

BOROUGH OF TELFORD & WREKIN

Minutes of a meeting of the Borough of Telford & Wrekin held on Thursday, 11 July, 2013 at 6.30 p.m. at The Place, Oakengates, Telford.

PRESENT:

Councillors S. Bentley, F.M. Bould, S.P. Burrell, E.J. Carter, E.A. Clare, D.G. Davies (Speaker), S. Davies, N.A. Dugmore, A.J. Eade, C.B.A. Elliott, A.R.H. England, N.A.M. England, R.C. Evans, V.A. Fletcher, G.M. Green, K.R. Guy, T.J. Hope, M.B. Hosken, M.G. Ion, A.S. Jhawar, R.T. Kiernan, A. Lawrence, J. Loveridge, C.N. Mason, A.D. McClements, W.A.M. McClements, J.C. Minor, C.P.R. Mollett, L.A. Murray (Mayor), A.A. Meredith, R.A. Overton, F.R. Picken, J. Pinter, G.C.W. Reynolds, S.A.W. Reynolds, H. Rhodes, K.S. Sahota (Leader), J.M. Seymour, R.J. Sloan, C.F. Smith, M.J. Smith, B.J. Thompson, C.R. Turley, P.R. Watling and D.R.W. White.

15. MINUTES OF THE COUNCIL

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the Annual Council Meeting held on 23 May 2013, be confirmed and signed by the Mayor.

16. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors R.K. Austin, K.T. Blundell, I.T.W. Fletcher, E.J. Greenaway, A.A. Mackenzie, R.G. Scammell, A.J. Stanton, K.L. Tomlinson and W.L. Tomlinson.

17. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

18. LEADER'S REPORT & ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Leader asked Members to note the launch of the Invest in Telford project which had taken place in June. He reaffirmed his administration's commitment to jobs, growth and investment for Telford together with a desire to support business in the Borough.

The Leader went on to highlight a number of recent successes:

- 135 Apprentices now employed
- Mentoring and support scheme for young people not in employment, education or training
- Newport swimming pool refurbished and extended
- New Phoenix school due to open in September
- Work to start on three new school sites at Oakengates Academy, Priorslee Academy and Lord Silkin school
- Jiggers Bank due to be reopened on 15 July

19. MAYOR'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

The Mayor told the meeting that he was privileged to be able to serve the Borough. He had been very pleased by the support and enthusiasm for the role of Mayor from the local community. The Mayoral Launch had taken place very successfully on 4 July at Castle Farm Community Centre, raising £1314. The Civic Service, held on 16 June had also been a successful event.

20. PUBLIC QUESTIONS

No valid questions received.

21. CABINET DECISIONS MADE SINCE THE LAST MEETING OF THE COUNCIL

Members received the report on the Cabinet decisions made since the last meeting of the Council on 2 May 2013.

22. RECOMMENDATION FROM CABINET

a) Service and Financial Planning – 2012/13 Out-turn and 2013/14 Update

Councillor W.A.M. McClements, Cabinet Member: Finance & Enterprise, presented the report of the Assistant Director: Finance, Audit & Information Governance which provided financial out-turn, capital and income monitoring information. Gross Revenue budget for 2013/13 was £411m and the net budget for reporting purposes just over £216m. Against a backdrop of £19m in budget savings in 2012/13 this had been a particularly positive end of year position. There was an income shortfall of £1.7m based on historical targets that had become unrealistic in the current economic conditions.

Councillor S. Bentley asked for details on savings in Fleet & Community Transport. Councillor McClements confirmed that he would provide a written response.

Following a vote it was:

RESOLVED:-

i) That the Revenue outturn position and related virements in Appendix 3 for 2012/13, which are subject to audit by the Council's external auditors, and the transfer to reserves as detailed in paragraph 6.4 be approved

(ii) that the Capital outturn position and related supplementary estimates, virements and re-phasing shown in Appendix 4, as summarised in the report, be approved

(iii) that performance against income targets be noted

(iv) that the initial pressure areas identified for 2013/14 be noted

b) Shaping Places Local Plan - Strategy and Options

Councillor C.F. Smith, Cabinet Member: Housing, Development & Borough Towns, presented the report of the Assistant Director: Planning Specialist which detailed strategies and options for consideration in the preparation of a new Local Plan. The strategy and options document had been produced following engagement with key stakeholders and sought views on proposed strategy for development in advance of preparation of the Local Plan.

Councillor N.A. Dugmore was critical of the document, believing that the plan provided for too much development on green space. The total target of 26,500 homes from 2011-2031 was too ambitious. It would be better to build developments that had currently been approved rather than allowing more development applications. The needs of the population and local infrastructure limitations should be key in decisions on further development. Over development of rural areas and key rural settlements needed to be addressed. Councillor V.A. Fletcher, referring to proposed development in Priorslee, believed that suitable infrastructure and employment should be in place before development took place.

Councillor A.J. Eade believed that development should be sustainable and was opposed to building on 'green' land when brown field sites should always be first considered for development.

Following a vote it was:

RESOLVED - That the Strategy & Options document be approved

23. RECOMMENDATIONS FROM BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

(a) 25 June Audit Committee

Corporate Fraud & Anti-Corruption Policy

Councillor R.J. Sloan, Chairman of Audit Committee, presented the recommendations from the meeting held on 25 June 2013 in relation to revisions to the Policy.

RESOLVED – That the updated Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy be adopted

24. UPDATE ON BOROUGH BOUNDARY REVIEW

Councillor R.J. Sloan, Chairman of the Boundary Review Committee, presented an update on progress of the review of ward boundaries by the Local Government Boundary Commission (LGBCE). The Commission had now published draft proposals which were open to public consultation until 9 September. Full council was not scheduled to meet again until after this date and Councillor Sloan sought

council's approval for the Boundary Review Committee to make a further response on behalf of the council

On the whole, much of the council's initial proposal had been accepted and included in the draft proposals. There were, however, some areas of concern. The council's proposals for a Lawley ward had not been adopted; Councillor Sloan felt that this was a missed opportunity. The council still believed that a Lawley ward was feasible but the creation of such a ward now seemed unlikely as this would require disassembling a large part of the draft proposals.

The other main area of contention had been the proposal for a 2 member Shawbirch ward which would include Admaston and Eyton. Boundary Review Committee had agreed to reject this proposal and would put forward an alternative of 2 single member wards for Shawbirch and Admaston and Bratton. The Preston area should remain in Church Aston & Lilleshall whilst Eyton should remain in Ercall Magna and not move to Hadley & Leegomery ward.

RESOLVED – that Boundary Review Committee be authorised to make the council's response to LGBCE's draft proposals before the deadline of 9 September.

25. ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT

Councillor D.R.W. White, Chairman of Scrutiny Management Board, presented the Annual Scrutiny report. Scrutiny were halfway through a 2 year work programme, particular thanks were given to co-optees who added value to the work of Scrutiny. The Chairman gave his thanks to staff and councillors who had worked tirelessly during the year. The year ahead presented significant challenges but Scrutiny members and staff would continue to work hard to ensure that these challenges were met. The Scrutiny function had recently been runners up in 'Working Together' category of the CfPS Good Scrutiny Awards. The work done on the impacts of welfare reform had been highly praised and demonstrated how the work of Scrutiny could feed in to policy making.

RESOLVED – that the Annual Scrutiny Report be noted.

26 MINUTES OF BOARDS AND COMMITTEES

Council noted the resolved minutes of Boards and Committees:

Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee	4 June
CYP Scrutiny	18 April
Health & Wellbeing Board	15 May
Licensing Committee	26 June
Plans Board	1 & 22 May and 12 June
Scrutiny Management Board	15 March

27. QUESTIONS

The following Questions were asked in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 10:

- a) Councillor J.M. Seymour asked the following question of Councillor A.R.H. England, Cabinet Member: Adult Social Care.

“Can the new Cabinet Member for Adult Care, Cllr Arnold England, confirm that he recognised the need for the Council to have a good relationship with local Care Homes, that he understands the constraints under which they operate and that he values the support they give to families, many of whom have spent long years caring for their loved ones before resorting to a Care Home? “

Councillor England replied that he agreed that the council had good relationships with Care homes, it was important that those homes primarily provided a good quality of care for residents. He valued the support given to families by care providers and paid tribute to the work being done by carers in the Borough.

Councillor Seymour asked if councillor England could explain why he had previously expressed the view that care providers used the council as a ‘cash cow? “

Councillor England agreed that he had said this previously and that there had been instances where this was true. He looked forward to the council and care providers working in partnership to provide good quality good value services.

- b) Councillor A.J. Eade asked Councillor K.S. Sahota, Leader of the council, the following question:

“Can Councillor Sahota explain why he has announced that the Council is to build 500 houses at Southwater when no decision has yet been made and the whole issue is supposedly subject to a feasibility study?”

Councillor Sahota replied that 551 houses would be built in the Town Centre/Southwater and other areas and that a feasibility study was being conducted.

Councillor Eade asked how much the cost was for the feasibility study
Councillor Sahota said the study was ongoing and that the information would be available once the feasibility study had been completed

- c) Councillor A.J. Eade asked the Leader of the council the following question:

“Could Councillor Sahota inform this Council if this Authority has registered with the Court of Appeal to seek leave to appeal following the damning dismissal of the Council’s case in the High Court by Mr Justice Turner?”

Councillor Sahota confirmed that an application had been lodged to seek leave to appeal.

Councillor Eade asked on what grounds the council had sought leave to appeal. Councillor Sahota replied that legal advice had been taken and the request to seek leave to appeal had been made to protect the public purse and in the interests of the Borough and its residents.

- d) Councillor E.J. Carter asked the Leader of the council the following question:

“Does the council leader agree with me that the continuing saga of the Audley Avenue versus Station Road sites in Newport is making this Authority a laughing stock? Will he and his colleagues accept that after two failed appeals they should concede defeat and back the Audley Avenue site and proposed Morrisons Supermarket Application?”

Councillor Sahota replied that he did not agree and referred to section 106 monies and off site highway works. The council had a duty to obtain the best value for land and to maximise capital receipts.

- e) Councillor T.J. Hope asked Councillor P.R. Watling, Cabinet Member: Children, Young People & Families the following question:

“With regard to children who runaway or go missing from home or care; could Councillor Watling tell me if an assessment of need is a standard part of a return interview and is a return interview conducted by and independent person away from the Childs home or placement?”

Councillor Watling provided the following response:

“The Council introduced a process based upon the West Mercia Protocol for working with missing persons earlier this year. The Joint Protocol for reporting Missing Children and Young People (October 2011 for review October 2014).

Since this time practitioners in the Borough had received awareness training and a detailed Return Interview Template developed for use by practitioners.

Our procedures had been forwarded to the National Missing People Charity who had agreed to undertake a health check to ensure that they were robust in safeguarding children and young people in the Borough.

Latest statistic information relating to missing persons showed:

- Number of Missing Persons episodes: 1/1/2013 to 5/6/2013 Number of missing reports 80
- Number Missing more than once: 12 Children missing more than once
- Number of return interviews completed/ number outstanding: 59 Completed / 21 Outstanding
- Number of External authority Missing Persons: 16 (6 external letters sent – new system in place)

The Protocols and partnership working with West Mercia police were very good and Liaison with the West Mercia police lead on missing Persons.

- f) Councillor A. Lawrence asked the following question of Councillor W.A.M. McClements, Cabinet Member: Finance & Enterprise:

“Given the economic climate can the administration confirm if there are any plans to reduce the financial support given by the Council to the trade union movement in line with the reductions to other budget areas?”

Councillor McClements replied that there had been a 25% reduction in this cost and that the cost was £105k for this year.

- g) Councillor M.B. Hosken asked the following question of Councillor H. Rhodes, Cabinet Member: Customer Services, Libraries & Transport:

“Will Cllr Rhodes agree that, following the announcement that Policing teams are to be cut by 50%, that response times and actions will be seriously damaged and that the council should enter in to immediate discussions with the Police Commissioner on this matter?”

Councillor Rhodes replied that she was very concerned by the proposed cuts but that the Borough had retained its Policing resources where other areas had not. The council would continue to work in partnership to help to reduce any threat to local communities. She had organised a meeting with the Police & Crime Commissioner and his Deputy.

- h) Councillor N.A. Dugmore asked the following question of Councillor C.F. Smith, Cabinet Member: Housing, Development & Borough Towns:

“Currently how many private homes in the Borough have been empty for more than six months?”

The Speaker noted that the allotted 30 minutes for questions had been elapsed and informed Councillor Dugmore that he would receive a written response to his question.

28. NOTICES OF MOTION

- a) Councillor K.S. Sahota moved, in accordance with Council procedure rule 11, the following motion:

“This Council agrees that there are no circumstances where a single Shropshire Council would be to the advantage of the residents of Telford & Wrekin and believes any plans to merge both Councils would lead to reduced services for our residents and threaten the future of the Princess Royal Hospital”.

The motion was seconded by Councillor R.A. Overton.

