with nothing placed or retained forward of the splays and the public highway exceeding 600 mm in height above the level of the adjacent carriageway.

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

5. Before any of the dwellings hereby approved are first occupied, the new accesses to the site, as illustrated on plan reference PO2 (sq.) Revision C, shall be completed within the limits of the public highway.

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

6. Concurrent with the construction of the new site access, all the existing site accesses made redundant as a consequence of the proposed development shall be permanently closed with the access crossing reinstated as a footway in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

Informatives:

Please note that prior to the access being constructed you require Section 184 Notice of Approval from Staffordshire County Council. The link below provides a further link to “vehicle dropped crossings” which includes a “vehicle dropped crossing information pack” and an application form for a dropped crossing. Please complete and send to the address indicated on the application form which is Staffordshire County Council at Network Management Unit, Staffordshire Place 1, Wedgewood Building, Tipping Street, Stafford, ST16 2DH or email nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk

Please note that prior to the reinstatement works taking place you require a Permit to Dig. Please contact Staffordshire County Council at Network Management Unit, Staffordshire Place 1, Wedgewood Building, Tipping Street, Stafford, ST16 2DH or email nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk

Any soakaway shall be located a minimum 4.5m rear of the public highway.

Item 6.34 – Paragraph 5.60 – Update from Flood Risk Management Team. They have revised their initial comments and recommend the following condition:

1. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The scheme must be based on the design parameters and proposed strategy set out in the Drainage Layout (Drawing No. C6734-100-P3). The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme to be submitted shall demonstrate:
 - Surface water drainage system(s) designed in accordance with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (DEFRA,

March 2015)

- Limiting the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to the 100 year plus 30% (for climate change) critical rainstorm to provide a 30% betterment on existing discharge rates
- Detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details on any attenuation system and the outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods
- Plans illustrating flooded areas and flow paths in the event of exceedance of the drainage system
- Provision of an acceptable management and maintenance plan for surface water drainage to ensure continued performance of the system for the lifetime of the development. This should include a schedule of required maintenance activities and frequencies and contact details for the organisation responsible for carrying out these duties
- Finished floor levels to be set at a minimum of 150mm above existing ground levels

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site.

Recommendation – As set out in the report, subject to the additional conditions and informatives.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 to ensure that the whole site is developed for the provision of affordable housing (100%) and a financial contribution of £6,851 for SAC mitigation.
- (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 conditions and informatives:-

Conditions:

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

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

2. Before the development hereby approved is commenced, drainage details for the disposal of foul sewage and surface water shall be submitted to an approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The

scheme shall thereafter be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the dwellings hereby approved are first occupied.

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

3. Before any of the dwellings hereby approved are first occupied, the parking and turning areas serving those dwellings, as shown on approved plan reference PO2 (sq) revision C shall be provided and surfaced in a porous bound material. The parking and turning areas shall thereafter be retained for the life of the development.

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

4. Prior to first use of the new site access the visibility splays to the site shall be provided and maintained in accordance with submitted details Drawing No. 6734-106 revision PD and with nothing placed or retained forward of the splays and the public highway exceeding 600 mm in height above the level of the adjacent carriageway.

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

5. Before any of the dwellings hereby approved are first occupied, the new accesses to the site, as illustrated on plan reference PO2 (sq.) Revision C, shall be completed within the limits of the public highway.

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

6. Concurrent with the construction of the new site access, all the existing site accesses made redundant as a consequence of the proposed development shall be permanently closed with the access crossing reinstated as a footway in accordance with details to be first submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

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

7. No development shall take place until a detailed surface water drainage scheme for the site has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority in consultation with the Lead Local Flood Authority. The scheme must be based on the design parameters and proposed strategy set out in the Drainage Layout (Drawing No. C6734-100-P3). The scheme shall subsequently be implemented in accordance with the approved details before the development is completed. The scheme to be submitted shall demonstrate:

- Surface water drainage system(s) designed in accordance with the Non-statutory technical standards for sustainable drainage systems (DEFRA, March 2015)
- Limiting the discharge rate generated by all rainfall events up to the 100 year plus 30% (for climate change) critical rainstorm to provide a 30% betterment on existing discharge rates
- Detailed design (plans, network details and calculations) in support of any surface water drainage scheme, including details

on any attenuation system and the outfall arrangements. Calculations should demonstrate the performance of the designed system for a range of return periods and storm durations inclusive of the 1 in 1 year, 1 in 2 year, 1 in 30 year, 1 in 100 year and 1 in 100 year plus climate change return periods

- Plans illustrating flooded areas and flow paths in the event of exceedance of the drainage system
- Provision of an acceptable management and maintenance plan for surface water drainage to ensure continued performance of the system for the lifetime of the development. This should include a schedule of required maintenance activities and frequencies and contact details for the organisation responsible for carrying out these duties
- Finished floor levels to be set at a minimum of 150mm above existing ground levels

Reason: To prevent flooding by ensuring the satisfactory storage of/disposal of surface water from the site

Informatives:

Please note that prior to the access being constructed you require Section 184 notice of Approval from Staffordshire County Council. The link below provides a further link to “vehicle dropped crossings” which includes a “vehicle dropped crossing information pack” and an application form for a dropped crossing. Please complete and send to the address indicated on the application form which is Staffordshire County Council at Network Management Unit, Staffordshire Place 1, Wedgewood Building, Tipping Street, Stafford, ST16 2DH or email nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk

Please note that prior to the reinstatement works taking place you require a Permit to Dig. Please contact Staffordshire County Council at Network Management Unit, Staffordshire Place 1, Wedgewood Building, Tipping Street, Stafford, ST16 2DH or email nmu@staffordshire.gov.uk

Any soakaway shall be located a minimum 4.5m rear of the public highway.

141. TPO 2015/05, Proposed Tree Preservation Order at 36 New Penkridge Road, Cannock

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.48 – 6.55 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Yvonne Scott, objecting to the proposed TPO.

The Committee asked questions of Chris Garner, Tree Protection Officer who was in attendance at the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That TPO 2015/05 is not confirmed as the removal of the tree would not have a significant negative impact on the local environment in terms of visual amenity and

would be detrimental to the amenity of the occupiers of 36 New Penkridge Road, Cannock.

The meeting closed at 4.15pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY 13 APRIL, 2016 AT 3.10 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

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

Allen, F.W.C.	Kraujalis, J.T.
Burnett, G.	Lea, C.
Dean, A.	Pearson, A.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Snape, P.A.
Grocott, M.R.	Sutherland, M.
Hardman, B.	

(The start of the meeting was delayed slightly due to the site visits running over).

142. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D. Foley and Miss M.J. Dudson.

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

Member	Interest	Type
Grocott, M.R.	Application CH/16/045, Residential development. Erection of a 3 bedroom detached house and associated access (resubmission of CH/15/044, amended plans) – <i>77 Hednesford Road, Rugeley</i> – Member knows the applicant and her family well.	Personal and Pecuniary
Pearson, A.	Application CH/16/0338, Outline application for proposed 5 no. 1 bedroom residential units – <i>Land to rear of 43 – 57 Broad Street, Bridgtown</i> – A relative of the Member lives near to the site.	Personal and Pecuniary

144. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

None.

145. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 March, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

146. Members' Requests for Site Visits

None.

147. Application CH/16/018, Retention of boundary fence, 132 Green Lane, Rugeley

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.6 – 6.14 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised the Committee that the applicant had intended on speaking at the meeting but was unable to attend. He read out a statement from the applicant supporting the application.

RESOLVED:

That the application, which was recommended for refusal, be approved as the Committee did not consider there would be a detrimental impact on the area.

148. Application CH/16/045, Residential development: Erection of a 3 bedroom detached house and associated access (resubmission of CH/15/044, amended plans), 77 Hednesford Road, Rugeley

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.15 – 6.33 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Having declared a personal and pecuniary interest, Councillor M.R. Grocott left the meeting during the determination of this application.

Prior to consideration of the application representations in support of the application were made by Mrs. Wood, the applicant.

RESOLVED:

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

149. Application CH/15/0308, Variation of condition 11 of planning permission CH/86/609 to allow the following hours of business: 07:00 hrs to 19:00 hrs Monday to Saturday and 10:00 hrs to 16:00 hrs on Sundays and public holidays (amended description), Homestyle, Cannock Road, Norton Canes, Cannock

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.34 – 6.44 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations in support of the application were made by Mrs. Mennell, the applicant. She clarified that the hours of business on a Monday to Saturday would be 08:00 hrs to 19:00 hrs (not from 7:00 hrs as indicated in the report).

RESOLVED:

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

150. Application CH/15/0338, Outline application for proposed 5 no. 1 bed residential units, Land to rear of 43-57 Broad Street, Cannock

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.45 – 6.61 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Having declared a personal and pecuniary interest Councillor A. Pearson left the meeting during the determination of this application.