Councillor Sahota noted that the council had made significant reductions in order to deal with unique budget pressures. The Borough was a growth area and the people of the Borough were an individual community. He was totally opposed to any suggestion of a merger with Shropshire council. Councillor N.A. Dugmore suggested that the Leader of his group had suggested looking further at possibilities for joint working. Circumstances changed and it would be unwise to rule out any options that might provide better value for money.

Councillor A.J. Eade believed it might be possible to provide savings of up to £10m by exploring joint working. He was disappointed to hear a number of councillors dismiss this option for savings. He believed that the council should explore all possible options for providing savings. Councillor W.A.M. McClements believed that it would be in the interests of other councils to acquire the assets of Telford & Wrekin. He challenged Councillor Eade to provide a breakdown of the proposed figure of £10m that might be saved by joint working arrangements. Councillor R.A. Overton believed that the Borough had different identities and interests than Shropshire council.

Councillor Sahota, concluding the debate, told the meeting that the Borough already worked closely with other authorities in a number of areas.

Following further debate during which a number of views were expressed it was moved and seconded that a recorded vote be taken. Upon the requisite number of Members signifying their support, a recorded vote on the motion as published was taken:

Against(13)

S. Bentley, SP Burrell, EJ Carter, NA Dugmore, AJ Eade, VA Fletcher, TJ Hope, MB Hosken, RT Kiernan, A. Lawrence, A.A.Meredith, CRP Mollett, JM Seymour.

For: (32)

FM Bould, EA Clare, DG Davies, S.Davies, CBA Elliott, ARH England, NAM England, RC Evans, GM Green, KR Guy, MG Ion, AS Jhawar, J Loveridge, CN Mason, AD McClements, WAM McClements, JC Minor, LA Murray, RA Overton, FR Picken, J Pinter, GCW Reynolds, S Reynolds, H Rhodes, KS Sahota, RJ Sloan, CF Smith, MJ Smith, BJ Thompson, CR Turley, PR Watling, DRW White

RESOLVED – that the motion be approved

b) Councillor S. Bentley moved, in accordance with Council procedure rule 11, the following motion:

“This Council notes with great concern falling recycling rates over the past two years when compared to an increase of 9% experienced over the years 2007 – 2011. Also of major concern is the complete closing of some recycling centres and reduction of opening hours of the remaining that will further exacerbate this failure. In view of the high cost of landfill charges that will increase year on year, this Council urges the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhood Services to produce a coherent plan that will save costs and maximise income for this authority”.

The motion was seconded by Councillor A.J. Eade.

Following a lively debate during which a number of views were expressed it was moved and seconded that a recorded vote be taken. Upon the requisite number of Members signifying their support, a recorded vote on the motion as published was taken:

For (12)

S. Bentley, SP Burrell, EJ Carter, AJ Eade, VA Fletcher, GM Green, MB Hosken, RT Kiernan, A. Lawrence, A.A.Meredith, CRP Mollett, JM Seymour.

Against: (28)

EA Clare, DG Davies, S.Davies, CBA Elliott, ARH England, NAM England, RC Evans, KR Guy, AS Jhawar, J Loveridge, CN Mason, AD McClements, WAM McClements, JC Minor, LA Murray, RA Overton, FR Picken, J Pinter, GCW Reynolds, S Reynolds, H Rhodes, KS Sahota, RJ Sloan, CF Smith, MJ Smith, BJ Thompson, CR Turley, PR Watling.

Absent: (5)

FM Bould, NA Dugmore, TJ Hope, MG Ion, DRW White.

RESOLVED – that the motion not be approved

The meeting ended at 8.49 pm

Mayor:

Date:

B

MAYORAL ENGAGEMENTS 2nd July 2013 – 2nd September 2013

July

- 3rd **M** Children & Young People's Open Art Exhibition at Gallery Bar, Oakengates Theatre, Oakengates
- 4th **M & DM** Mayor's Charity Launch at Castle Farm Community Centre, Hadley, Telford
- 5th **M** Fairtrade Schools Conference at Engenuity, Ironbridge, Telford
- M** Lunchtime Organ Concert at Wellington Methodist Church, Wellington
- 6th **M** Shropshire Prayer Breakfast at The Mercure, Albrighton Hall Hotel, Albrighton
- M** Dawley Day Official Opening at Dawley Park, Dawley Telford
- M** Telfordaires – A Summer Fundraiser at The Old Hall School, Wellington
- 7th **M** Newport Town Council Civic Service at St Nicholas' Church, Newport
- 14th **DM** Wellington Town Council Civic Service at All Saints Church, Wellington
- DM** Malinslee Urban Day at Malinslee Playing Park, Malinslee
- DM** Royal British Legion Summer Parade Service at Dawley Christian Centre, Dawley
- 17th **DM** Active Lifestyles Award Evening at Oakengates Theatre, The Place, Oakengates
- 19th **DM** Adam's Grammar School Speech Day and Prize Giving at Adam's Grammar School, Newport
- 20th **DM** Young British Talent at Hadley Park East, Telford

B

	22nd	M	Visit to Wellington Cottage Care Trust Day Care Centre at Haygate Road, Wellington
	23rd	M	Visit to Telford & Wrekin CVS at The Glebe Centre, Wellington
	24th	M	Opening of SP Services Ltd Headquarters at Bastion House, Hortonwood 30, Telford
		DM	Citizenship Ceremony at Register Office, Wellington Civic & Leisure Centre
	31st	M	Tour of the University of Wolverhampton – Telford Innovation Campus at Telford Conference Centre, Priorslee, Telford
		M	Tour of McPhillips (Wellington) Ltd at Horton House, Hortonwood 50, Telford
August	3rd	M	Seventh Day Adventist Church Opening of Workshops at Telford Whitehouse Hotel Football Ground, Wellington
	7th	M	Official Opening of Telford Town Park Water Play Facility at Telford Town Park
		M	Pre-Flower Show Concert for ABF The Soldiers Charity at St Chad’s Church, Shrewsbury
	9th	M	Shrewsbury Flower Show Luncheon at Shrewsbury High School, Shrewsbury
	11th	M	Mayor of Shrewsbury’s Flower Show Summer Lunch at Members Marquee at Shrewsbury Quarry, Shrewsbury
	13th	M	Tree Planting & Plaque Unveiling Ceremony at Wellington Peace Garden, off Larkin Way, Wellington
	19th	M	Opening of Click & Collect Service at Asda Donnington Wood, Telford
	21st	DM	Citizenship Ceremony at the Registry Office, Wellington

B

- | | | | |
|------------------|------------------------|----------|---|
| | 24th | M | Telford Archers "Have-a-Go" Day at Sinclairs Club, Ketley, Telford |
| | | M | 60 th Anniversary of the opening of Hadley Rest Room, Hadley |
| September | 1st | M | T-Party Festival in Telford Town Park, Telford |

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

COUNCIL – 12 SEPTEMBER 2013

SUPPORTING FAIR TRADE IN TELFORD AND WREKIN: PROGRESS REPORT

REPORT OF THE MANAGING DIRECTOR

LEAD CABINET MEMBER: CLLR KULDIP SAHOTA

1. SUMMARY

- 1.1 Co-operation is at the heart of fair trade, and two years ago the Council publicly committed to supporting the campaign in the borough. Since then, we have been working with local schools, businesses and organisations and in February 2013 the Telford and Wrekin Fairtrade Alliance was officially launched at Harper Adams University.
- 1.2 The Alliance is working to increase awareness and support of fair trade across the borough with the aim being to achieve Fairtrade borough status from the Fairtrade Foundation by 2014/15.

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 2.1 **That the Council notes the progress that has been achieved over the last 12 months.**
- 2.2 **That the Council continues supporting the Alliance and working towards its goals for achieving Fairtrade borough status.**
- 2.3 **Members are asked to endorse the Council's renewed Fair Trade Resolution as set out in section 6.2**

3. SUMMARY IMPACT INFORMATION

Community Impact	Yes	The Council is supporting the fair trade campaign borough wide and will encourage residents and visitors to get involved. Although the proposals won't have a significant impact on any specific group of people there is potential for a positive impact across all communities through an increased awareness and availability of fair trade products.
Financial & Value for Money Impact	No	The actions and activities identified for the Council will be funded from within existing Council resources – this includes the provision of secretarial and administrative support to the Telford and Wrekin Fairtrade Alliance, responsibility for their webpages and development of a

		fair trade directory. Any budget variances will be reported through financial monitoring as appropriate. The Fairtrade Alliance itself is primarily funded from fundraising activities and partner donations.
Legal Issues	Yes	<p>The Council can “in principle” give endorsement to the purchase and use of fair trade products, but always expressly subject to the priority of public procurement legal requirements intended to ensure the free movement of goods and services, equal treatment of bidders and transparency.</p> <p>It is therefore the case that the Council can include and welcome bids for fair trade options within contract notices and invitations to tender for the provision of goods, however that fair trade cannot form part of the specifications or be a mandatory requirement which could result in the rejection of a non-fair trade tender. This is because being fair trade, i.e. ensuring fairer prices for producers, safer working conditions, and an end to child labour, does not alter the quality or nature of the product and as such does not relate to the subject matter of the contract.</p>
Other impacts, risks and opportunities	No	By not demonstrating commitment and leadership in this and other areas of sustainability, the Council risks damage to its reputation.
Impact on specific wards	No	

4. **BACKGROUND**

4.1 Fair trade guarantees a better deal for third world producers. Fair trade gives power back to both producers and consumers. Producers get fair wages, good working conditions, help with the development of products and marketing, while consumers are given the choice to make a difference by buying fair trade products whenever they can.

4.2 The Council supports fair trade in two ways:

1. As part of our **corporate social responsibility**, we recognise the importance of fair trade, actively promoting the campaign to staff throughout the year, and making Fairtrade products available for visitors and employees where ever possible. Cllr Veronica Fletcher is our Fair Trade Champion and works with members of the Co-operative Council & Commercial Delivery Team to co-ordinate promotions and events.
2. The Council also works in partnership and is a member of two groups in Shropshire:
 - Working with Shropshire Council, local organisations and individuals, we are part of **Shropshire Fairtrade Coalition**, which was first awarded

Fairtrade Status by the Fairtrade Foundation back in 2007. To achieve this, ongoing activity is required from the Council, and a steering group meets regularly in the County to ensure progress and continued commitment to the campaign. For the Council's part, we passed a Resolution in 2008 agreeing to serve Fairtrade products in Council buildings and in meetings.

- We have more recently become a supporting member of **Telford and Wrekin Fairtrade Alliance**, a group of local schools, businesses and organisations that have agreed to work together to better support and promote fair trade in Telford and Wrekin. The Council is a key member on this group and provides administrative support for it. The aim is to achieve Fairtrade borough status from the Fairtrade Foundation by 2014/15.

5. INFORMATION

Over the past 18 months the Council has been actively involved in supporting the fair trade campaign as an employer and with partner organisations:

5.1 A visit from a Fairtrade Banana Farmer

Last November, local school children were delighted to meet Nicholas Faisal, a Fairtrade banana farmer from St Lucia. Organised by the Fairtrade Foundation and Bridges Global Education Centre in Wellington, the event was due to be hosted at Redhill Primary School in Priorslee, but unfortunately it had to close unexpectedly due to a lack of water supply in the area. At short notice St Peter's C of E Primary School in Bratton stepped in and hosted the event and children from other schools in Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin attended. They heard from Nicholas about banana farming in St Lucia, asked him questions, and then made their own presentations. All the children had a great time, and learned a lot about fair trade.

5.2 Fairtrade Fortnight 2013

Fairtrade Fortnight is a national annual event, organised by the Fairtrade Foundation. It brings together consumers, retailers, businesses, producers and campaigners nationwide, to promote awareness and sales of products and to campaign on the issues of trade justice.

The theme this year was to 'Go Further' and as a Council, we did just that. We worked with staff and partner organisations to organise a number of events and activities to help raise awareness in the borough and get even more people involved:

- We started the campaign with the official launch of Telford and Wrekin Fairtrade Alliance at Harper Adams University. This was attended by a range of partners from local schools, businesses and organisations, as well as the Leader and Mayor of Telford and Wrekin Council, and the Mayor of Newport. There was coverage in the local press and on BBC Radio Shropshire.

- During the Fortnight, Shropshire was fortunate enough to have a visit from a Fairtrade farmer, visiting the county, courtesy of the Fairtrade Foundation. Gerardo Arias Camacho is a coffee farmer and a board member of Llano Bonito, his local coffee co-operative in Costa Rica. During his visit we were lucky enough for him to attend a number of events in Telford, including visits to Egnuity in Coalbrookdale (one of the Ironbridge Gorge Museums), Harper Adams University in Edgmond and Redhill Primary School in Priorslee – all of which have Fairtrade status.
- A number of staff gave up time to do bag packing at Tesco in Madeley (a supporting partner) to promote the fair trade campaign and to raise some funds for the Alliance.
- Within the Council we ran lots of internal communications for staff and got apprentices involved, taking fair trade trolleys round some Council buildings to sell products.

All in all it was a very successful Fortnight, including confirmation from the Fairtrade Foundation that Shropshire Fairtrade Coalition had received renewed status as a Fairtrade County. This reflects the hard work and commitment of many supporting partners, including the Council.

For more information on the events that took place during Fairtrade Fortnight, you can visit our Fairtrade webpages at www.telford.gov.uk/fairtrade.

5.3 Telford and Wrekin Fairtrade Alliance

In June 2013, the Alliance met to review its action plan. The meeting was Chaired by two students from Newport Girls High School, in their roles as Fairtrade Ambassadors. They did an impressive job and gained some valuable experience in the process.

The group agreed that the overall aim is to achieve Fairtrade borough status by the end of 2014/15. The group ran through the Fairtrade Foundations criteria for this and agreed a number of key actions to achieve during 2013/14, including:

- Registering with the Fairtrade Foundation to work on achieving Fairtrade borough status;
- Carrying out a fairtrade audit – for all retail and catering outlets in Telford and Wrekin;
- Do some targeted promotion with local businesses;
- Produce a directory of all supporting businesses and catering establishments – to be published on the Council's fair trade webpages;
- Identify a flagship employer for Telford and Wrekin;
- Develop and issue certificates for members of the Alliance;
- Produce some marketing materials to help raise awareness and to use at future events, including Fairtrade Fortnight;
- Use of social media to promote the Alliance;
- Plan, organise and jointly deliver events and activities during Fairtrade Fortnight 2014.

5.4 Beacon Co-operative Learning Day at Charlton School

The Charlton School are a part of a new beacon co-operative trust with membership including, Dothill Primary School, Crudgington Primary School, High Ercall Primary School, Apley Wood Primary School, Keele University, New College and the Shropshire Wildlife Trust;

As part of their partnership working, they held a Cooperative Learning Day on Monday 1st July 2013, to emphasise the Trusts ethical values of honesty, openness, social responsibility and caring for others.

All partner Trust schools took part and they were involved in a number of activities with the aim being for the children to collaboratively work and learn together and make a valuable contribution to their community. The highlight of the day was an evening showcase of everything they had done.

Parents/carers attended along with stalls from some of the Trust partners. This included one for the Alliance who attended to run a fair trade stall. Linking in with the theme of 'social responsibility' we promoted the new partnership, raised awareness of the campaign and gave attendees the opportunity to buy a variety of fair trade products from a local supplier.

NEXT STEPS

6.1 The Council has achieved a lot in the last 18 months, but ongoing activity and support is required. Taking account of the goals the Alliance has set for the coming year (Section 5.2), the Council now needs to renew its Resolution, setting out practical actions it will commit to.

6.2 **Council Resolution:**

Co-operation is at the heart of fair trade and co-operatives are found throughout the fair trade system. As a Co-operative Council, we are committed to doing as much as we can to support and promote fair trade across the borough.

Working with Shropshire Fairtrade Coalition and Telford and Wrekin Fairtrade Alliance, the Council resolves to:

- Continue its support of the principles of Fairtrade status for Shropshire Fairtrade Coalition, granted on 13 July 2007;*
- Work with Telford and Wrekin Fairtrade Alliance to achieve Fairtrade borough status by 2014/15;*
- Ensure that where ever possible, the Council will provide fair trade products for staff and visitors, and at Council events;*
- Promote and encourage fair trade principles and raise awareness of fair trade goods in Council publications;*
- Continue promoting fair trade across the borough through the use of social media, press releases, webpages and at events;*

- *Encourage local employers to utilise fair trade products in their businesses;*
- *Continue organising activities and raising awareness for Fairtrade Fortnight and World Fairtrade Day each year;*
- *Ensure that where appropriate, we will ‘welcome’ fair trade as an option in our tenders;*
- *Working with Bridges and our Fairtrade Ambassadors, we will encourage and support more local schools to educate pupils on the fair trade campaign and work towards them achieving Fairtrade status;*
- *Continue providing administrative support to Telford and Wrekin Fairtrade Alliance, including responsibility for updating web pages and the development of a fair trade directory.*

In passing this motion the Council reaffirms its concern for those millions of people living in poverty in the developing world, and recognises the assistance that fair trade provides to help poor communities in the developing world lift themselves out of poverty.

The Council also reaffirms its longstanding commitment to support our local farming and business community where ever possible in support of local sustainability. In taking this stance we recognise that there is absolutely no conflict or competition between fair trade for the developing world and local sustainability.

7 PREVIOUS MINUTES

- March 2008 – notice of motion, minute 79 (b)
- 28 January 2010 – Fair trade status Progress Report, minute 80
- 27 January 2011 – Fair trade Status Progress report, minute 72
- 12 July 2012 – Fair trade Progress Report, minute 24

8 BACKGROUND PAPERS

None.

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL

COUNCIL – 12 SEPTEMBER 2013

REPORT OF CABINET – FOR INFORMATION ONLY

MATTERS DETERMINED BY THE CABINET

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This report sets out those matters determined by the Cabinet at its meeting on 25th July 2013.

2.0 CABINET BUSINESS

Matters that have been determined by Cabinet are listed below:

2.1 25th July 2013

2.1.1 Financial Monitoring 2013/14

2.1.2 Winter Maintenance Service Review

2.1.3 Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site – Jackfield Stabilisation

2.1.4 Re-Provision of Residential Mental Health Services

2.1.5 Acquisition of Land at Donnington Wood and Snedshill

3.0 DELEGATION OF POWERS GRANTED BY THE CABINET

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
Ironbridge Gorge World Heritage Site – Jackfield Stabilisation	Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection	Following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Public Health and Public Protection and the Assistant Director: Neighbourhood & Leisure Services to take any required procedural steps to enter into any necessary legal agreements (whether or not under seal), land transfers, vesting and other legal documentation – and to take any required procedural steps to acquire land or rights in, on or over land by agreement or compulsorily, to facilitate land assembly and deliver the Project, including the exercise of relevant

D

REPORT HEADING	DELEGATION GRANTED TO	DETAIL OF DELEGATION GRANTED
		powers of compulsory land acquisition as required.
Re-Provision of Residential Mental Health Services	Assistant Director: Care & Support Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection	Following consultation with the Cabinet Member for Adult Social Care to award a contract for a term of three years, with an option to extend for up to a maximum of a further two years, for the provision of mental health services following competitive tendering in accordance with the Council's Constitution. To execute all documentation required to give effect to any agreement reached pursuant to the resolutions.
Acquisition of Land at Donnington Wood and Sendshill	Assistant Director: Development, Business & Employment Assistant Director: Family & Cohesion Services Assistant Director: Law, Democracy & Public Protection	In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Finance & Enterprise to acquire the two parcels of land at Lodge Road, Donnington Wood and off Holyhead Road, Snedshill as shown on the plans appended to the report. In consultation with the Cabinet Member: Housing, Development & Borough Towns to develop the Lodge Road land and part of the Snedshill land as a Gypsy and Traveller site. To seal or sign any documents to give effect to the resolutions.
LEGAL COMMENT FINANCIAL COMMENT LINKS WITH CORPORATE PRIORITIES RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT EQUALITY & DIVERSITY WARD IMPLICATIONS	As described in each report considered by Cabinet. Copies of all reports have been previously circulated to all Members of the Council	

TELFORD & WREKIN COUNCIL**COUNCIL – 12 SEPTEMBER 2013****2013/14 FINANCIAL MONITORING REPORT****REPORT OF THE ASSISTANT DIRECTOR: FINANCE, AUDIT & INFORMATION GOVERNANCE (CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER)****PART A) – SUMMARY REPORT****1.0 SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES**

1.1 The Financial Monitoring report to Cabinet in July showed overall revenue spending projected to be within approved budgets and provided an update on progress on capital programme spending. The report also highlighted some new capital allocations and which require formal approval by Full Council.

1.2 SUMMARY

The detailed approvals required by Council are:

Slippage				
	13/14 £	14/15 £	15/16 £	Comment
Ensure that Neighbourhoods are Safe, Clean and Well Maintained				
Integrated Transport	-520,000	520,000		Prudential
New Allocations				
	13/14 £	Comment		
Improve Local People's Prospects through Education & Skills Training				
Devolved Formula Capital	-54,487	Reduced allocation due to schools converting to Academies		
Basic Need Contingency	630,238	1 of 2 year allocation; Standards Fund Grant		
Contingency for Reactive Works	-190,344	Reduced allocation – approved allocation based on prior years		
Hollinswood Primary – Infant and Junior Merger	50,000	External – School Contribution		
Donnington Wood Infants – New Early years Development	29,500	Section 106 Funding		
Muxton Primary – 3 Class base extension	24,500	Section 106 Funding		
Teagues Bridge Primary – 3 class base extension, Hall, Boiler and Roof	293,486	Section 106 Funding		
Improve Health & Well Being of Our Communities				
Newport Fitness Facility	60,000	Prudential		
Protect & Support our Vulnerable Children & Adults				
ICT Social Care Review	300,000	Prudential		

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 Members are asked to approve the changes to the capital programme shown in section 1 above.

3.0 SUMMARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

COMMUNITY IMPACT	Do these proposals contribute to specific Priority Plan objective(s)?	
	Yes	Delivery of all priority objectives depend on the effective use of available resources.
	Will the proposals impact on specific groups of people?	
	No	
TARGET COMPLETION/DELIVERY DATE	The capital programme will be immediately updated to reflect the new approvals.	
FINANCIAL/VALUE FOR MONEY IMPACT	Yes	Financial impacts arising from this report will be reflected in future financial monitoring reports and built in to the final service and financial planning strategy for 2013/14 and beyond
LEGAL ISSUES	No	None directly arising from this report. The S151 Officer has a statutory duty to monitor income and expenditure and take action if overspends /shortfalls emerge.
OTHER IMPACTS, RISKS & OPPORTUNITIES	No	
IMPACT ON SPECIFIC WARDS	No	Borough Wide

4.0 PREVIOUS MINUTES

07/03/13 – Full Council, Service & Financial Planning Strategy
25/07/13 – Cabinet, 2013/14 Financial Monitoring

PART B) – ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

There is no additional information.

5.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

2013/14 Budget Strategy / Financial Ledger reports

Report Prepared by:

Ken Clarke, Assistant Director: Finance, Audit & I.G. (C.F.O.) – 01952 383100; Pauline Harris, Finance Manager – 01952 383701

BOROUGH OF TELFORD & WREKIN

COUNCIL CONSTITUTION COMMITTEE – 18th JULY 2013

JOINT HEALTH SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS

REPORT OF THE SCRUTINY GROUP SPECIALIST

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 There are two issues that require consideration to ensure that the Health Scrutiny arrangements in Telford and Wrekin have the relevant provisions for Joint Health Scrutiny Committees:

- Voting rights for co-opted members on the Telford and Wrekin and Shropshire Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee
- Provisions to establish a Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny committee with other Local Authority areas if required.

1.2 If agreed, both these issues will require amendments to the Council's constitution. Agreement of all Members is necessary in order to disapply political balance requirements.

2.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

2.1 It is recommended that Council Constitution Committee make the following recommendations to Council:

- **To agree the voting Scheme for the Co-opted Members of the Joint HOSC as set out in Appendix 1 and the consequent changes to the Constitution as set out in Appendix 2**
- **To agree the procedure to establish future Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committees as set out in section 5 of this report and the consequent changes to the constitution set out in Appendix 2.**

3.0 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

3.1 FC – 50

4.0. JOINT HEALTH SCRUTINY ARRANGEMENTS

4.1 Telford and Wrekin Council values the contribution of co-opted members on the Council's Scrutiny Committees. At Full Council on the 29th October 2009 it was decided to confer voting rights on the 3 independent co-opted Telford

and Wrekin Members of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee with Shropshire Council. Under this Scheme co-opted members can only exercise their right to vote in respect of matters relating to the re-configuration of health services that were subject to consultation by the Telford and Wrekin PCT and Shropshire PCT during 2009. The scheme set out that when the matter of the re-configuration of health services in Shropshire and Telford & Wrekin has been finally determined, this Scheme will be revoked. Shropshire Council subsequently agreed the same scheme to confer voting rights for Shropshire Council co-optees on the Joint HOSC.

- 4.2 The Joint HOSC considered the Full Business Case for the Service reconfiguration at the meeting on 12th April 2012 and has continued to monitor the implementation of the service changes and the travel and transport plan. The Joint HOSC is developing the work programme for 2013/14 and many of the issues are outside the remit of the current voting scheme e.g. Review of accident and emergency services, 111 service and stroke services.
- 4.3 Following discussions with the co-chairs of the Joint HOSC and Members of the relevant Scrutiny Committees it is proposed that both Telford and Wrekin Council and Shropshire Council extend the voting rights of the co-optees to all matters considered by the Joint HOSC, but that the scheme is time limited and reviewed every 3 years. A draft scheme is attached for consideration by Council Constitution Committee in Appendix 1 and the consequent changes to the Constitution are set out in Appendix 2.