Prior to consideration of the application representations in support of the application were made by Fred Pritchard, the applicant.

RESOLVED:

(A) That the applicant be requested to enter into an Agreement under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 to secure a financial contribution towards Affordable housing based on the formula outlined in the report.

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

(Councillor F.W.C. Allen left the meeting at this point and was not present for the determination of the following application).

151. Proposed Tree Preservation Order No. 2015/06 – 25b Old Penkridge Road, Cannock

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.62 – 6.69 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That Tree Preservation Order No. 2015/06 be confirmed without modification.

The meeting closed at 4.15pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY 4 MAY, 2016 AT 3.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

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

Allen, F.W.C.	Johnson, T. (substituting for D. Foley)
Burnett, G.	
Dean, A.	Kraujalis, J.T.
Dudson, Miss M.J.	Lea, C.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Pearson, A.
Grocott, M.R.	Snape, P.A.
Hardman, B.	

152. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors D. Foley and M. Sutherland.

Councillor T. Johnson was in attendance as substitute for Councillor D. Foley.

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

None

154. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillors G. Burnett, C. Lea and P. Snape declared they had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/15/0080, Residential development: erection of up to 93 dwellings with associated parking, landscaping/public open space and access (all matters reserved expect access), Former Parker Hannifin Works, Walkmill Lane, Bridgtown in view of an article in the Express and Star from the Leader of the Council.

155. Minutes

RESOLVED:

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

156. Members' Requests for Site Visits

None.

157. Application CH/15/0080, Residential development:- erection of up to 93 dwellings with associated parking, landscaping/public open space and access (all matters reserved except access), Former Parker Hannifin Valve Works, Walkmill Lane, Cannock

Consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.1 – 6.25 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Development Control Manager advised the Committee that Members had visited the site in the past to look at a previous application. He further advised that Bridgtown History Society had requested that the developer provides a plaque to commemorate the industrial heritage of the site.

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Nigel Simkin on behalf of the applicant.

RESOLVED:

That the application be refused for the following reasons:-

The proposed development, in accordance with Policy CP7 of Cannock Chase Local Plan (Part 1) and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document is required to provide 20% on-site affordable housing. However, in this instance the proposed development fails to make any on-site affordable housing provision. As such, the proposed development is contrary to Local Plan Policy (Part 1) CP7 and Developer Contributions Supplementary Planning Document.

158. Application CH/16/088, Residential development: Proposed erection of 1 no. detached dwelling and associated works, 19 Eskrett Street, Hednesford

The application was deferred to the next meeting at the request of the applicant.

159. Application CH/16/063, Prior Notification: Erection of hay barn to replace existing outbuildings, Deavall Farm, Hawks Green Lane, Cannock

Following a site visit consideration was given to the report of the Development Control Manager (Item 6.46 – 6.55 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Steve Barnes on behalf of the applicant.

RESOLVED:

That prior approval pursuant to Class A of Part 6, Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) Order 2015 be granted.

160. TPO No. 2015/07, Proposed Tree Preservation Order, Hawkins Logistics Ltd.,

Redbrook Industrial Estate, Brereton, Rugeley

The report seeking Members approval to confirm TPO 2015/07 was withdrawn.

The meeting closed at 3.50pm.

CHAIRMAN

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
PLANNING CONTROL COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY 18 MAY, 2016 AT 3.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

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

Burnett, G.
Dudson, Miss M.J.
Freeman, Miss M.A.
Grocott, M.R.
Hardman, B.

Hoare, M. (substituting for M. Sutherland)
Johnson, T. (substituting for D.Foley)
Kraujalis, J.T.
Lea, C
Snape, P.A.

161. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors F.W.C. Allen, A. Dean, D. Foley, A. Pearson and M. Sutherland.

Councillor T. Johnson was in attendance as substitute for Councillor D. Foley and Councillor M. Hoare was in attendance as substitute for Councillor M. Sutherland.

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

None

163. Disclosure of lobbying of Members

Councillor Mrs. S.M. Cartwright declared that she had been lobbied in respect of Application CH/16/088, Residential development: Proposed erection of 1 no. detached dwelling and associated works – 19 Eskrett Street, Hednesford

164. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 4 May, 2016 be approved as a correct record and signed.

165. Members' Requests for Site Visits

RESOLVED:

That a site visit be undertaken in respect of Application CH/16/149, Proposed demolition of 2 no. bungalows and extension of existing car park and associated works, Civic Centre, Beecroft Road, Cannock

Reason: To consider the impact on the amenity of the area

166. Application CH/16/088, Proposed erection of 1 no. detached dwelling and associated works, 19 Eskrett Street, Hednesford

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

Prior to consideration of the application representations were made by Mr. Roskell (an objector) and Mr. Reynolds, the applicant's agent (supporting the application).

The Development Control Manager clarified the background to the application for the benefit of the Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the application, which was recommended for refusal, be approved subject to:

- (A) Conditions to be delegated to the Development Control Manager.
- (B) The applicant being requested to enter into an obligation under Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990 to require an affordable housing contribution if appropriate.

The meeting closed at 3.40pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BETTER JOBS AND SKILLS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 8 MARCH, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Cooper, Miss J. (Chairman)

Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Hoare, M.
Freeman, Miss M.A.	Preece, J.T.
Gamble, B.	Whitehouse, Miss S.

Also in attendance:-

Councillor G. Alcott (Economic Development and Planning Portfolio Leader – observer)
Councillor Mrs. D.M. Todd (Town Centre Regeneration Portfolio Leader – observer)
Sheila Dunning (Cannock Traders Association)
Linda Whitehouse (The Traders of Hednesford Association)
Ian Hodgson (Rugeley Traders Association)
Paul Brewer (Bilfinger GVA)

11. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. A. Allt, G. Burnett, M. Buttery and T.B. Johnson.

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

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

13. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the Meeting held on 9 December, 2015 be approved as a correct record.

14. Town Centre Trader Issues

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager welcomed Sheila Dunning (Cannock Traders Association), Linda Whitehouse (The Traders of Hednesford Association) and Ian Hodgson (Rugeley Traders Association) to the meeting to highlight any issues that were relevant for their respective town centres.

Cannock Traders Association

Sheila Dunning raised two issues in relation to Cannock Town Centre. The first related to the development of the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village and she asked how and where the proposed £150k investment into the town centre would be spent and whether the Traders Association would receive any of the funding. The second issue was in relation to youths loitering in the town centre shopping centre, in particular around Market Hall Street. Customers had complained about their presence and the Shopping Centre Manager had raised it but there had been little action by the Police.

In response to the issues raised the Planning and Economic Development Services Manager advised that discussions were ongoing between the Council and the developer of the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village. The S106 Agreement would contain a large number of elements and it was anticipated that there would be specific initiatives to support the position and appeal of the town centre. Details of the s106 Agreement were currently under negotiation and there was potential to support the work of the town centre Traders Association and to consider how best to connect the Designer Village to the town centre.

Sheila Dunning asked whether the Developers were considering providing a free shuttle bus between the Mill Green Designer Outlet Village and the town centre. The Officer explained that establishing a connection between the two sites was part of the discussions for the S106 Agreement. It was unlikely that a shuttle bus would be free as a sustainable solution was required. Therefore improving the existing bus routes and rail station would be the most likely outcome along with providing better facilities for users along the corridor between the Designer Village and the town centre.

A Member asked for clarification regarding which parts of the town centre was lacking in terms of policing and whether the Shopping Centre Manager had approached the Police regarding the issues raised. Sheila Dunning explained that as the shopping centre was owned privately it was covered by its own security team. Therefore she assumed the problems were occurring elsewhere in the town centre. She would speak with the Cannock Shopping Centre Manager and ask her to contact the Police direct regarding the problems being experienced.

Traders of Hednesford Association

Linda Whitehouse outlined the issues relating to Hednesford town centre. The first issue was in relation to anti social behaviour including drugs related

incidents, proxy buying and bullying (children not feeling safe). She had raised these issues with the relevant officers/Police.

She considered that it was important to address the issue of how to increase the footfall in the town centres in order to help the independent traders. This was an issue affecting all three town centres. The Association was looking at getting a street market (farmers/craft market) back in to the town which would hopefully assist.

She made reference to the 13-17 year olds who had nowhere to go and considered that investment was needed to improve the provision for them.

Another issue she raised related to HGV's who were entering the town centre and causing problems by mounting the pavements particularly at the junction of Eskrett Street and Market Street. The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager confirmed that the County Council was looking at a scheme to address the parking issues in Anglesey Street.

She commented on the condition of the paving in the town centre and asked who was responsible. The Officer confirmed that the County Council was responsible for paving and this was a common theme in all three town centres. Following discussions between Officers and representatives of the County Council it had been agreed that a "walk-about" with representatives from key agencies would be set up to identify any issues (such as the condition of the paving/potholes/resurfacing etc.) within the town centres so that the County Council could address them.