5.0 PROVISION FOR ESTABLISHING FUTURE JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEES

- 5.1 Telford and Wrekin has a long standing and successful Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee with Shropshire Council. However the Local Authority needs to be in a position to respond to any proposed changes to NHS services that will affect a wider geographical areas than is covered by this Joint HOSC. The draft Health Scrutiny Guidance sets out that:
- The Health Scrutiny regulations require the appointment of a Joint HOSC where a health service commissioner or provider consults more than 1 local authority's health scrutiny function on substantial reconfiguration.
 - The Joint HOSC will need to reflect the political make up of the participating local authorities, unless exceptions under the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 apply.
 - Only the Joint HOSC may make comments on the proposal consulted on or require the health service commissioner or provider which has the proposal under consideration to provide information to them, or require a member or employee of that body or provider to attend before them to answer questions.

- Only the Joint HOSC can then make a report and recommendations back to the organisation proposing the change.
- The power to refer to the Secretary of State can be exercised by any of the local authorities participating in the Joint HOSC or by (and only by) the Joint HOSC where the power to refer has been delegated to it.
- Local authorities will need to consider arrangements / protocols for joint Committees with other authorities so that these can be established quickly when the need arises.

5.2 The time required to establish a Joint HOSC which is politically balanced is considerable and could result in a short time for the Joint HOSC to consider the NHS proposals, gather the evidence required and respond to the consultation.

5.3 A model adopted by several other authorities waives the requirement for political balance on any future Joint HOSC established if all the other participating authorities also agree to this. Under these circumstances the Chair of the HOSC would be the Telford and Wrekin representative on this Joint HOSC and will share and discuss documents with the health spokespeople. If any of the participating authorities do not agree to waive political balance the Membership of the Joint HOSC will be appointed by the relevant Scrutiny Committee. The arrangements adopted by Solihull MBC are attached as an example in Appendix 3. Following discussion with the Chair of the HOSC it is proposed that this model is considered by CCC and, if agreed, recommended to Full Council in September as set out in Appendix 2.

6.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES

6.1 Co-opted Members on the Joint HOSC will be appointed in line with the Scrutiny policy on co-opted members.

7.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT

7.1 There are no direct environmental implications resulting from this report.

8.0 LEGAL COMMENT

8.1 The proposals in this report with regard to voting rights for co-optees accord with the requirements set out in the Local Government Act 2000 and the Local Authorities (Committee System) (England) Regulations 2012.

8.2 In accordance with section 17 Local Government and Housing Act 1989 in order for political balance requirements to be disapplied, no member present must vote against the proposal.

9.0 OPPORTUNITIES AND RISKS

9.1 There may be circumstances where the Council will need to respond quickly to a consultation on NHS service reconfiguration. Currently this would require working with other authorities to agree the political balance requirements of a Joint HOSC and Full Council appointing the Telford and Wrekin representatives. The arrangements proposed enable the Local Authority to respond appropriately with other Council's that have similar arrangements.

10.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are no significant implications as the proposed changes can be accommodated within the existing base budget. However, there maybe a requirement for additional Scrutiny resource to deal with future specific and time limited consultations. Any request will be subject to resources being available at the time and with appropriate approvals being given.

11.0 WARD IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are no ward implications resulting directly from this report.

12.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS

12.1 Health and Social Care Act 2012
Draft Health Scrutiny Guidance

Report prepared by: Fiona Bottrill Scrutiny Group Specialist and Statutory Scrutiny Officer 01952 383113

**SCHEME MADE UNDER PARAGRAPH 12 OF SCHEDULE 1
LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 2000
SCHEME TO GIVE VOTING RIGHTS TO CO-OPTED MEMBERS
OF THE JOINT HEALTH SCRUTINY COMMITTEE**

In accordance with Paragraph 12 of Schedule 1 to the Local Government Act 2000 (as inserted by section 115 Local Government Act 2003) the Borough of Telford & Wrekin has determined that the three co-opted members of the Joint Health Scrutiny Committee (that is those members of the committee who are not members of the authority) shall have permission to vote in accordance with this Scheme.

The co-opted members can exercise their right to vote in respect of any matters relating to the work of the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee. The Scheme will be revoked after 3 years at which point Council can determine if it should be renewed.

DRAFT

Scrutiny Rules

- 1. What is Scrutiny?**
- 2. How does it work?**
- 3. The Scrutiny Assembly**
- 4. Scrutiny Committees**
- 5. The Scrutiny Management Board and the role of individual Chairmen**
- 6. Working Practices**
- 7. Call-in**
- 8. Procedural Rules**

1. What is scrutiny?

- 1.1. There is a Scrutiny Assembly, and a minimum of 2 and a maximum of 6 Scrutiny Committees (including the Scrutiny Management Board) that oversees and scrutinises the work of the Leader and his/ her Cabinet and the Council as a whole.
- 1.2. This allows members outside the Cabinet and citizens to have a greater say in Council matters by investigating issues of local concern. This can include questioning Cabinet Members, senior officers of the Council and inviting people from outside the Council to give opinions and expert advice.
- 1.3. Scrutiny Committees also have the power to scrutinise the services provided by organisations outside the Council e.g. NHS services and the work of the Community Safety Partnership.
- 1.4. Scrutiny Committees can make reports and recommendations to Leader, the Council and some partner organisations. The Decision Takers are not required to implement the recommendations but do have to consider any recommendations made.
- 1.5. Scrutiny also monitors the decisions of Decision Takers. They can 'call-in' a decision which has been made by the Decision Taker but not yet implemented. This enables them to consider whether the decision is appropriate. They may recommend that the Decision Taker reconsider the decision. They may also be consulted by the Leader, other Cabinet members or the Council on forthcoming decisions and the development of the Budget & Policy Framework.
- 1.6. The Council has appointed a Scrutiny Officer with statutory responsibilities to promote the role of the Council's scrutiny committees within the authority, support the work of the scrutiny committees by providing help and advice to scrutiny members but also those being scrutinised. (This role cannot be held by the Head of paid Services, the Chief Finance Officer or the Monitoring Officer.)
- 1.7. There is a Scrutiny Handbook which does not form part of the Constitution but contains the more detailed operational notes about how the scrutiny function is performed.

2. How does it work?

- 2.1. Scrutiny is not designed for use for political purposes and accordingly the existence and nature of any party whip must be disclosed at the start of any Scrutiny Assembly or Scrutiny Committee meeting.

3. The Scrutiny Assembly

Who is on it

- 3.1. All members of the Council who are not Cabinet Members.
- 3.2. The scrutiny committee that covers education matters has statutory co-optees and other scrutiny committees may also co-opt members.
- 3.3. The Mayor does not sit on any committees but may attend and participate (but not vote) if he or she wishes.

What does it do?

- 3.3.1. The Scrutiny Assembly acts as a consultee on scrutiny matters. This may be done by e-mail or at meetings as deemed necessary.

4. Scrutiny Committees

Who is on them?

- 4.1. Membership of the Scrutiny Committees is determined at Annual Council but can be changed from time to time at the request of the relevant Group Leader to the Proper Officer.
Membership of any Joint HOSCs other than the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee with Shropshire will be the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee with health Scrutiny powers if all participating authorities agree to waive political balance. If political balance is not waived then the Scrutiny Committee with Health Scrutiny powers will appoint the members of the Joint HOSC.

What do they do?

- 4.2. Each committee will:
 - 4.2.1. Scrutinise the work of the Council according to their terms of reference as included in the Scrutiny Handbook
 - 4.2.2. Agree the Committee's work programme and undertake this through formal committee meetings, Member Working Groups and sub-groups
 - 4.2.3. meet as required to deliver the work programme
 - 4.2.4. be entitled to appoint Co-optees in accordance with legislation and the Policy for Co-opting Scrutiny Members as set out in the Scrutiny Handbook.
 - 4.2.5. Act as consultee for draft budget & policy framework policy proposals published by the Leader (Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee only) and any alternative proposals developed by opposition groups
 - 4.2.6. Review the strategies and policies of the Leader and the Council and to scrutinise any matter affecting local people and make proposals to the Leader.
 - 4.2.7. Review the discharge by the Leader of any of his/ her functions, including comparison of performance against any appropriate targets, plans or standards.
 - 4.2.8. Review any decisions or proposed decisions of the Council and of Decision Takers, including call-in (Scrutiny Management Board only).
 - 4.2.9. Consider any matters which affect the Council or its administrative area or the inhabitants of that area and to make recommendations to the Council or the Leader arising from that consideration.
 - 4.2.10. Consider any matter referred to it by the Scrutiny Management Board, from the Leader or the Council and make recommendations to the Leader or the Council accordingly.
 - 4.2.11. Consider applications for additional items to go on the Work Programme
 - 4.2.12. Consider any Councillor Calls for Action and/ or Petitions
 - 4.2.13. Scrutinise the planning and provision of NHS services for the population of Telford and Wrekin. This power has been delegated by Council to the Health and Adult Care Scrutiny Committee including the power of referral to the Secretary of State for Health.

4.2.14. Scrutinise the work of partner organisations in accordance with national legislation and good practice.

4.3. The Scrutiny Committees statutory and constitutional duties and powers include:-

- 4.3.1. powers of a Scrutiny Committee in relation to Leader and Cabinet Executive decisions made but not implemented as set out in **section 21(3) of the Local Government Act 2000** i.e. Call-in of decisions taken but not yet implemented
- 4.3.2. Scrutiny of the Crime and Disorder Reduction Partnership (as set out in **section 19 of the Police & Justice Act (2006)**).
- 4.3.3. Scrutiny of Flood and Water Management (as set out in the **Flood and Water Management Act 2010**).
- 4.3.4. Consideration of Social Care referrals on health and social care issues from Healthwatch as set out in the regulations for the Health and Social Care Act (2012) for the Local Involvement Network (LINK) (as set out in section 226 of the **Local Government and Public Involvement Act (2007)**).
- 4.3.5. Statutory Scrutiny of Local Area Agreements (as set out in **section 21E of the Local Government Act 2000**).
- 4.3.6. Statutory health scrutiny function including referral to the Secretary of State for Health and appointing Members and Co-optees to any Joint Health Scrutiny arrangements (as set out in **Section 7 of the Health & Social Care Act (2001)** and amended by the **National Health Service Act (2006)** the **Health and Social Care Act (2012)**).
- 4.3.7. The powers of a Scrutiny Committee in relation to the consideration of Councillor Calls for Action in relation to the relevant Council priority as set out in **section 21A of the Local Government Act 2000 and section 19(3) of the Police & Justice Act (2006)**.
- 4.3.8. The powers of a Scrutiny Committee in relation to petitions as set out in the **Local Democracy, Economic Development and Economic Construction Act (2009)**.
- 4.3.9. Scrutiny of the Leader and Cabinet Executive's budget proposals as set out in the Policy Framework and Budget Procedure Rules of this Constitution.

5. Scrutiny Management Board and the role of individual Chairmen

Who is on it?

The Chairman, appointed by Council, for each Scrutiny Committee and any other Members appointed by Council. (The Role Description for the Chairman of the Scrutiny Assembly will be set out in the Scrutiny Handbook.)

What does it do?

5.1. The Scrutiny Management Board will:-

- 5.1.1. co-ordinate, oversee and monitor the delivery of the Scrutiny work programme.
- 5.1.2. oversee the allocation of scrutiny officer resources to the Scrutiny Committees.
- 5.1.3. allocate Scrutiny suggestions to the relevant Scrutiny Committee and may make recommendations about priorities for the work programme and joint scrutiny of issues.
- 5.1.4. be responsible for scrutiny in relation to Leader and Cabinet Executive decisions made but not implemented as set out in **section 21(3) of the Local Government Act 2000** i.e. Call-in of decisions taken but not yet implemented.
- 5.1.5. receive requests from the Leader and Cabinet Executive or individual Members and/or the Full Council for reports from the Scrutiny Committee and to allocate them if appropriate to one or more Scrutiny Committees.
- 5.1.6. receive / agree notification of Key Decisions falling within the terms of reference for their scrutiny committee that need to be taken but which are not included on the Notice of Key Decisions and Private Reports/Meetings in accordance with the rules on General Exceptions

- or agree to a Key Decision being considered as an Urgent Decision and therefore being exempt from call-in
- 5.1.7. review and make recommendations to the Council Constitution Committee regarding changes to Scrutiny Arrangements including Call-in. Scrutiny Assembly Members will be informed of any proposed changes.
 - 5.1.8. may make changes to the scrutiny structure and processes after consulting with the Scrutiny Assembly. The Scrutiny Handbook will be updated to reflect the changes. Changes will be reported back to the next full Council meeting.
 - 5.1.9. periodically review and make changes to the Policy for Co-opting Scrutiny Members
 - 5.1.10. the Chairman will report annually to Council on the work of scrutiny in the previous year and priorities for the future.

6. Working Practices

The Scrutiny Handbook

- 6.1. Details about how to undertake scrutiny reviews and general provisions governing the management of the scrutiny process are contained in the Scrutiny Handbook. The Scrutiny Handbook includes details and protocols on:
 - 6.1.1. Agreeing the Scrutiny Work Programme
 - 6.1.2. Role of Cabinet Members in Scrutiny
 - 6.1.3. Scrutiny Member and Officer relations
 - 6.1.4. Councillor Call for Action
 - 6.1.5. Call – In
 - 6.1.6. Media Protocol
 - 6.1.7. Terms of Reference for the Scrutiny Assembly and Scrutiny Committees
 - 6.1.8. Role Description for the Scrutiny Chairmen
 - 6.1.9. The Policy for Co-opted Scrutiny members
- 6.2. Changes to the Scrutiny Handbook can be agreed by the Scrutiny Management Board in consultation with the Scrutiny Assembly.

Witnesses and other investigatory techniques

- 6.3. Scrutiny Committees may hold enquiries and investigate the available options for future direction in policy development and may appoint advisers and assessors to assist them in this process. They may go on site visits, conduct public surveys, hold public meetings, commission research and do all other things that they reasonably consider necessary to inform their deliberations. They may ask witnesses to attend to address them on any matter under consideration.
- 6.4. Members of the Cabinet and Officers (at Service Delivery Manager and above) can be called to attend Scrutiny Committees to answer questions within their remit about any particular decision or series of decisions, the extent to which the actions taken implement Council policy and/or the performance of the service. Members and Officers called must attend as soon as is practicable but must be given at least 14 days notice of the date of the meeting which notice shall include full details of the issues that they are to be questioned about (for more details see the Scrutiny Handbook).

7. Call-in

What is it?

- 7.1. The call-in procedure allows, subject to certain limitations, Key Decisions which have been made but not yet implemented, to be referred back to a Decision-Taker for reconsideration. Call-in is split between call-in of decisions that are within the Budget & Policy Framework and those that are outside the Budget & Policy Framework.

Call in and urgent decisions

- 7.2. Urgent decisions are exempt from call-in but will be monitored annually by the Scrutiny Management Board. Further information on the process to agree an urgent decision that is exempt from call-in is set out in the Scrutiny Handbook.

How can you make a request for call-in of decisions within the budget and policy framework?

- 7.3. A request for call-in must be made, in writing, to the Proper Officer within 3 working days of the Record of Decisions being published. After this the decision becomes effective and can be implemented. If, however a request for a call-in is received within the time limit the decision to which the call-in request relates is suspended and cannot be implemented until the call-in process has been completed.
- 7.4. The request for a call-in must be signed by a minimum of 5 members (or Voting Co-optees) and detail the decision that is being called in and the reasons why it is being called in, having consideration to the Principles of Decision-Making.

Limits on call-in

- 7.5. The call-in procedure does not apply to:
 - 7.5.1. Decisions taken by the Leader and Cabinet Executive that are urgent;
 - 7.5.2. Decisions of full Council;
 - 7.5.3. Any decisions taken by officers that are not key decisions;
 - 7.5.4. Recommendations from the Leader and Cabinet Executive to the Council;
 - 7.5.5. Specific or individual Employee Relations, Disciplinary or Grievance matters;
 - 7.5.6. Matters which are subject to formal or statutory appeal processes or are sub-judice;
 - 7.5.7. Individual appeal cases for example, Planning, Licensing, Housing, Education;
 - 7.5.8. Decisions of the Standards and Audit Committee or Regulatory Committees;
- 7.6. The Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Board will determine whether the call-in is valid within 3 days of receipt of the call-in request, he / she may, in consultation with the Monitoring Officer, determine that a request for call-in is not valid if he/she reasonably considers that the reason for the call-in does not *prima facie* comply with the Principles of Decision-making or falls outside the remit of call in as set out in 7.5 above.

Before the call-in meeting.

- 7.7. The Proper Officer will record the time and date of receipt of the request and will inform the Decision Taker and the Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Board. The final wording of the call-in proposal will be accepted from the lead call in Member up to 2 days after receipt of the call in.
- 7.8. The Proper Officer will arrange a meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board and will notify the members who signed/ supported the request for call-in of the time and date and location of the meeting at which the request for call-in will be considered.

- 7.9. In exceptional circumstances where it is not possible to achieve a quorate meeting Scrutiny Management Board within the prescribed timescales, substitute members from the Scrutiny Assembly may be appointed by Group Leaders.
- 7.10. A call-in meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board must be held within 10 working days of the call-in request being received. If it not held within that time the decision being called-in will take effect from that date.
- 7.11. In the meantime the Decision-Taker may meet with some or all of the members supporting the call-in informally to clarify the points at issue and ensure that there is no confusion regarding the decision and to identify whether the concerns expressed in the request for call-in can be addressed by the Decision Taker in the original decision. This can include formal advice from the Monitoring Officer and Chief Finance Officer about whether or not the decision falls within, or is outside the Budget & Policy Framework
- 7.12. Any member may, in writing to the Proper Officer, withdraw their support for a request for call-in until no later than 24 hours before the start of the meeting of the relevant Scrutiny Committee that is due to consider the request for call-in. If, after one or more members have withdrawn their support, there are less than 5 members still in support of the request for call-in it will no longer be valid and the meeting will be cancelled.
- 7.13. The call-in papers which must be circulated to members of the Scrutiny Management Board and other parties involved in/ attending the meeting at least 48 hours prior to the meeting are:-
- 7.13.1. the original report on which the decision was based
 - 7.13.2. a copy of the call-in request
 - 7.13.3. one side of an A4 sheet of paper setting out the main points of their argument
 - 7.13.4. background information that supports these arguments, which could include budgetary information, statistical information, maps, consultation results or as summary of changes in legislation.

The call-in meeting

- 7.14. The Chairman of Scrutiny Management Board is responsible for the effective management of the call-in meeting and has discretion over the procedure for the meeting. Generally however he or she will ask the members making the request for call-in to identify a lead call-in member who will be invited to present their argument, ask any questions of the Decision-Taker and put forward alternative proposals (30 minutes) and, at the end of the meeting sum up their position if they want to (5 minutes). The Decision Taker (with officer support if appropriate) will have the opportunity to explain their decision and express their views on any alternative proposals (30 minutes) and, at the end of the meeting sum up their position if they want to (5 minutes). Members of the Scrutiny Committee will consider the papers and may ask questions of anyone in attendance at the meeting at any time or when invited to by the Chairman (no time limit) before considering their response to the request for call-in.
- 7.15. Any Scrutiny Committee member arriving at the meeting after the lead call-in member has started his or her presentation will be allowed to remain in the meeting as an observer but will not be allowed to take part in the debate or the voting process. This will be made clear on the agenda for the meeting.

Decisions of the Scrutiny Committee on a call-in

- 7.16. If having considered the proposal contained in the request for call-in, Scrutiny Management Board supports the original decision it may be implemented with immediate effect.
- 7.17. If, having considered the request for call-in Scrutiny Management Board is concerned about the original decision, then the decision remains suspended and it will be referred back to the Decision-Taker for reconsideration, or, if the decision is deemed to be outside the Policy and Budget Framework refer the matter to full Council. (see Call in of Decisions outside the Budget & Policy Framework below). These meetings will take place as follows:-
- 7.17.1. full Council - within 10 working days of the call-in meeting
- 7.17.2. Cabinet - at the next scheduled meeting of the cabinet
- 7.17.3. Individual Decision-Taker - within 3 working days of the call-in meeting.
- 7.18. Whether a call-in proposal is supported or not, members may come to agreement on any comments they wish to pass to the decision taker. The Chairman will sum up and clarify any points which member wish to pass to Cabinet. These will be reported to the Cabinet by the Scrutiny Management Board.
- 7.19. A decision can only be called in once. However, if the Decision Taker significantly alters the decision after considering recommendations from the relevant Scrutiny Committee the new decision will also be capable of being called-in.

Call in of decisions outside the Budget & Policy Framework

- 7.20. When a request for call-in has been received and the Scrutiny Management Board consider that the decision is, or if made, would be contrary to the Budget & Policy Framework then the Chair will seek the advice of the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer if that advice has not already been sought by those making the request for call-in..
- 7.21. If either officer advises that the decision is outside the Budget & Policy Framework then,
- 7.21.1. if the decision has already been implemented then the relevant scrutiny committee will refer the advice of the Chief Finance Officer/ Monitoring Officer to Council for consideration along with a report from the Leader about the decision.
- 7.21.2. If the decision has not been made or has been made but not yet implemented the relevant scrutiny committee will refer the (proposed) decision to Council who must consider the advice within 10 working days during which time no further action will be taken in respect of the decision or proposed decision.
- 7.22. Having considered the advice Council may:-
- 7.22.1. endorse the decision of the Decision-Taker as falling within the existing Budget & Policy Framework;
- 7.22.2. amend the relevant financial regulations or policy to encompass the decision of the Decision-Taker and agree the original decision with immediate effect; or
- 7.22.3. Accept the decision of the Chief Finance Officer/ Monitoring Officer, agree no changes to the existing Budget and Policy Framework and require the Leader to re-consider the decision or proposed decision in accordance with the advice of the Chief Finance Officer and Monitoring Officer
- 7.23. If the advice is that the decision is within the Budget & Policy Framework then the report of the Chief Financial Officer/ Monitoring Officer and Leader will be reported back to the relevant scrutiny committee.

8. Procedural Rules

- 8.1. See Council Rules on Motions without notice, Points of Order, Personal Explanation and Conduct (except rule 12.1) (substituting the Chairman of the relevant scrutiny committee for the Mayor) which apply to all scrutiny meetings

Scrutiny Assembly

Scrutiny Committees

**Scrutiny Management
Board**

Appointment of Chairman/ Vice-Chairman		
The Chairman of the Scrutiny Management Board is automatically the Chairman of the Scrutiny Assembly	Council (in year vacancies appointed by group leaders) Vice-Chairmen may be appointed by majority decision of the Committee.	Council
Politically balanced		
No	Yes except where the political balance requirement has been waived in respect of joint HOSC arrangements	Yes
Membership		
all non cabinet members and all co-opted members	8 and all co-opted members. The Mayor may not sit on a Scrutiny Committee. <u>Joint Shropshire and Telford and Wrekin HOSC 3 elected members and 3 voting co-optees from each local authority</u> <u>Other joint HOSC arrangements to be determined as agreed by Council :</u> <u>If requirement for political balance is waived by all participating authorities then the chair of the relevant Scrutiny Committee with Health Scrutiny powers will be the Telford and Wrekin representative on the Joint HOSC</u> <u>If the requirement for political balance is not waived then the membership of the Joint HOSC will be appointed by the relevant Scrutiny Committee with Health Scrutiny powers</u>	7 (or as to make the Board politically balanced)
Quorum		

n/a	3 Elected Members The quorum for the Joint HOSC is set out in the Terms of Reference for this Committee in the Scrutiny Handbook.	3
Substitutes		
n/a	no	no(except for call-in)
Co-optees		
yes – but with no voting rights	Yes – but with no voting rights except:- Special Rules children & young people –4 co-optees with voting rights (in respect of educational matters only) (1 Church of England and 1 Roman Catholic diocesan representative and 2 parent governors) Joint HOSC (delete health and adult care)3 co-optees with voting rights as approved by Council (delete – in respect of the reconfiguration if hospital services)	no
Co-optees can be appointed for a fixed term or as a standing member – there is a 1 month notice period on either side. Members of one Scrutiny Committee can be co-opted to work with another Scrutiny Committee.		
Meetings		
As and when required	Meet approximately 6 times a year. Meetings may be formal public meetings, informal working group or sub-group meetings as necessary to deliver the work programme Joint Scrutiny Committees with other authorities can be established. The Members of the Joint HOSC with Shropshire is a sub-	Meets formally six times a year

	committee of the Health and Adult Care Scrutiny Committee.	
Meetings held in public		
Yes (subject to rules on exempt information and confidential information)	Yes (subject to rules on exempt information and confidential information)	Yes (subject to rules on exempt information and confidential information)
Joint working/ working groups		
	<p>Scrutiny Committee(s) can hold joint meetings/ scrutiny reviews with one or more other Scrutiny Committees and establish working groups, sub groups, joint committees and joint sub committees where the Chairman/ Chairmen of the relevant Scrutiny Committee(s) agree that it is conducive to the efficient delivery of the scrutiny function. Where 2 Scrutiny Committees work jointly on an issue under scrutiny and the meeting is held as a formal public Committee meeting one Scrutiny Committee will be the lead Committee for this area of work.</p> <p>Working Groups are not formal Council meetings and do not have to meet in public or meet the political balance requirements as any findings/ recommendations are reported to the relevant Scrutiny Committee(s) for consideration.</p>	
Calling meetings		
The Chairman may ask the Proper Officer to call a meeting.	A schedule of meetings is agreed by the Committee as required to deliver the work programme or the Chairman may ask the Proper Officer to call a meeting.	A schedule of meetings is agreed annually by the Board or the Chairman may ask the Proper Officer to call a meeting
Agenda items		
Agreed by the Chair of the Scrutiny Management Board	Agenda items are approved by the Scrutiny Committee Chairman as required to	Agenda items are approved by the Chair of the Scrutiny Management

	deliver the work programme agreed by the Scrutiny Committee.	Board as required to deliver the agreed work programme.
Scrutiny Reports		
n/a	Scrutiny reports are sent to the Proper Officer for inclusion on the Cabinet agenda (if within the Budget and Policy Framework) and Council (if outside the Budget and Policy Framework).	Scrutiny reports are sent to the Proper Officer for inclusion on the Cabinet agenda (if within the Budget and Policy Framework) and Council (if outside the Budget and Policy Framework).