A Member asked whether a Cannock Chase Member could be involved in the "walk-about". The Head of Economic Development confirmed that this might be possible and advised that at the Rugeley Town Council meeting the previous week Town Councillors had also expressed an interest in taking part in the "walk-about". For practical reasons it was suggested that it might be sensible to have a single representative from each Council.

Rugeley Traders Association

Ian Hodgson highlighted the issues affecting Rugeley Town Centre. He explained that youths were loitering outside Barclays Bank in the evening due to the bank providing free internet access. The youths were not causing any harm but they did look intimidating. Additionally, Barclays Bank was closing on a Wednesday and this was having a damaging effect on footfall. Rugeley Town Council would be discussing this with the Bank.

He also commented on the poor condition of the paving and drains which had been discussed at a Rugeley Town Council meeting. It had been agreed that this would be addressed as part of the "walk-about".

He then raised the issue of the continuing problems with the Horsefair works explaining that the new paving provided as part of the scheme was poor, traffic was backing up for 30 minutes in the evening towards Breretonl and motorists were still parking in the central reservation. He considered that the scheme

had not worked and a number of issues required revisiting.

He spoke about the out of town retail shops such as Tesco's and Screwfix who were providing free parking and considered that some form of free parking within the town centre would be useful, even for just 30 minutes. He sought confirmation on how much it cost to administer parking charges and how much was taken in revenue. He also asked whether there were any plans to provide electric vehicle charging points.

He asked that the Traders Association be kept informed about any proposals in relation to the redevelopment of the bus station/market hall site. He also mentioned HGV's/vans entering the town centre pedestrian area causing damage to the paving. He considered that clarification was required as to what type of vehicle was allowed to enter this area.

He then went on to raise the issue of Amazon employees whose shift times did not tie in with the train/bus times and as a result a number of employees were waiting at the stations for some considerable time, some had been sleeping under the canal bridge and this was not enhancing the look of the town centre.

In response to the issues raised the Planning and Economic Development Services Manager advised that policing issues affected all three town centres. The Committee could note the issues raised and express concern via the Chairman of the Committee to a representative of Staffordshire Police.

With regard to the free wi-fi provided by Barclays Bank he commented that the responsibility of turning the router off in the evening was with the Bank itself.

With regard to the Horsefair works he commented that the Committee had previously raised concerns with the County Council in terms of the needs and benefits of the scheme, the time taken for it to be completed and the impact on trade and footfall. He would raise these issues with the County Council as part of the concerns raised in respect of resurfacing etc.

He noted the comments in relation to parking and advised that free parking being available within walking distance of the town centres was an issue not just in Rugeley but in Cannock as well. The income generated from parking had slightly declined as shoppers were using the alternative free parking that was available.

He was not aware of any proposal in the town centre regarding electric vehicle charging points and commented that the opportunity to provide this was remote given the Council's current financial position.

He confirmed that there were no current proposals to redevelop either the bus station or the market hall site. Although this site had been identified as a key redevelopment opportunity through the Rugeley Area Action Plan any development would be reliant upon the Flood Alleviation Scheme being in place. He would ensure that the Traders Association would be involved in any future proposals for this site.

He advised that he would discuss the issues raised regarding HGV's/vans entering the pedestrian area of the town centre with the County Council to ascertain whether CCTV cameras could be used to identify the vehicles causing the damage.

In response to the concerns raised regarding Amazon employees he commented that there was no permanent bus service available (only a seasonal one) and this was not ideal. Amazon considered that the problem lay with the Agency providing the employees. However he would raise it with Amazon to ascertain if a solution could be reached.

A Member advised that the Barclays Bank wi-fi may remain on overnight as they may update their system at night. He also commented that providing an area for youths to get together with free wi-fi access may assist in tackling ASB problems. He advised that the service station for the M6 toll had electric charging facilities.

The Head of Economic Development advised that there were a number of common themes affecting the town centres and these would be collated. The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager had responded to a number of the concerns raised. The "walk-about" involving relevant agencies including the Police, Community Safety Team, District and Parish Councils would be arranged as soon as possible.

He informed Members of an initiative taking place in Rugeley in partnership with the County Council called the "Town Deal". Partners involved in the initiative were encouraged to identify common issues affecting town centres and work in partnership to address them. A launch event was planned for May and the Committee would be informed of the date when it was known. He hoped that this may address some issues productively.

The three representatives from the Traders Associations were thanked for their attendance.

AGREED:

- (A) That the concerns expressed regarding the policing issues within all three town centres be noted and the Chairman of the Committee express these concerns to a representative of Staffordshire Police.
- (B) The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager refer the issues raised regarding the Horsefair works to the County Council as part of the concerns raised regarding resurfacing etc.
- (C) The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager refer the issues raised regarding HGV's/vans entering the pedestrian area of the Rugeley town centre with the County Council to ascertain whether CCTV cameras could be used to identify the vehicles causing the damage.

- (D) The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager raise the concerns with Amazon regarding there being no permanent bus service for Amazon employees to ascertain if a solution could be reached.
- (E) That the “walk-about” involving relevant agencies including the Police, Community Safety Team, District and Parish Councils would be arranged as soon as possible.
- (F) That the Committee be advised of the launch date for the Rugeley “Town Deal” initiative when the details had been confirmed.

15. Quarter 3 Performance Report

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Governance (Item 6.1 – 6.4 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

The Head of Economic Development advised that some of the commentary within the Priority Delivery Plan had been updated since the agenda had been circulated. An updated version would therefore be sent to Members. He then led the Committee through the actions within the PDP and updated them on the progress.

The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager referred to the initiative to “seek to maximise local employment within those businesses creating 50+ jobs with the aim that 50% of new employees will be residents of the district”. Members noted that M&S food store was opening next week and they had not followed through with their commitment to this initiative. The Officer confirmed he would express the Council’s disappointment and establish why M&S had not committed to do this.

The Head of Economic Development advised that issues had arisen with regard to the redevelopment of the former Aelfgar School and it was unlikely that the County Council would be supporting the Extra Care scheme at this site. He further advised that the reference to Cannock street market should have read 19 November, 2015.

(At this point in the proceedings Councillor Miss S. Whitehouse left the meeting).

AGREED:

- (A) That the Committee note the performance information relating to Better Jobs and Skills Priority Delivery Plan in Quarter 3 as detailed at Appendix 1 of the report.
- (B) That the Committee notes the actions and indicators which are rated Yellow, Orange or Red and the associated commentary/remedial action proposed by the Lead Officer.
- (C) That the revised Quarter 3 Priority Delivery Plan for Better Health Outcomes be circulated to Members.

16. Unemployment and Youth Unemployment Data

Consideration was given to the latest data (Item 6.1 – 6.3 of the agenda). The Planning and Economic Development Services Manager led the Committee through the data explaining that there continued to be a downward trend in overall unemployment and youth unemployment in the CCDC area. It was noted that the trend had continued in January which was not usually the case. At the previous meeting it had been agreed that regional data should be presented in the future so that a comparison could be made between Cannock Chase District and the Staffordshire districts and this had been provided at Item 6.3.

17. Work Programme

Consideration was given to the updated Work Programme at Item 7.1 of the agenda. Arising from a request at the previous meeting to include an item on how schools prepared young people for employment, Harriet Allen from Cannock Chase High School had agreed to attend the next meeting. In addition the Principal from South Staffordshire College had indicated that he wanted a representative to attend the meeting for this item but this was still subject to confirmation.

Members should advise Officers of any additional items they wished to include on the Work Programme.

18. Exclusion of the Public

RESOLVED:

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

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BETTER JOBS AND SKILLS SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
TUESDAY 8 MARCH, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 2

19. Cannock Town Centre: Future Positioning

Paul Brewer from Bilfinger GVA (Birmingham Office) was in attendance to provide the Committee with a presentation outlining the future of Cannock Town Centre.

He explained the background to the report and outlined the issues and opportunities that existed within the town centre. Members noted that there were a number of potential development opportunities within the town centre. It was noted that the report set out the short, medium and long term actions which could help to support the town centre.

Following the presentation Members were given the opportunity to ask questions.

Regular updates would be provided to Members to keep them informed of the progress being made, particularly with reference to the Cannock Town Centre Area Action Plan.

The meeting closed at 18:10pm.

CHAIRMAN

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
COMMUNITY SAFETY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON WEDNESDAY 9 MARCH AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:

Councillors

Dudson, Miss M.J. (Chairman)

Gamble, B. (Vice-Chairman)

Dean, A.

Snape, P.A.

Foley, D.

Stretton, Mrs. P.Z.

Kraujalis, J.T.

Sutherland, M.

Lea, C.I.

Witton, P.T.

Pearson, A.