EXTRACT FROM REPORT TO PLANNING COMMITTEE ON 24 JULY 2013

INVEST IN TELFORD – PLANNING UPDATE

REPORT OF SERVICE DELIVERY MANAGER: DEVELOPMENT MANAGEMENT

1. SUMMARY OF MAIN PROPOSALS

- 1.1 The report provides an update to inform Planning Committee Members of the Planning team's performance over the past 12 months, in addition to the recent changes to the service area structure. The report also sets out the proposed national changes to performance indicators and the need to provide both timely and quality decisions. Consideration is given to Councils Priorities in addition to the service areas, and makes recommendations to achieve this when determining planning applications

2. RECOMMENDATIONS

That Planning Committee recommend to Full Council that the practices for public speaking at Planning Committee be brought in line with those of other Councils.

3. SUMMARY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

COMMUNITY IMPACT	Do these proposals contribute to specific Priority Plan objective(s)?	
	Yes	Business Winning, Business Supporting Council
	Will the proposals impact on specific groups of people?	
	No	No
TARGET COMPLETION/ DELIVERY DATE	August 2013	
FINANCIAL/VALUE FOR MONEY IMPACT	Yes	The resource implications of the recommended changes to planning processes have been addressed through the restructure of the service and will be accommodated within existing budgets. Enhanced technical and administrative support has been resourced to facilitate determination of applications within the Planning Guarantee period of 26 weeks (paragraph 4.5), therefore the risk to local planning fee income as a result of this legislative change is considered to be low.
LEGAL ISSUES	Yes	Any recommended changes to the Public Speaking Scheme will need to be approved by full Council.
OTHER IMPACTS, RISKS & OPPORTUNITIES	No	The recommendations carry no inherent risks but seek to provide a more effective and efficient planning service.
IMPACT ON SPECIFIC WARDS	No	Borough wide impact.

4. PROPOSED CHANGES

4.1 **Invest in Telford**

In April 2012, Cabinet approved a report entitled 'Encouraging Growth - A New Way of Working'. This recognised the challenges facing businesses and developers wishing to invest in the Borough both from global economic conditions but also those identified by investors as local barriers. The Report launched a Business & Development Charter which pledged to ensure a more streamlined, consistent, personalised and supportive service to all our customers. Since its adoption in June 2012 these pledges have been

embedded in new ways of working and new initiatives, including the opening on 4 February of a dedicated 'Business & Planning First Point' within the offices at Wellington. Staffed by Business Support Officers and Planning Customer Services Officers this provides a 'one stop shop' for all business and planning inquiries. Located in Wellington it gives access to Officers dealing with property, land, planning, development, funding for business and wide ranging business support advice.

- 4.2 It is also recommended that for a more effective use of Member time that the scheme for public speaking is brought in line with the practices adopted by other LPAs with regard to 3 minute representations. The Chair would still have discretion to exceed the time limits when there are particular applications which require longer presentations. The Parish Charter Monitoring Group have consulted all the Parish/Town Councils on this proposed change and the findings are shown in **Appendix 2**. Of the 17 responses received 9 Councils preferred 3 minutes (including 1 Parish that still wanted 5 minutes to be available when requested) with 4 Councils requesting 5 minutes. A total of 4 Councils had no opinion. Given the support from the majority of the Parish Councils it is proposed that Planning Committee recommend to the Council (as the scheme for public speaking is a Full Council initiative) that the time for public speaking be set at 3 minutes. The existing Public Speaking Leaflet is included at **Appendix 1**.

5. **BACKGROUND PAPERS**

Appendix 1 Public Speaking Leaflet

Appendix 2 Parish Charter Monitoring Group survey results

Report prepared by David Fletcher, Service Delivery Manager Development Management.

Public Speaking at Plans Board



The Council is responsible for determining applications for planning permission. The majority of planning applications are dealt with under delegated powers by Officers and are not considered by the Plans Board. However, major, complex and contentious proposals will be determined by elected Councillors at Plans Board meetings. Public speaking applies only to applications which are heard at a public meeting of the Plans Board.

Public speaking at Plans Board meetings is not a legal requirement. The purpose of this scheme is to give the public, Parish Councils and applicants an opportunity to make their views known in person to the Plans Board. Letters of support or objection will also continue to be taken into account.

Plans Board meetings are normally held on Wednesdays. Venue details can be obtained from Democratic Services. Wherever possible, items on which the public wish to speak will normally be considered early on the agenda and, therefore, the order of business may differ from the published schedule. Any speaker not present when the application they are concerned with falls to be considered will lose the opportunity to speak.

If you wish to speak at the meeting you **must** register in advance in accordance with the procedure set out below.

Can I speak on any planning application?

Only on those which are due to be determined by the Plans Board.

How will I know when a particular application will be heard at Plans Board?

Development Management will be able to advise whether an application is likely to be considered by the Board and when. Registrations for public speaking are not accepted until the relevant Plans Board agenda has been published. Agendas are published five clear working days before the date of the meeting.

Who can speak at Plans Board Meetings?

- The person applying for planning permission (or his or her agent or other representative) is entitled to speak in support of their application.
- Any other member of the public (or his or her agent or other representative) is entitled to speak either in favour or against the application.*
- A representative of a Parish or Town Council is entitled to speak either in favour or against the application, providing that the property is situated within that Parish or Town Council area, or in certain circumstances when the property is in an adjoining Parish or Town Council area.
- Borough Ward Councillors, providing that the property is located within their ward, or in certain circumstances when the property is located in an adjoining Borough ward. A Borough Councillor may also speak as a 'stand in' for the Ward Councillor.

An applicant in favour of the application can speak even though an objector does not and vice-versa.

* What if more than one person wishes to speak in each category?

In the event of more than one objector or one applicant/supporter wishing to speak either:

- Prior to the meeting, a spokesperson may be appointed on behalf of all those wishing to speak in the same category. This should normally be the first person who registered to speak but if an alternative is subsequently agreed, details must be provided to the Democratic Services Team before the day of the meeting. If the objectors or applicant/supporters cannot reach agreement about who will speak, then the person who registered first will be given the opportunity to speak.
- In some cases, for example when there are just two objectors wishing to speak, individuals may agree to share the allocated time.

Names and contact details of all those who register to speak will be publicly available from Democratic Services.

In the case of multi member Borough Wards, the Chairman may, at his discretion, allow more than one Borough Ward Member to speak.

How long is allowed for speaking?

A maximum of 5 minutes is allocated to each of the following categories of speaker:

- The authorised Parish or Town Council Representative for the area
- The Borough Ward Councillor (if not a member of Plans Board).
- Those wishing to speak in favour of the application
- Those wishing to speak opposing the application

These time limits will be strictly adhered to. In certain circumstances the Chairman may agree to extend these time limits in the interests of a balanced debate. Speakers will not be allowed to complete presentations if the allocated time limit expires.

What is the Procedure for speaking?

The Chairman will announce the application and speakers will then be invited to address the Board in the following order:

1. Parish/Town Council representative
2. Borough Ward Councillor
3. Objector (or agent/spokesperson on behalf of objectors)
4. Applicant or their agent/spokesperson

The Chairman will have the discretion to halt the Speaker should they begin to stray from the discussion of planning grounds or make inappropriate or offensive comments.

Speakers may read from prepared statements.

Once speakers have finished they will be asked to retake their seats in the public gallery and may take no further part in the meeting.

Following this, a Planning Officer will present the written report and respond to any questions raised by members of the Plans Board before the Board debates and makes a decision on the application.

What can I say?

Comments must be based on planning issues, for example: overlooking/loss of privacy, loss of light, adequacy of parking, highway safety and/or traffic generation, noise or disturbance resulting from use, layout and density, design, character and appearance, conservation, sustainability and planning policy. Issues such as boundary or property disputes, land ownership, restrictive covenants, property values, commercial competition and the developer's character or motives are not material planning considerations.

Speakers must not:

- Make statements of a personal or slanderous nature; or
- Be abusive; or
- Interrupt other Speakers or the debate of the Plans Board.

Can I provide additional information to present at the meeting?

Additional material, such as plans or photographs cannot be handed out at the meeting but must be provided to the Democratic Services Team at least 48 hours before the meeting.

What happens if an application is deferred?

If the Plans Board Members decide to defer the application (either before or after hearing the speakers) there will be a further public speaking session at the meeting to which the application is brought back for consideration but the registration requirements will still apply and the onus is on speakers to re-register.

What happens if an application is withdrawn prior to being heard?

Applications are seldom withdrawn, however, if the application is withdrawn before being presented at the meeting, those who have already expressed a wish to speak will be notified before the meeting, providing that sufficient time has been given for Officers to notify those involved of the withdrawal.

Where can I get further information or advice?

Public Speaking & Meeting Procedure Queries:
Democratic Services
☎ 01952 383215 ✉ publicspeaking@telford.gov.uk

Planning Application Queries:
Development Management
☎ 01952 380380 ✉ planning.control@telford.gov.uk

How do I arrange to speak at the Plans Board?

Borough Councillors, objectors, applicants/supporters must register to speak as below. Parish or Town Council representatives will be entitled to speak subject to the Clerk of their Council notifying Democratic Services in writing or by email of the nominated speaker(s) and the application(s) they will be speaking on in accordance with the process below.

Please contact the Democratic Services team by **no later than 5pm, two working days before the meeting** using one of the following methods:

✉ publicspeaking@telford.gov.uk
☎ 01952 383215
✉ Democratic Services
Telford & Wrekin Council
Addenbrooke House
Ironmasters Way
Telford
TF3 4NT

As part of the registration process, individuals should disclose whether they wish to speak for or against an application and in which category. In addition, email or telephone contact details must be provided.

Names and contact details of all those who register to speak will be publicly available from Democratic Services.

**CONSULTATION PARISH CHARTER MONITORING GROUP
REGARDING REDUCTION FROM 5MINS TO 3 MINS FOR SPEAKERS AT PLANNING
COMMITTEE**

Church Aston	
Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote	5 minutes
Chetwynd	3 minutes
Dawley Hamlets	No opinion
Edgmond	3 minutes
Ercall Magna	
Eyton Parish Meeting	
Great Dawley	
Hadley & Leegomery	3 minutes
Hollinswood & Randlay	3 minutes
Ketley	5 minutes
Kynnersley	
Lawley & Overdale	5 minutes plus other comments
Lilleshall & Donnington	15 th July
Little Wenlock	
Madeley	
Newport	No opinion as yet
Oakengates	
Preston on the Wealdmoors Parish Meeting	3 minutes, as long as 5 available when requested
Rodington	5 minutes
St Georges & Priorslee	3 minutes
Stirchley & Brookside	
The Gorge	3 minutes
Tibberton & Cherrington	No opinion
Waters Upton	3 minutes
Wellington	3 minutes
Wrockwardine	No opinion
Wrockwardine Wood & Trench	

BUDGET & FINANCE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee held at 6.30pm on Tuesday, 2nd July 2013 in Meeting Room 3, Darby House, Telford.

PRESENT: Councillors S. Reynolds (Chair), K. Austin, N. Dugmore (part), R. Evans, K. Guy, G. Reynolds, and Co-optee R. Williams.

Also attending: Cllr. W. McClements, Cabinet Member Finance & Enterprise; R. Partington, Managing Director (MD); K. Clarke, Assistant Director Finance, Audit & Information Governance and Chief Financial Officer (CFO); S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

BFSC-7 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meetings of the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee held on 4th June 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

BFSC-8 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs. A. Lawrence, C. Mollett and co-optee F. Robinson.

BFSC-9 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

BFSC-10 SERVICE & FINANCIAL PLANNING REPORT- 2012/13 OUTTURN

The Chair invited the CFO to summarise the key points in the 2012/13 Outturn report. These were:

- The Outturn report gives the financial position at year end and had been reported to Cabinet on 27th June.
- The outturn was very positive, with a year end surplus of £55k which was very good in the context of a net revenue budget of £126m and a savings target of £19m. Pro-active management of the financial pressures in safeguarding and adult care had also enabled the Council to remain within budget.
- A £2.5m one-off contingency had been set aside for 2013/14.
- £1m had been transferred from reserves into a Severance Fund.
- The Council had been advised that half of the receipt from the sale of its interest in WMS could be treated as revenue and had been transferred into the budget strategy reserve.
- Section 5.3 set out the service variations over £100k
- Appendix 2 set out detailed service variations over £50k

- Appendix 3 set out the revenue virements required to balance budgets
- Section 7 and Appendix 4 set out the position on the capital budget. There was a variation of £16.9m on capital spend due to delays and re-phasing of schemes into 2013/14 as set out in section 7.2 and in detail in Appendix 4. The shortfall in estimated income from capital receipts was offset by the slippage on capital spend, so there had been no additional borrowing requirements during 2012/13 and no consequent impact on the revenue budget for that year.
- Collection on Council Tax, NNDR and Sales Ledger had ended slightly behind target.
- The report flagged up pressures rolling forward into 2013/14 including:
 - **Care & Support** - pressure on adult care continued, particularly from the continued cost switching from the NHS to the Council from the withdrawal of CHC funding.
 - **Safeguarding** - the forecast in the report was that after use of the contingency set aside specifically for safeguarding would end 2013/14 in-balance, but the forecast had subsequently been revised and was now projecting an overspend of £400k at year end after use of the contingency.
 - **Capital receipts** - the requirement for 2013/14 had been revised from £39m to £45m due to receipts being deferred from 2012/13. Some of the receipts had been delayed beyond 2013/14 including the sale of land in Newport leaving a shortfall of £30m in required receipts.
- There was some good news:
 - Treasury management was expected to benefit by £0.5m even taking into account the rephrasing of capital receipts
 - The indications were that the refund on the revenue grant support for the academies topslice would be £730k (received in 2013/14 for 2012/13) more than double the £351k refund in 2012/13 (for 2011/12).
- KPMG had started the audit, the accounts were open for public inspection. The formal statement of accounts which are subject to audit could be circulated to the Committee if anyone wished to see them.

There were then some comments and questions from members:

- The Chair congratulated officers on coming in £55k under budget and making £19m savings and put on record her thanks to officers. The CFO said the thanks were due to Cabinet members especially as the budget was projecting a £4m overspend last September.
- Mr. Williams queried the shortfall in income from school meal fees and whether it was due to reduced up-take or because the fees were not being collected properly which he felt could put vulnerable parents into debt. Officers explained that responsibility for collection had passed from the Council to the schools, but the CFO said he would look into this and provide a response. The MD said the issue could be looked at as part of the review of school catering. Subsequently the relevant Assistant Director has confirmed that they're not aware of an issue.
- Mr. Williams expressed strong concern about the potential £30m shortfall in capital receipts. He wanted to know why projections made by professional people could

be so far out, and said that this was an issue he raised every year and he was frustrated because details were not given to the Committee to scrutinise. The CFO replied that the required amount of capital receipts had been delivered in the past. Sites were continually under review and the best assumptions were made about market values and the best time to sell a property to achieve the best price, but it was impossible to know the exact receipt until the property was sold and sometimes the projection in terms of value or timing of disposal could be out. Mr. Williams said he understood that £20m of the £30m shortfall was accounted for by one receipt in Newport, but even so, there was still a remaining shortfall of £10m which was a very significant amount details are provided to the Audit Committee and members of the Scrutiny Committee are free to attend its meetings.

- Mr. Williams wanted to know what the impact of not collecting the receipts would be. The CFO explained that there would be a small revenue impact on debt charges which can be accommodated within the net position on treasury management given the considerable slippage on capital spending reported in the outturn report. The loss of revenue from interest would only be relatively small because interest rates were so low and the interest impact would only accrue from half way through the year as receipts were generally assumed to be received mid-year.
- Mr. Williams wanted to know whether the slippage in the 2012/13 capital programme was due to the slippage in the capital receipts. The CFO explained that the capital programme assumed a level of borrowing and a level of capital receipt and some slippage was built in. A lot of capital projects slip – for example there had been a 3 month delay on one project because of objections about access – and it was not always possible to predict what objections would be made or the delay impact. The MD said that the Council does not take its foot off the gas with capital receipts and wanted to bank the money, but was not prepared to sell imprudently – to have a “fire sale” at silly prices. There was an assumed level of value for each property and it was necessary to realise the best possible value to maximise the interests of local council tax payers.
- Cllr. Guy asked what happens if the required capital receipt is not realised until after a project had started and whether this would delay a project. The Cabinet member said that some projects were not moving as quickly as they should, but capital receipts were monitored and discussed regularly and new plots were looked at to move forward.
- Cllr. Guy referred to the revised projections for safeguarding, the consistent overspend and the discussion at the previous meeting about setting a more realistic budget, and said he did not understand why the budget was not increased to a realistic amount. The MD said there was not always a direct correlation between the budget and spending because events could outstrip the budget. There were 2 factors to consider:
 - a) Internal cost control i.e. being in control of costs and providing the right care at the best price when a child is taken into care. There was still work to be done, but costs had been reduced through the commissioning process for residential

and external foster care placements and the new care contract at Jigsaw; the campaign for internal foster carers continued and there had been 50 new enquiries; the high-cost residential placements had been reviewed and a number of moves were being planned from residential to foster care. There was some good work going on, but still more to do.

- b) What happened in the community - the Early Help support was still in its infancy and further up-skilling was needed.

It was not as simple as just putting more money into the budget. There was a fine balance because officers need to be aware of savings targets but no one at the Council wanted social workers to make assessments and decisions based just on money. The welfare benefit reforms may have an impact. The MD believed the strategy was right and would have an impact on costs but it was important to do the right things which took time.

- Cllr. Guy checked he had understood the position correctly, that they would wait until the changes had been implemented and would then review the budget position. The MD confirmed it was. He said the budget could be set at any level but this would mean cutting services in other areas. The budget was scrutinised on a monthly basis and investment had been made into early intervention and edge of care prevention strategies. The CFO said the budget needed to be realistic and this was why an additional £600k had been invested in the service with a £930k contingency which was felt realistic given the Cost Improvement Plan when the budget was agreed.
- Mr. Williams asked if the position could be summarised as keeping the base budget tight but having a contingency. Cllr. McClements said that was right and there was a double contingency with the safeguarding and general contingency but the pressure needed to be kept on people who are spending the money. Most authorities had seen an increase in the number of children coming into care but Telford & Wrekin had seen a steeper proportional increase against its peers and the underlying causes for this needed to be understood, for example whether it is because Telford & Wrekin has a lower wage economy and higher youth unemployment than peers. Since the last meeting, he had seen a map of where other local authorities place their children and there were 24 children's homes in Telford & Wrekin and 61 in Shropshire and he felt the high concentration in the county could be a sign of the lower unit costs. Mr. Williams said he felt it was better to have a lower base budget and try to meet it than to increase the budget.
- The Chair asked about the expectations for income collection given they were down against target and some of the welfare benefit changes had come in. The CFO said the benefits team had been very proactive. They had telephoned people affected early on to offer alternative methods of payment such as direct debit, 12 monthly instalments, weekly instalments, collecting payments on the best date for the customer and the Council was prepared to accept different types of payment to suit customers. They had been very proactive, but the pressures continued. Collection of business rates was important for the Council's income because under the business rates retention scheme the Council would retain 50% of business rate income (up to a threshold).

There were no further questions. The Chair and other members of the Committee asked the MD and CFO to pass their thanks down to staff on achieving a good outcome.

**BFSC-11 RESPONSE OF THE MANAGING DIRECTOR TO THE
COMMITTEE'S COMMENTS ON THE SERVICE & FINANCIAL
PLANNING STRATEGY 2013/14-2015/16**

The Chair reminded members that the Committee had requested that the Managing Director attend a meeting to respond to their comments on the budget strategy and in particular to outline the Council's approach to:

- Outsourcing and shared services
- Opportunities for commercial income
- Setting priorities and budgets for future years given continuing budget cuts.

Richard Partington gave a presentation providing the following information and points:

Our Financial Context -

The 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) had cut local government funding by 28%. George Osborne had updated and extended the deficit period in the Autumn Statement meaning deeper cuts for longer. The spending review in June announced a further 10% cut to local government funding from 2015/16, making a 50% grant reduction in real terms from 2011/12 and 2017/18. Telford & Wrekin Council had already made savings of **£50m** from 2009/10-2013/14. With the June announcement, a further **£40m** saving would be needed by 2017/18 (£10m per year for the next 4 years) meaning the cuts were only half way through and things would get much tougher.

Spending Round 2013 -

The government's spending plans and savings (£11.5bn) announced in June were for 2015/16 onwards. An additional £3bn had been announced for capital projects and the fact that the M6/M54 link was on the list was welcome although not likely to happen until 2020/21. Council Tax freeze grants would continue for 2014/15 and 2015/16 with the referendum threshold remaining at 2% - Telford & Wrekin had increased Council Tax by 1.9% following consultation. £3.8bn had been announced for pooled NHS/local authority funding and Telford & Wrekin would be looking closely at the integration of health and social care services and the potential for sharing services. A key question was how the funding would be distributed across local authorities.

Our Initial Strategy -

Telford & Wrekin had seen the "storm" early on in 2009. Richard Partington had written a paper "One Council, One Team, One Vision" (and One Business) about what needed to be done. It did not follow other Council's strategies but was about understanding the local position and designing a fit for purpose organisation - at that time there were five departments which were not functioning as one organisation. This led to a transformation programme right across the organisation to attack cost, strip out bureaucracy and duplication and to make the Council flexible and responsive. Services had been completely redesigned. The approach had been recognised as an exemplar by the LGA.

A Co-operative Council -

In May 2011 Telford & Wrekin committed to becoming a Co-operative Council. This was about looking outwards and working with employees, residents and partners to

develop new ways of delivering services with the community, and joining up services - "Making Every Contact Count".

Our Results -

There was now a newer, better organisation. £50m savings had been delivered without the public seeing major service cuts; the Council had worked hard to make this happen and few other authorities had redesigned services and jobs from top to bottom. ICT was a critical element and Telford & Wrekin was ahead of the game on developing the IT infrastructure and enabling technologies and other authorities were having a look. Senior management had been reduced by 50%, middle-management by 35%. More than 40% had been saved on back office costs – the MD emphasised how good this was compared to an average 20% saving other authorities had made from outsourcing or sharing services and the fact that some of these authorities were now considering bringing services back in-house as initial cost benefits reduced. Around 1,000 posts had been lost with relatively few (30-40) compulsory redundancies. Office costs had been reduced by 33%. There was a focus on savings from procurement and, going back to the point about outsourcing, the services that were delivered by external providers had been the hardest place to make savings.

Savings/One-offs used in Budget Strategy -

This slide showed the amount of one-off and on-going savings from 2005/06 to 2013/14. Around £20m of the £50m savings had come from "one-offs" which had now gone leaving little leeway to rely on further savings from one-offs – there were none in the 2013/14 budget strategy.

Not doing the "Easy Stuff" -

Telford & Wrekin had resisted making what were seen as "easy" savings that other authorities may have made. Car parking charges had not been introduced in the borough towns because they could dampen economic activity. Free swimming for under-16s had been re-introduced and maintained. There had been no across-the-board pay cuts for staff, and pay increments and sick pay had been retained. There had been minimum cuts to front line services. Key voluntary sector organisations had been given some certainty with three year funding guarantees. Cuts could have been made in these areas, but it was decided that was not the right thing to do. There had been a major consultation on Council Tax options and the public view had supported an increase.

...And Transforming Delivery -

Mr. Partington disagreed with the Committee's view that savings had been made by "salami slicing". A 20% savings target had been set across the board which had been delivered with a variety of solutions. Key services had been re-engineered with First Point as the "front door" for residents; children's services had been re-designed with a single point of contact Family Connect and a new First Point had been set up for businesses as part of the "Business Supporting, Business Winning" economic growth strategy. There was a business approach to making savings - not a slavish one - and resources were aligned to where services were needed. For example, additional investment had been made into children's safeguarding, Business Support and adult care (£28m in 2012/13, £35m in 2013/14) and into Destination Telford which was key to economic growth in the borough and to future income. The Co-operative projects had helped to lever in external funding, for example the Small Business Loans Scheme.

But...Under Pressure -

The job was not done – there would be bigger grant cuts and for longer than set out in

2010. Inflation was rising with no provision in the budget. The aging population and the £8.5m cost shunt to the Council from CHC withdrawal were continuing pressures. Earlier discharge from hospital and increasing care home fees would also increase social care costs. The “shop window” to the borough was important to attract investors so investment in roads and the environment was important. The welfare benefit reforms could impact on cost and income collection. Telford & Wrekin was a youth unemployment hot spot. The Ofsted inspection regime was very challenging. A 1% pay rise for staff had not been built into the budget projections from 2014/15 onwards. So things were tough.