Also in attendance –

- Councillor C. Bennett (Crime & Partnerships Portfolio Leader, Observer).
- Matthew Ellis, Staffordshire Police and Crime Commissioner (for agenda item 4).
- Glynn Dixon and Jennie Hammond, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner (for agenda item 4).
- Geoff Knight, Chief Inspector, and Simon Brownsword, Inspector, Cannock Local Policing Team (for agenda item 5).

13. Apologies

Apologies for absence were submitted for Councillor B. Hardman.

14. 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.

15. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 3 December 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed.

16. Change in Order of Agenda

The Chairman advised that due to the delayed arrival of the Police & Crime Commissioner, the update on the Staffordshire Police Transformation Project and

the Quarter 3 Priority Delivery Plan Update Report would be considered before the item on Child Sexual Exploitation.

17. Staffordshire Police Transformation Project Update

Geoff Knight advised that the Cannock LPT was performing better than LPTs from other Staffordshire Police areas in respect of; response times to incidents; detection rates of burglaries, thefts from motor vehicles and significant acquisitive crime; the number of case files being referred back from the courts for being 'deficient' in content; and call handling and customer service. Conviction rates through the courts were also extremely positive, running at just over 90%. Areas still under development and review were; working relationship with the CID; role and utilisation of PCSOs; and community engagement.

A Member commented that the figures provided were positive, but did not match up with views presented at another meeting by representatives from the local traders' associations who felt the town centres were unsafe and lacking in a visible policing presence. Geoff Knight responded that those views appeared to be a perception rather than the reality, as no real concerns or priorities had been identified for the town centres. In terms of policing presence, both 'visible' and plain clothed officers and PCSOs had been out on foot patrol on a regular basis. Simon Brownsword further replied that a weekly review was undertaken of priority areas of concern and appropriate resource directed to those areas.

A Member raised concern with difficulties faced by parish and town councils in getting officers to attend their meetings to provide update reports for the local area. Geoff Knight replied that officers should make every effort to attend if able to do so, but will look to address this if it is a wider issue for all parishes.

A Member queried if the Cannock LPT would lose any officers once the pilot stage of the Transformation Project had finished. Geoff Knight replied that there was no expectation that the number front line officers or PCSOs would reduce, but there were still questions marks about the number of detectives in post.

The same Member then raised that the figure of 36% of case files being returned as being 'deficient' was still quite high, even if it was lower than elsewhere, and that the visibility of officers seemed to have dropped in recent months. Geoff Knight replied that prior the pilot the deficiency figure was 80%, so there had been considerable improvement, but there was still work to do as the figure had been as low as 20% at one stage. In respect of visibility of officers, the LPT had technology in use which could track and plot the movement of officers out on patrol, and had shown that visibility has increased.

A Member queried when the expected end date was for the pilot stage of the Project. Geoff Knight responded that there was no set end date as such as the Project was operating on a rolling basis, but the PCC may have in mind a conclusion date based on available resource and budgets.

A Member suggested that one way to improve community engagement would be to make better use of the Neighbourhood Watch scheme in local areas. Geoff Knight replied that this matter had been discussed with PCSOs, so was certainly

being looked into.

A Member asked for clarification on the differences between the roles and responsibilities of PCs and PCSOs. Geoff Knight replied that he would ask Simon Brownsword to pull some information together and circulate it to Members via the Council.

18. Quarter 3 2015-16 Cleaner and Safer Environments Priority Delivery Plan Update (Community Safety Section Only)

Consideration was given to the report of the Head of Governance (Item 6.1 – 6.7 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the performance information relating to the 'Community Safety' section of the Cleaner and Safer Environment Priority Delivery Plan in quarter 3, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.

19. Child Sexual Exploitation

Prior to the commencement of this item, Councillors Kraujalis and Stretton left the meeting and did not return.

Matthew Ellis, Staffordshire Police and Crime Commissioner, and Glynn Dixon and Jennie Hammond, Office of the Police and Crime Commissioner, were in attendance for this item.

Matthew Ellis provided background detail on the work being undertaken at a national and local level to tackle Child Sexual Exploitation (CSE), and sought Members' views on what support district and borough councils in Staffordshire could provide to the key agencies involved.

A Member asked for a specific definition of CSE. Matthew Ellis replied that it covered matter such as modern day slavery, sexual exploitation of children – forcing them to do things against their will. Jennie Hammond further replied that the Government had recently reported on a definition of CSE, which also covered child sexual abuse.

A Member then queried to what extent CSE was an issue in Cannock and Staffordshire. Glynn Dixon replied that Operation SafeNet had resulted in a number of arrests being made and property such as computers etc. being seized. Matthew Ellis further replied that at a national level there was concern about the increasing number of CSE cases judges had to deal with, and so support was being put in place to help them manage their caseloads. Jennie Hammond also replied that Staffordshire Police had received specific funding to combat CSE online as well as 'on-street'.

A Member queried what duty of care was in place for police officers and staff involved in CSE cases. Matthew Ellis and Glynn Dixon replied that duty of care was a priority as there was a risk that officers and staff could become either

deeply affected or desensitised by the CSE work, and so welfare support was put in place as necessary.

A Member queried if there were any CSE issues in Staffordshire on the scale that had happened in other areas such as Rotherham. Matthew Ellis replied that thankfully nothing was happening on that scale, but agencies were taking more responsibility now than may have been the case previously to tackle such issues. Glynn Dixon further replied that the Child Safeguarding Boards across the County saw CSE as a top priority to tackle and try to ensure it doesn't happen.

A Member commented that there was a need to ensure that everyone had a clear understanding of what exploitation and abuse meant, and that when incidents were being reported, they were being taken seriously by the appropriate authorities.

A Member queried if there was any credibility to social commentary on CSE mainly being 'family-centred'. Jennie Hammond replied that such abuse was still the most prevalent out of all types, and as such was a key focus of the Strategic Governance Board.

20. Work Programme Discussion

The Chairman reported that the main item of business for the next meeting on 14 April would be a review of the Committee's work programme for 2015/16.

A Member requested that the Prevent training, which was discussed at the meeting held in December 2015, be arranged before the next meeting takes place. The Partnerships and Communications Manager replied that she would liaise with relevant Officers to determine what could be arranged.

The meeting closed at 5:55pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
CUSTOMERS AND CORPORATE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON MONDAY 22 FEBRUARY 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:

Councillors

Johnson, T.B. (Chairman)

Bernard, Mrs. A.F.

Burnett, G.

Dudson, Miss M. J. (substitute)

Freeman, Miss M.A.

Grice, Mrs. D.

Hoare, M.W.A.

Kraujalis, J.T.

Pearson, A.

Stretton, Mrs. P.Z.

13. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors Miss J. Cooper (Vice-Chairman), M. Sutherland and Mrs. M.A. Davis (observer).

Councillor Miss M.J. Dudson was substituting for Councillor Miss J. Cooper.

14. 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.

15. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 30 November 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed.

16. Cannock Citizens' Advice Bureau

Sue Nicholls (Chief Officer) and Angela Jones (Service Manager) from the Staffordshire South West Citizens' Advice Bureau (CAB) were in attendance for this item. Reports on work undertaken by the CAB for the period April to December 2015 and Universal Credit (UC) Preparations were circulated for Members' reference and consideration.

Work update report

Members raised questions on several aspects of the report which covered; financial support, benefits advice/claims, debt management, referrals to/from the

CAB and other agencies/support services, appeals and tribunals cases, provision of outreach services and home visits and the working relationship between the Council and CAB. The CAB Chief Officer and Service Manager replied as appropriate.

Members commented positively on the level of detail contained within the work update, but requested that the respective information for 2013/14 be provided for comparative purposes. Information was also requested about the number of cases which were taken to tribunal.

Universal Credit report

Members queried if the Council had any plans to install an IT suite at the Council Offices for UC claimants to use, and whether the required Officer resource was in place to support claimants using it. The Head of Commissioning replied that a suite would be installed in the reception area in the near future, and the Revenues and Benefits service had been given funding to ensure resource was in place. The CAB Chief Officer further replied that Officers had been trained by the CAB in order that they be ready for when the suite goes live.

Councillor M.W.A. Hoare left the meeting at the end of this item and did not return.

17. Quarter 3 Performance Report 2015/16 – Customers PDP

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 5.1 – 5.9 of the Official Minutes of the Council) (*presented by the Policy & Performance Manager*).

The Policy & Performance Manager advised that direction of travel performance indicators for the ‘making the best use of limited resources’ strategic objective would be included in the end of year performance report as relevant data was still being collated.

Delivering Council services that are customer centred and accessible

A Member commented positively on the performance of the use of online forms and e-payments transactions along with the associated cost savings involved, and then queried what was being done to further promote these services. The Head of Commissioning replied that promotion was being undertaken via the Council’s website and emails, as well as testing of the software via the proposed mobile app. It was also hoped that ICT suite to be set for UC claimants could also be used for online reporting and transactions for Council services.

A Member made a general comment about morale being low amongst Officers due to a reduction in available resources, and suggested that Members needed to be doing more to address this.

In respect of developing a support strategy for UC claimants, a Member commented that there was a need to be looking forward to when UC was fully rolled out and the likely/expected impact on claimants and those who need to support them.

Making the best use of limited resources

The Head of Economic Development advised that a report was going to be submitted to Cabinet in March to seek approval for the establishment of a property partnership with Public Sector Plc. The purpose of the partnership would be to facilitate property related projects for the Council, making use of private sector funding, resources and skills in addition to those available through the Council and paid for by the partnership.

In respect of the Building Control Service, the Head of Economic Development reported that discussions were underway with a number of other district councils nearby with a view to moving to a wider shared service arrangement. Potential options were being put together and would be presented to each constituent council later in 2016 for formal consideration.

Members commented positively on the proposals put forward for asset management, Building Control and Land Charges and thanked Officers for the work undertaken to date.

Members requested more detailed information on what the future plans were for the ICT service, as only limited information had been provided in the report.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The performance information relating to the Customers Priority Delivery Plan, as detailed in Appendix 1 to the report, be noted.
- (B) The actions and indicators which were rated, yellow, orange or red and the associated commentary/remedial action proposed by the Leader Officer be noted.
- (C) That the Head of Technology submit a Briefing Note to the next meeting of the Committee to provide a detailed update on the preparation of the IT Strategy and any future proposals/developments for the ICT service.

18. Community Engagement Review Task & Finish Group

The Chairman provided the Committee with feedback of the meeting of the Task & Finish Group which took place on 8 February 2016. The views of the Group had been sought on ways in which community engagement could be improved or developed, what roles councillors had to play in it and whether there was a larger role for scrutiny.

The meeting closed at 6:15pm

CHAIRMAN

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ENVIRONMENT SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
WEDNESDAY 24 FEBRUARY, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Preece, J. (Chairman)
Witton, P. (Vice-Chairman)

Foley, D.	Lea, C.I.
Gamble, B. (substituting for Dudson, Miss M.)	Pearson, A.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.
Johnson, T.B.	

Also in attendance:-

Councillor A. Dudson (Environment Portfolio Leader-observer)

16. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Miss M.J. Dudson, A. Dean and M.R. Grocott.

(Councillor B. Gamble was in attendance as substitute for Councillor Miss M. Dudson).

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

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

18. Minutes

With regard to Minute No.10 a Member asked for an update on the progress of free microchipping of dogs. The Environmental Protection Manager advised that the Council's kennel operator had provisionally agreed to offer free microchipping and negotiations were continuing.

A Member asked for an update with regard to lobbying the LGA suggesting that the Secretary of State consider allowing Fixed Penalty Notices to be issued as part of the Regulations. The Environmental Protection Manager advised that the Government considered that as Local Authorities had the power to seize dogs, microchip them, recharge the owner and to prosecute the owner if they resisted, sufficient powers were in place and there was no reason for the introduction of Fixed Penalty Notices.

With regard to Minute No. 14 a Member raised concern regarding the continuing problem with parking on grass verges. The Committee noted that there had been one reply in response to the email Members had received asking for areas within their Wards where they were concerned about parking on grass verges. This had been forwarded to Staffordshire County Council for consideration. Another Member agreed that inconsiderate parking in general in the District was a problem, not only on grass verges but at other locations. The Committee agreed that this issue should be referred to the Community Safety Scrutiny Committee for consideration.

RESOLVED:

(A) That the Minutes of the meeting held on 2 December, 2015 be approved as a correct record and signed.

(B) That the Community Safety Scrutiny Committee be asked to give consideration to the problem caused by inconsiderate parking in general in the District, not only on grass verges but at other locations.

19. Quarter 3 Performance 2015-16 – Cleaner and Safer Environments

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

The report provided Members with the progress on the performance of the Council in relation to the “Environment” actions and indicators set out in the “Cleaner and Safer Environment” Priority Delivery Plan for 2015/16.

AGREED:

(A) That the Environment Scrutiny Committee notes the performance information relating to the Environment section of the Cleaner and Safer Environment in Quarter 3 as detailed at Appendix 1.

(B) That the Committee notes the actions and indicators which are rated Yellow, Orange and Red and the associated commentary/remedial action proposed by the Lead Officer.

20. Waste Containers Left on Streets

The Waste and Engineering Services Manager provided Members with a presentation which outlined the following:-

Historically there have been no issues with residents leaving their waste containers on the streets. However, over the last 18-24 months there has been an increasing issue with waste containers (bins) left on the street after/between collections.

Residents are asked to remove their waste containers the same working day and those who do not comply are given a polite verbal / written request. The "Love Your Streets Campaign" focused on this issue when joint visits from Officers and PCSO's were made to the worst areas. No enforcement action was currently undertaken.

In some cases the polite notices do not seem to be working. Some residents are getting frustrated at the perceived lack of action by Council with regard to this issue. Leaving waste containers on the streets does not help the 'look and feel' of the district.

The problem is worse when it is difficult to access the rear of properties. In particular, problems exist in terraced houses and also in new properties. The design of both old and new estates can also cause problems.

Enforcement of this issue is difficult. Section 46 of the Environment Protection Act was explained. The responsibility for enforcement depended on the location, for example:-

- pavements (responsibility of highways)
- Service Strips (responsibility of highways)
- Private / No-Mans Land (difficult to ascertain responsibility)

There was a statutory requirement on the Council to undertake refuse collection so removal of refuse bins was counter productive.

Members were shown a number of photographs of different locations in the district where the problem with leaving waste containers on the streets was at its worst. These locations were Cannock Road in Chadsmoor where there were no rear entrances to these terraced properties. Cambrian Lane in Rugeley where bins were being left on a service strip behind the fencing to the rear of the properties and Eaton Road in Rugeley where bins were left on a strip of land adjacent to some fencing.

Members noted what other local authorities were doing to address this problem:-

- Nothing
- Polite Requests
- Remove & Replace Bins
- Section 46 Notice – Fixed Penalty
- Remove & Replace Bins for a fee

Members were asked to consider whether Officers should continue to issue polite notices or whether enforcement action should be taken. The Officer explained that should Members support enforcement action a report would be

brought back to the Committee and any recommendation would then be referred to Cabinet.

Members discussed this issue and agreed that should the polite notices have no effect then enforcement action should be taken against the offenders.

AGREED:

That a report be prepared for consideration at a future Environment Scrutiny Committee indicating that Members were of the opinion that polite notices continue to be issued to residents who continue to leave their waste containers on the street and should these notices have no effect, enforcement action should be taken.

21. Waste Collection Contract

The Waste and Engineering Services Manager provided the Committee with an update regarding the Waste Collection Contract.

A briefing note had been sent out on 22 January, 2016 outlining what waste to put in each bin. Following the discussion at the previous meeting the disposal site had clarified what type of food waste would be allowed to be placed in the brown bins. All residents had been asked not to place any food waste in their brown bins as from 1 February, 2016. The changes had been advertised on buses, in press releases, on stickers placed on the bins and in leaflets.

He also advised that a new "Bin Calendar" booklet was due to be delivered to residents in the next few weeks. In addition to the information regarding bin collection dates the booklet clarified the changes to the brown bin collection, contained information on what should go in each of the bins along with some general information regarding recycling. There was also a link to the website for even more information.

He confirmed that 498 composters had been ordered so far and these would be delivered to residents in March. He explained that there had been a few complaints regarding the changes to the food waste collection. However, residents were satisfied once the reasons for the changes had been explained and they had been informed that the green waste collection did not go to landfill but an incinerator.

Members noted that the refuse collection team would transfer to Biffa on 2 April, 2016 and Biffa were getting prepared for this.

A Member asked whether the interest in the home composters was as low as expected. The Waste and Engineering Services Manager advised that the interest had been lower than expected.

Members asked for clarification over what would happen if the wrong items were placed in the bins. The Officer confirmed that a tag system was in place. Amber tags would be placed on brown bins if they contained any food waste and a notice would be attached asking the resident not to do it again. A red tag

would be placed on the bin if it happened again and the bin would not be emptied. Some leniency would be applied in certain circumstances (ie. for older persons etc).

The Committee noted that recycling placed in the blue recycling bins should be loose and not bagged in black bin bags. A number of residents had been placing items such as nappies or food waste in black bin bags and attempting to dispose of these by placing the black bin bag in the blue recycling bins.

Arising from the discussions a Member asked whether bins could be tagged if they were left out on the streets following the collection. The Officer confirmed that this could be considered as part of the polite warnings which would be issued.

The Chairman agreed that Councillor A. Dudson, the Environment Portfolio Leader could speak. He asked for confirmation of the transfer date of the refuse collection team to Biffa and whether there was any cost to the authority. The Waste and Engineering Services Manager confirmed that the transfer date was 2 April, 2016 and an agreement had been reached making it cost neutral.

22. Other Items

“Clean for the Queen”

The Committee noted that during the weekend of 4 – 6 March a campaign to clear up litter would take place across the Country in time for the Queen’s 90th birthday. The areas in the District that would be litter picked were:-

- Hednesford Park/Gaskins Wood
- Heath Hayes
- Coulthwaite Way, Rugeley

Volunteers from various groups including Friends of Hednesford Park, the Council and local businesses were to be involved in this event. It was hoped that this would be rolled out throughout the year and not just this weekend.

Members were asked to advise Officers if there were any areas within their Wards that would benefit from a litter pick.

“ECO Stars – Fleet Recognition Scheme Award”

The Committee was advised that the Council had won an ECO Stars Fleet Recognition Scheme Award. This Scheme aimed to help fleet operators improve efficiency, reduce fuel consumption and emissions and make cost savings. It was originally set up in Yorkshire and had been rolled out across Staffordshire. It aimed to tackle local air quality issues caused by transport, focusing on HGV’s, buses, coaches and vans.

Members of the scheme are awarded an ECO Star rating ranging from 1 Star to 5 Stars. The Council’s refuse fleet had been awarded 3 stars.

New participants (from the transport industry) were welcome to join the scheme.

The meeting closed at 5.10pm.

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
HELD ON TUESDAY 14 MARCH, 2016 AT 4:00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK
PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors:

Gamble, B. (Chairman)	
Freeman, Miss. M.A. (Vice-Chairman)	
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M.	Hoare, M.W.A.
Dudson, Miss. M.J.	Johnson, T.B.
Foley, D.	Stretton, Mrs. P.Z.
Grocott, M.	Sutton, Mrs. H.M.

By Invitation:

Mr. Clive Cropper, Practice Manager, Moss Street Surgery.

Also present:

County Councillor Mrs. C. Mitchell, Staffordshire County Council Representative

Observing:

Councillor Mrs. C. Mitchell, Culture and Sport Portfolio Leader

39. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mrs. A. Allt, J.P. Johnson and Mrs. M.A. Davis, Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader.

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

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

41. Minutes

The Senior Committee Officer referred to page 21, Minute 33. Wigan Culture and Leisure Trust, paragraph 4 and wished to note that the paragraph should make reference to golf and not footgolf.

Steve Shilvock, Head of Environmental Health referred to page 22, Minute 34 and advised that the Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader would raise the issue of cuts to community pharmacy through the Cabinet. He also indicated that information was available on the Department of Health website.

He advised that it would be appropriate to forward a letter to the Health Secretary at the Department of Health concerning this matter.

A Member referred to the same Minute above and sought clarification on the number of pharmacies within Cannock. Clarification would be sought and the Member informed separately.

The Head of Environment Health referred to page 23, Minute 37. Healthwatch, Staffordshire – Update and reported that he had contacted Healthwatch and sent on the Committees best wishes to Hester Parsons. He had also asked for a representative to be appointed to the Health Scrutiny Committee.

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 23 February, 2016 be approved as a correct record.

42. Improving Patient Access Project - Update

The Chairman welcomed Clive Cropper, Practice Manager, Moss Street Surgery to the meeting to provide an update on the Improving Patient Access Project.

Clive Cropper indicated that as of 31 March, 2016 the current funding of the service would come to an end and a decision on future funding would be made in April.

He then reported on the key objectives and achievements and advised that access to primary care was improving. There was now a collaboration of 27 practices which included Great Wyrley and Norton Canes. Whilst working well, he indicated that further interaction and joint working with the practices was needed.

He advised that the practices which were opening and offering weekend appointments, together with those that were open later in the evening were having a positive impact and supporting the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) with reducing attendances at both A&E and the Minor Injuries Unit (MIU).

Clive Cropper reported on a project where all databases of all the surgeries would be interlinked, and advised that a National Evaluator Contractor was appointed around 3 weeks ago to support the project.

He indicated that just over 500 patients are seen per month and that by the end of February there were around 5000 seen since the start of the service, although he reported that Sunday appointments did not work well and consequently stopped them in November last year as staff were often having to work until very late on a Friday. The decision was taken however to re-introduce the Sunday service.

Clive Cropper advised that over the course of a few months there had been a very high rate of people cancelling afternoon appointments; however November/December figures showed that this problem had decreased from 7.5% to 4.5% and was currently around 6%. He commented that whilst some people simply did not turn up to appointments, other people had valid reasons such as residents in nursing homes that may be unwell. He indicated that discussions had taken place to see if telehealth consultations could be undertaken via video link with people in nursing homes.

He then referred to a recent online satisfaction survey which received a low response. It was then agreed that a paper survey be made available and as such 2500 responses had been received. He provided information from the survey on questions asked and it was found that 98% of those that had completed the survey wished to see the current service continue beyond 31 March.

The Chairman referred to the satisfaction survey and although the surveys received were positive, he also indicated that there were patients who may have received a poor service but did not fill a survey in.

It was reported that the set up costs of the project was £320k which was a lot cheaper in comparison to others.

A Member referred to the service and the issue over the years with patients trying to book GP appointments in the evening and weekends and hoped that this would continue. The Member asked about the impact on the MIU.

Clive Cropper indicated that this service worked very well and the MIU was linked well with himself and the surgeries. He advised that if a patient turned up at the MIU but needed a GP, the network surgery would be contacted and they would be sent to see someone else.

In response to a question raised by a Member, Clive Cropper reported that if it was found a patient was not turning up for appointments and a few had been missed, they would be contacted via letter and advised that they would be removed if the situation continued.

A Member referred to the problem with trying to contact a particular surgery in Rugeley for appointments, particularly for children. Clive Cropper responded and would take this on board.

Clive Cropper asked if the Health Scrutiny Committee could acknowledge the service being provided and urge the CCG to continue with it.

The Chairman thanked Clive Cropper for his update.

RESOLVED:

That a letter be forwarded to the CCG from the Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader on behalf of the Health Scrutiny Committee requesting that the current service provided continues.

43. Access to Social Care Services

The Chairman reported that an apology had been forwarded and therefore this item would not be dealt with.

44. Kings Fund Report on the Contribution of District Councils to Public Health

The Chairman welcomed Rob Lamond, Policy and Performance Manager to give a presentation to Members on the Contribution of District Councils to Public Health.

The Policy and Performance Manager gave a presentation which covered the following:

- A time of challenge and opportunity
- District Councils have a key role to play
- District Councils face challenges and opportunities in fulfilling this role
 - A new public health system
 - Funding constraint, and change
 - Devolution and wider reform
- A review and assessment of District Councils contribution through core and enabling functions
 - What District Councils can do on public health in core functions
 - How District Councils enabling roles underpin better public health
- Recommendations
 - Recommendation 1: The District Councils' Network (DCN) should develop an engagement and partnership strategy to support its members as they navigate the landscape that is emerging in the wake of recent public health reforms.

Recommendation 2: The DCN should continue to advocate for and support its members in the ongoing negotiations around devolution and its implementation. The devolution agenda provides an ideal opportunity for district councils to ensure their long-term contribution to health improvement remains at the core of this agenda.

Recommendation 3: Clinical commissioning groups (CCGs) and county councils should discuss district councils when discussing alignment as one key part of the 'out-of-hospital care' system. District councils are a key partner in improving the relationship between the health and social care system and the community.

Recommendation 4: The DCN should work with directors of public health and their representative bodies (including the Association of Directors of Public Health and the Faculty of Public Health) and the NHS to better articulate district councils' prevention role in the Forward View (for example, through their role in providing leisure services).

Recommendation 5: District councils should be more proactive in collating existing evidence on the health economics of their activities.

Recommendation 6: Public Health England should work with the DCN to systematically develop the evidence on the health economics of district councils' functions. This could be one of the first tasks under the aegis of Public Health England's new health economics framework.

Recommendation 7: The DCN should work with Public Health England to skill up and train district council officers in health economics, to secure better decisions in the long term.

Recommendation 8: The Chartered Institute of Environmental Health should, as a matter of urgency, work with the DCN and other relevant parties to better understand the cost-effectiveness and return on investment of environmental health services.

Recommendation 9: District councils need to invest in health impact assessment (HIA) to move beyond innovative case studies of processes to show demonstrable improvements in health outcomes.

Recommendation 10: Over time, the DCN, or designated body, should develop an accessible catalogue of relevant HIAs and make it available to all district councils.

The Policy and Performance Manager reported that a group of professionals would work with the District Councils Network on how to make progress with the recommendations. The Council would provide input and become involved for policy support with the group.

Members discussed the presentation and a number of questions came out of the discussion which included enforcing better quality housing and working with landlords, questions regarding resources in order to undertake the recommendations and the impact for the future with the loss of public services.

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

The Chairman advised Members that the next meeting of the Healthy Staffordshire Select Committee would be held next week.

46. Healthwatch Staffordshire – Update

The Head of Environmental Health had previously reported that he had requested that Healthwatch appoint a representative to attend meetings of the Health Scrutiny Committee.

47. Work Programme

The Head of Environmental Health circulated an updated Work Programme for 2015/16 and would endeavour to make arrangements for the items not dealt with which were Mental Health and Wellbeing provision in the District and the Better Care Fund to be placed on the Agenda for the last meeting scheduled for 19 April, 2016.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the Work Programme for 2015/16 be noted.
- (B) That the Head of Environmental Health endeavour to make arrangements for the items not dealt with which were Mental Health and Wellbeing provision in the District and the Better Care Fund to be on the Agenda for the last meeting scheduled for 19 April, 2016

CHAIRMAN

The meeting concluded at 5.15 p.m.

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
HOUSING SCRUTINY COMMITTEE
MONDAY 7 MARCH, 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Foley, D. (Chairman)
Cartwright, Mrs. S.M. (Vice-Chairman)

Bernard, Mrs. A.F.	Johnson, J.P.
Cooper, Miss. J.	Kraujalis, J.T.
Grice, Mrs. D.	Peake, Mrs. C.
Hoare, M. (Substitute)	Preece, J.T.

Also Present (Observers) –

Councillor Mrs. M.A. Davis, (Health and Wellbeing Portfolio Leader – for matters related to Social Alarms)

13. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors G. Burnett, P.T. Witton, B. Hardman and F.W.C. Allen (Housing Portfolio Leader).

Councillor M. Hoare was in attendance as substitute for Councillor G. Burnett. .

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

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

15. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 8 December, 2015 be approved as a correct record.

16. Void Review

Members were shown a short DVD regarding the Void Review process. Photographs were also circulated which showed the poor state some properties

could be left in when Council tenants were either evicted, properties abandoned or older tenants moved into residential care.

Nirmal Samrai, Head of Housing and Waste Management indicated that approximately 24 properties per year were left in a poor condition and more recently the Council had been successful in the prosecution of an individual due to the neglect of a property.

Members asked whether or not any items which were left in an abandoned or evicted property could be sold.

The Head of Housing and Waste Management responded and advised that an inventory would be made of any property left in a dwelling which would then be stored for 28 days and disposed of. She advised that In the past the Council had used Home Comforts which was a furniture recycling service that helped tenants who were struggling to set up home. However, the organisation had a certain criteria concerning the condition of items, and many items were in a poor condition, and therefore it was decided that the Council would no longer use this service.

In response to a question raised by a Member, it was reported that the void loss budget had not been exceeded although there had been an increase in the voids budget to around £900k. It was reported that it was hoped that information or a review concerning voids would be reported in a future Priority Delivery Plan.

The Head of Housing and Waste Management indicated that it was not always possible to undertake checks on each Council owned property as there was only currently 3 Estate Officers, however, it was hoped in the future that pre-termination checks were undertaken to try and avoid the problems with the poor state properties were left in.

Members also discussed the various safety checks undertaken in a property such as gas and electrical safety testing, and asked if while operatives were visiting properties, they could be encouraged to identify those that appeared in a poor condition.

The Head of Housing and Waste Management reported that it was intended to introduce certain checks on properties, although it was not intended for operatives to report on the condition of properties.

Catherine Owen, Housing Maintenance Manager circulated copies of the Council's Void Standard Inspection Form Check List, Decorating Allowance and Gifting Forms for Members to view. She indicated that the Gifting Form was used in cases where a tenant was moving out of a property but where they had carried out their own work previously. The work would be checked to ensure it was of a certain standard as the Council would take no responsibility for it. The tenant would then be asked if they wished to 'Gift' the fixtures/fittings to the new tenant of the property. It was reported that in the past the Council had been criticised for removing items which could be re-used.

The Head of Housing and Waste Management referred to the Council's policy on

one bedroom bungalows which now allowed people over the age of 40 to apply, however she indicated that bungalows were re-decorated regardless of the age or physical capacity of the person who resided in the property. She asked Members of the Committee if they wished to discuss and consider this as an area for reviewing.

Members discussed this in detail and although Members were of the opinion that the decoration of bungalows should be reviewed, they also expressed concern that vulnerable people were not excluded and that any works undertaken by a tenant should be of a certain standard. Members agreed that more information was required around the following:

- Number of one bedroom bungalows vacant over the last 2 years
- Profile of residents allocated one bedroom bungalows
- Sample telephone survey – satisfaction with decorating
- Number of difficult to let
- Cost of decorating one bedroom bungalow

RESOLVED:

That a further report regarding the one bedroom bungalow re-decoration scheme be made available to the next Housing Scrutiny Committee on 12 April, 2016.

17. Quarter 3 Performance Report

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 5.1 – 5.10).

5.4 More and Better Housing: Increasing the Supply of Affordable Housing

The Head of Housing and Waste Management reported that the Moss Road Estate was currently on target with 16 properties let, 2 let next week, a further 5 in April and 10 properties being handed over in July.

5.5 Procure a Development Partner for the Redevelopment of Former Garage Sites and other Areas of Council owned Land

It was reported that three tenders had been received which were being evaluated. Contractors had submitted plans and garage sites would then be identified.

5.8 Implement a Range of Improvements Works as Provided for in the 2015-16 HRA Capital Programme

Mike Walker, Environmental Protection Manager reported that the workload associated with the investigation, subsequent issue of two Prohibition Notices and preparation of legal proceedings had been such that progress with regard to the Redress Scheme had been unavoidably delayed and the target missed. However, all outstanding Agencies were contacted in January.

5.9 More and Better Housing: Planning for the Housing Needs of the District

Members expressed concern that some developers were not contributing to S106 payments which was having an impact on social housing.

It was agreed that the Better Jobs and Skills Scrutiny Committee be asked how the Council determines when a developer cannot make this contribution.

RESOLVED:

- (A) That the performance information relating to More and Better Housing Priority Delivery Plan for Quarter 3 as detailed at Appendix 1, be noted.
- (B) That the actions and indicators which are rated Yellow, Orange or Red and the associated commentary/remedial action proposed by the Lead Officer, be noted.
- (C) That the Better Jobs and Skills Scrutiny Committee be asked how the Council determines when a developer cannot make a S106 contribution, and provide a report back to the Housing Scrutiny Committee.

18. Supporting People Review 2015/16

Consideration was given to the Briefing Note of the Head of Housing and Waste Management (Item 6.1 – 6.5).

The Head of Housing and Waste Management outlined the report and indicated that the Supporting People grant funding of £222,000 would be withdrawn at the end of March, 2016 with the withdrawal of the funding affecting the most venerable people in the District.

Members discussed this and expressed concern that Bromford Housing Association would no longer be in a position to provide support to vulnerable people within the District.

The Head of Housing and Waste Management advised that the Council had secured funding from the Tenancy Services Budget for a Tenancy Sustainment Officer who would provide assistance with tenancies, money advice and signposting. It was also hoped that a further Officer could be recruited with match funding from Staffordshire County Council.

Members however expressed concern that the same service Bromford offered could not be offered with the two posts. Members discussed the funding which was given to both the Cannock Advice Centre and the Citizens Advice Bureau and were keen to see people referred to both services.

Members discussed this in further detail and agreed that a recommendation be forwarded to Cabinet highlighting the concerns of the Committee to the withdrawal of funding. The Committee would also monitor the situation over the next 12 months and report back to Cabinet.

RESOLVED:

That it be recommended to Cabinet that Members of the Housing Scrutiny Committee express concern with the withdrawal of the Supporting People grant funding of £220,000 at the end of March, 2016, and that the Committee intend to monitor the situation over the next 12 months and report back to Cabinet.

19. Work Programme

The Head of Housing and Waste Management discussed with Members of the Committee the topic for the next Scrutiny Review.

Members discussed in detail the Council's Allocations Policy and highlighted problems with how restrictive it was for other people outside the area. It was agreed that a mini review of the allocations policy be undertaken and information be provided at the next meeting.

Members agreed the following Work Programme:

12 April, 2016

- Void Review – Proposed Changes and Recommendations
- Next Scrutiny Review – Council's Allocations Policy

(The meeting concluded at 5.20 p.m.).

CHAIRMAN

PAGE INTENTIONALLY BLANK

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (TRANSITIONAL)
HELD ON TUESDAY 15 MARCH 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Kraujalis, J.T. (Chairman)
Pearson, A. (Vice-Chairman)

Cooper, Miss. J.	Hoare, M.W.A.
Dudson, Miss M.J.	Lea, C.I. (substitute)
Foley, D.	Preece, J.T.
Freeman, Miss M.A. (substitute)	Sutherland, M.
Gamble, B.	

10. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received for Councillors Burnett, T.B. Johnson and Snape.

Councillor Miss Freeman was substituting for Councillor T.B. Johnson, and Councillor Lea was substituting for Councillor Snape.

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

No declarations of interests or party whip declarations were received.

12. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 26 January, 2016 be approved subject to a minor wording amendment being made on page 8.

13. Review of Scrutiny Toolkit

Members considered and discussed the updated version of the Scrutiny Toolkit which also included suggested amendments from the Centre for Public Scrutiny.

A discussion was then held on training arrangements for Members of Scrutiny Committees, specifically whether or not it could be made mandatory. The Head of Governance advised that clarification on this would need to be sought from the Council Solicitor and Monitoring Officer.

Members also discussed matters relating to resourcing of Scrutiny Committees, roles and responsibilities of the Chairmen, attendance by Cabinet Members and annual reporting to Council of the work of the Committees.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) Subject to inclusion of agreed amendments, the Scrutiny Toolkit be approved and submitted to Cabinet for noting.
- (B) Council be asked to approve that a written annual report detailing the objectives achieved by the Scrutiny Committees during the preceding 12 months be submitted to Council each year for consideration (the first such report to be submitted to a Council meeting to be held in Spring/Summer 2017).

The meeting closed at 5:15pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
LICENSING AND PUBLIC PROTECTION COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY 10 MARCH 2016 AT 10:00AM
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT: Councillors

Grice, Mrs. D. (Chairman)
Johnson, T.B. (Vice-Chairman)

Grocott, M.R. Sutherland, M.
Lea, C.I. Todd, Mrs. D.M.
Snape, P.A. Witton, P.T.

21. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor B. Hardman.

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

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

23. Minutes

RESOLVED:

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

24. Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) Consultation on the Review of Animal Establishment Licensing in England

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 4.1 – 4.22 of the Official Minutes of the Council) (*presented by the Food, Safety and Licensing Manager*).

The Committee considered each of the consultation questions in turn and agreed the responses as shown in the below table:

Question	Committee Response
Q1 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to introduce a single Animal Establishment Licence?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal.
Q2 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to promote or require use of the Model Conditions by local authorities, for activities where they have been agreed?	Unanimous agreement with the proposal as the Council is already working to the Model Conditions.
Q3 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to prohibit the sale of puppies below the age of eight weeks?	Majority agreement with this proposal.
Q4 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to make clear that the statutory licensing threshold for dog breeders is set at three or more litters per year?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal.
Q5 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to legally require pet sales to provide written information when selling animals?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal.
Q6 – What other proportionate measures could address concerns around the care of exotic animals?	Detailed written information should be provided on how the animal should best be cared for (e.g. how and what it should be fed, ideal living conditions, likely adult size of animal etc.).
Q7 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to allow licences to be issued for a fixed term, set at any point during the year?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal.
Q8 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to increase the maximum length of a licence that local authorities may issue to up to three years?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal, but safeguards should be built in to the licence to ensure that the welfare of the animal is monitored on a regular basis.
Q9 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to allow licence holders to transfer licences to new owners of the same premises, subject to notification of and approval by the local authority?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal.
Q10 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to require licence holders to notify local authorities of major changes, such as a change of premises or scale of activities?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal.

Q11 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to maintain the registration requirement for performing animals?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal, but note that such matters are the responsibility of the County Council
Q12 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposed changes to the registration system for performing animals?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal, but note that such matters are the responsibility of the County Council
Q13 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with these proposals on powers of entry?	Unanimous agreement with these proposals.
Q14 – To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposal to allow an exemption from licensing requirements for businesses affiliated to a body accredited by the UK Accreditation Service (UKAS)?	Unanimous agreement with this proposal.
Q15 – Do you think sector-led UKAS-accredited certification schemes could improve animal welfare in unlicensed areas?	Majority agreement with this proposal, although no specific comments made.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The contents of the DEFRA consultation be noted.
- (B) Through Officers of the Licensing Unit, the responses listed in the table above be submitted as the Licensing & Public Protection Committee's response to the consultation questions.

25. Licence Conditions for the Home Boarding of Dogs

Prior to the commencement of this item, Councillor Todd advised that she knew the owners of one of the Home Boarding establishments who had been invited to the meeting for this item. As such, she declared a personal and pecuniary interest in this matter and left the room for the remainder of the meeting.

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Environmental Health (Item 5.1 – 5.23 of the Official Minutes of the Council) (*presented by the Food, Safety and Licensing Manager*).

Members were advised that those persons who were currently licenced to home board dogs had been invited to the meeting to put forward their views on the proposed conditions.

A discussion was then held between the Committee and the licence holders regarding those conditions which the licence holders were particularly in disagreement with and sought clarification on a number of matters.

During the consideration of this item, Councillors Sutherland and Witton left the meeting and did not return.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The proposed licence conditions for the home boarding of dogs as detailed in Annex 1 of the report be approved, subject to necessary wording amendments being made as agreed.
- (B) A meeting of the Licensing & Public Protection Committee be held in late April 2016 to receive and consider the licence conditions which include the requested amendments referred to in decision (A).
- (C) It be noted the final version of the licence conditions will be presented to Council on 6 July, 2016 for approval.
- (D) It be noted that the intention will be to impose the finalised conditions upon licences granted on or after 1 January, 2017.

The meeting closed at 12:05pm

CHAIRMAN

CANNOCK CHASE COUNCIL
MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
AUDIT AND GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE
HELD ON THURSDAY 31 MARCH 2016 AT 4.00 P.M.
IN THE CIVIC CENTRE, BEECROFT ROAD, CANNOCK

PART 1

PRESENT:
Councillors

Witton, P.T. (Chairman)
Pearson, A. (Vice-Chairman)

Bowater, J. Johnson, J.P.
Freeman, Miss M.A. Stretton, Mrs. P.Z.

Also Present: James Cook, Engagement Lead – Grant Thornton (External Auditors)

25. Apologies

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor B. Hardman.

26. 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.

27. Minutes

RESOLVED:

That the Minutes of the meeting held on 24 November, 2015, be approved as a correct record and signed.

28. Quarter 3 2015-16 Internal Audit Report

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

In respect of the Value Added Tax (VAT) audit, a Member sought clarification on what affected the Council's level of Exempt Input Supply VAT and how it was monitored. The Chief Internal Auditor replied that a number of services were exempt from charging VAT, such as; legal fees, leases, allotment rents etc., whilst others were outside the scope of VAT (mainly the statutory services). Due to special rules in place the Council was able to recover the VAT on the costs associated with exempt supply services provided that the amount was no greater

than 5% of the total VAT reclaimed. If the exempt supply was over 5% then none of the VAT could be reclaimed from the costs associated with exempt supply services. Monitoring the level was difficult, but critical to do as changes in service provision in the future could affect the balance and lead to higher costs of services due to the reduction in the level of VAT reclaimed.

In respect of the Housing Property Services audit, a Member queried what matters were still outstanding on the final sign-off of the 2011-12 External Envelope Works contract. The Chief Internal Auditor replied that it related to clarifying who was responsible for payment of pensions liabilities for contractor staff.

RESOLVED:

That:

- (A) The contents of the Internal Audit Report for quarter 3 of 2015-16 be noted.
- (B) The revision to the Audit Plan as set out in Appendix 5 to the Internal Audit report be approved.

29. Internal Audit Plan 2016-17

Consideration was given to the Report of the Chief Internal Auditor (Item 5.1 – 5.18 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Internal Audit Plan for 2016-17 be approved.

30. Risk Management Policy & Strategy

Consideration was given to the Report of the Head of Governance (Item 6.1 – 6.17 of the Official Minutes of the Council) (*presented by the Risk & Resilience Manager*).

RESOLVED:

That Cabinet, at its meeting to be held on 21 April, 2016, be recommended to approve the Risk Management Policy (Annex 1 of the report) and Risk Management Strategy (Annex 2 of the report).

31. Cannock Chase District Council Certification Letter 2014-15

Consideration was given to the Letter of the External Auditors (Item 7.1 – 7.3 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

RESOLVED:

That the Letter of the External Auditors be noted.

32. Cannock Chase District Council Audit Plan 2015-16

Consideration was given to the Report of the External Auditors (Item 8.1 – 8.20 of the Official Minutes of the Council).

A Member queried whether the owners of Rugeley Power Station would still be liable to pay business rates to the Council after its closure if staff were still employed there to support the decommissioning process. The External Auditor replied that the owners could appeal to the District Valuer to receive a reduction in business rates payable, but it was in the Council's interest to continue to receive as much income as possible so as to reduce the projected funding shortfall.

RESOLVED:

That the Report of the External Auditors be noted.

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

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

In respect of fraud risk assessment, a Member queried if the Council had enough checks in place to monitor those persons eligible for single person council tax discount. The Chief Internal Auditor replied that checks were undertaken using a number of sources including; data held within the Revenues and Benefits team, entries on the Council's electoral register and information collated by the County Council's Registrar Service.

RESOLVED:

That the Report of the External Auditors be noted.

The meeting closed at 4:55pm.

CHAIRMAN