Our Strategy -

Things were being done and opportunities explored. Telford was a growth point – the strategy was to support job and housing growth which would bring more income into the borough and to the Council from business rates and the New Homes Bonus scheme. Opportunities around the City Deals and Growth Pact were being looked at. A closer relationship with JobCentre Plus was needed as key to the growth strategy. New income streams were being looked at, both new commercial income and income from existing services e.g. schools, personalisation. The integration of health and social care presented a big opportunity and the investment in pooled services created the potential for better services and the Council needed to be leading the agenda. Cost saving behaviour was being encouraged e.g. shifting to direct debits which were cheaper to process and saved on front-line costs. More automation was needed and processes were being redesigned. Savings from procurement would continue to be pushed, although there was less flexibility with outsourced contracts for example, inflationary pressure and inflexibility in the TWS contract limited savings opportunities, the cost of some care contracts had gone up by 9-10%. Co-operative service delivery would continue to grow, such as the Snow Wardens and Environmental Action Teams.

Our “Commercial” Approach -

A lot of authorities were thinking about commercial income. Telford & Wrekin would lose £40m grant funding over the next 4 years and this needed to be replaced. Five key areas were being looked at to generate income: traded services, existing service area enterprises, new service area enterprises, new commercial enterprises and commercial investments. The commercial approach was to develop/provide services that businesses or residents choose to buy rather than to increase prices. Ideas should complement the Council’s values and not just be about money making but they still need a “business head”. There were no guarantees, but Cabinet and officers were prepared to be brave and rigorous business cases and plans were being developed to minimise risk. One of the issues was staff having the time and capacity to develop ideas which would generate income. The first idea to “go public” was the Council developing and managing some 550 homes and a feasibility study was in progress. Other ideas were being worked up and would be presented to Cabinet in September and the MD thought there would be some surprises in the ideas. He emphasised that Telford & Wrekin was not pursuing a trading company model such as IP&E in Shropshire as there was no business case at this stage to suggest that this was necessary in Telford & Wrekin.

Taking Heart -

An advantage in developing commercial ideas was that Councils were a “trusted brand”. The MD felt that this was an exciting time because although there were worries and threats ahead, there were also opportunities without precedent or

rule-book so Councils could take control of their own destiny.

At the end of the presentation Members had some questions and comments.

- Cllr. Austin asked about the model for housing ownership and whether it would fall down on the Right to Buy. The CFO explained that there would be a Council owned company which would own the stock and therefore the properties would not be subject to Right to Buy.
- Cllr. Evans asked for clarity about the further £40m savings required and whether completely new savings would need to be found or whether the on-going savings would contribute to this. The CFO explained that the revenue savings were on-going and contributed to existing savings targets, but the June announcement of a further 10% grant cut from 2015/16 meant that £10m new savings would need to be found each year for four years.
- Cllr. McClements referred to the comment the Committee had made about outsourcing in the budget response, and said that when work is outsourced the organisation loses its skilled staff and is then hostage to a contractor who can put prices up, and the idea of giving away skills and control was folly. This had happened at a previous engineering company he had worked at. Businesses need a blend of control and skills, and contrary to outsourcing more services there were arguments to look at whether it would be better to bring some services back in-house. Adult care was possibly worth exploring because a lot of agency care workers were paid minimum wage but a provider could be charging £14 per hour. Cllr. Evans said she worked in the adult care sector and made no further comment. Richard Partington said there was a lot of good will amongst staff who worked extra unpaid hours and this could be lost with outsourcing.
- Cllrs. Guy and G. Reynolds thanked the MD for his presentation which they said had given them assurance of strong leadership. They suggested the presentation should be shared with all staff to inspire confidence that the Council had a plan and was looking ahead for opportunities. The Chair agreed it was an excellent report which should go to all staff. The MD said that it had already been shared with Senior Managers, Service Delivery Managers and Team Leaders and the plan was to share it with all staff. Just having a growth strategy did not mean that growth would happen – the whole Council needed to perform to deliver the agenda and bringing teams together made the organisation stronger. In response to a suggestion that there should be one big event for staff to hear the presentation, the MD replied that there was a positive narrative, but staff would inevitably ask if they will be part of it and they will worry so this had to be handled sensitively. Telford & Wrekin was lucky; there were growth opportunities and the Council had seized the challenge and needed to be positive, but realistic. Cllr. Guy said that from his experience, strong leadership had a positive impact on morale and performance.
- Mr. Williams referred back to the three specific issues the Committee had asked to be addressed in the presentation and asked if they had all been addressed. He did not feel the question of outsourcing had been addressed but the Chair said she

felt the approach had been explained. Mr. Williams said he had not heard anything about what the opportunities were for commercial income generation and the MD said the presentation had set out the overall approach and areas where there were opportunities to generate income but the specific ideas could not be discussed because they were commercially confidential. Cllr. McClements assured Mr. Williams that ideas were being developed and further initiatives would be presented to Cabinet in September and that there were some surprising ideas. He said that Telford was lucky because it had growth potential. The retail sector was changing radically with the move to internet shopping but the retail offering in Telford was strong and would have support from the Council to help it keep its competitive advantage. This was crucial for the borough and for the Council's income which will depend on business rate retention. He said we had seen what has happened in other towns where high street shop closures had percolated through the town, and in this respect Telford was lucky. The MD said that other places, including Shrewsbury's riverside complex, seemed to be struggling to get investment but there were some exciting announcements coming up in Telford that would take the town up a league. Private investment was coming in and a good relationship had been built with the town centre management company so they were also investing in the centre.

When there were no further comments the Chair thanked Cllr. McClements and officers for the presentation and answering questions and they left the meeting.

BFSC-12 SINGLE STATUS

The Chair advised members that the Assistant Director Law, Democracy & Public Protection as lead officer for Single Status had sent apologies for the meeting but had provided a written briefing note which was tabled. The Chair asked if members had further questions which they would like the Assistant Director to attend a future meeting to address. Members said it was a good initial report, but Cllr. Evans said there was a lot more to be explained such as why Single Status was so behind schedule, questions about staff morale particularly staff who may have a drop in salary and the financial contingencies set aside for implementation. It was agreed that Cllr. Evans would discuss these issues with the Assistant Director and report back to the Committee if she felt there were issues that needed to come back to a future Committee meeting.

BFSC-13 WORK PROGRAMME

Members discussed the work programme in the light of the information discussed at the meeting. The Scrutiny Officer updated members on the status of outstanding information requested at the last meeting:

- Cost trend data in care placements was being verified and would follow
- Cost benchmarking data – there was no off-the-shelf benchmarking data available but this had been discussed by Cabinet members and officers who were looking into what was available regionally and how it could be used to benchmark costs. This would take some time and a report would follow.
- The question about the cost benefit of spending more on marketing to attract foster carers was being looked at and a response would follow.

All other reports requested had been circulated.

The following was agreed in relation to the work programme:

- Care Placements: members requested an update on the Cost Improvement Plan in November
- Continuing Healthcare: members of the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee would be invited to attend the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee meeting when it receives the Health & Wellbeing Board response to the Committee's recommendations on CHC. Cllr. Evans said she sits on both Committees and could be a link.
- Capital Receipts: the Chair would discuss monitoring of capital receipts with the Chair of the Audit Committee to discuss how this would be done to avoid duplication.
- Single Status: the approach had been agreed in the previous discussion.
- Ideas for commercial income: members would wait until the September Cabinet report was published and then decide whether there were any issues they wanted to scrutinise at a future meeting.

The meeting ended at 8.15pm.

Chair:.....

Date:.....

CHILDREN & YOUNG PEOPLE SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Children and Young People Scrutiny Committee held on Thursday, 6th June 2013, held at 6.00pm in Meeting Room 3, Darby House, Telford.

PRESENT: Councillors M. Ion (Chair), G. Green, J. Greenaway, C. Turley and Co-optees A. Atkinson, R. Aveley, S. Rayner, M. Ward.

Attending: Stephanie Gaskell, Head Teacher St Lawrence CE Primary School; Lisa Howells, Chair of Board of Governors, St Lawrence CE Primary School; Mandie Haywood, Head Teacher Old Park Primary School; Stephanie Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

CYPSC-1 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee held on 18th April 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chair subject to correction of Mr. Rayner's name on page 5.

The Scrutiny Officer informed members that the date of the Annual Foster Care Conference was 8th November.

CYPSC-2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs. J. Loveridge, A. Mackenzie, J. Pinter and Co-optee S. Ali. The Chair informed members that Cllr. Pinter had been appointed to the Committee at Annual Council to replace Cllr. M. Smith.

CYPSC-3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

CYPSC-4 PLANNING PRIMARY SCHOOL PLACES IN TELFORD & WREKIN

The Chair reminded members that the Committee had started to take evidence at the last meeting on the challenge for the borough in planning primary places. There were two ways of increasing capacity – by building new schools or expanding existing schools. The Committee had heard from officers and now wanted to hear from head teachers to get their views.

The Scrutiny Officer had attended a meeting of the Primary Heads Forum Executive Committee to discuss engaging the schools in the scrutiny review and the Executive members had raised a number of issues at the meeting. Workshops had been held at the Primary Heads' Forum (PHF) meeting on 23rd May for Heads in each cluster to identify issues to feed into scrutiny. Stephanie Gaskell, Mandie Haywood and Lisa Howells had been nominated or volunteered to attend the scrutiny meeting to

represent the wider views of head teachers in the borough and to bring their own experience as Heads of a small and large primary school to scrutiny. The Chair welcomed them to the meeting and invited them to introduce themselves and present the key issues.

Mandie Haywood was Head of Old Park Primary School in Malinslee with 500 children on roll. Stephanie Gaskell was head of St. Lawrence CE Primary School in Preston with 80 children on roll. Lisa Howells was Chair of the Board of Governors at St. Lawrence. They presented the issues identified by the PHF as follows:

1. Impact of the “bedroom tax”

This was a challenge across the borough. The movement of families in social housing to smaller properties had caused sudden pupil movement between schools which created issues - one school had had 6 new admissions in a week and another had admitted children of families who had moved into the borough from Staffordshire. Over time, the distribution/location of 2 bed roomed properties across the borough would need to be factored into school place planning.

2. The determination of the Published Admission Number (PAN)

This was a major issue for the PHF. The Heads felt that the PAN should be set in the context of the school and take account of the number of classes and class size limits for year 1 and upward and it was not a consultative process. For example:

- a) The Old Park PAN had been raised from 60 to 80 which was a difficult number to manage when the children moved from reception (three classes) to year one. Years 5 and 6 had the old PAN of 60 and years 4 downwards had 80. There was high mobility in the area and admissions could fluctuate – last year there were 85.
- b) St. Lawrence had a long standing issue with the PAN which was set at 12. This made it hard to accommodate children living just outside the boundary. Children moving into the village had to be admitted, but there were three children just outside on the waiting list who could not be admitted. The Head had consulted with the Heads of neighbouring schools about increasing the PAN to 15 who had said it would not impact on their schools. The Governors had tried to move the PAN but had not been able to. The PAN also constrained the school’s ability to improve the quality of learning. Increasing the PAN to 15 would allow the school to have another class and recruit another teacher, so a small adjustment would have a big impact. The school had started as a Victorian village school and had grown around one hall. PE was still provided in the hall which was not the best option. Years 3, 4 and 5 were all in one room. Children moving into the village and winning appeals had to be admitted which meant one year group had been split and had to use the hall which was not a good learning environment and it had been difficult to bring the groups back together.

3. Drawing boundary lines between catchment areas

There were concerns and a lack of clarity about how and where boundary lines between catchment areas were drawn. People identify with their local community and want their children to attend a school in that community. Boundary lines are moved so families fall into catchment areas of schools that parents don’t want to

send their children to because they don't identify with that community, or the school is too far to walk to or involves crossing busy roads. In Hadley / Leegomery the boundary around HLC had been moved so more people feel into the Teagus Bridge catchment area but parents identified with HLC and other preferences were more likely to be Apley Wood or Millbrook. The Head of Old Park did not feel that Ironstone Primary would alleviate pressure on Old Park because parents want to walk their children to school it was too far.

4. Lack of early involvement of practitioners in the design of buildings and lack of transfer of experience

Heads were not involved in building design at an early enough stage so their expertise as practitioners was not used in terms of what would work well. The plans for Lightmoor had already been drawn up when a head had identified simple problems which meant the building would not work such as the fire escape leading to the boiler room. Overseeing a building project took an enormous amount of time for Heads and this was an issue when they were trying to maintain standards at the same time. The timing of the amalgamation at HLC meant there was some additional capacity, but this was not the norm. It did not always need to be the Head of the school involved – a number of Heads had already been through the BSF process and a lot had been learnt along the way, but no one asked what lessons had been learnt and previous experience had not been drawn on for subsequent projects. Chains of communication could be too long - the head would talk to the architect who would talk to the contractor and so on, and things could get lost along the way. It would be better to have joint project meetings. The overall message was that the local authority must involve practitioners in school building projects and at an earlier stage.

5. Impact of academies and free schools

Academies and free schools were free to set their own admission numbers and could increase without communicating with the other schools or the authority. This had not had a big impact on primary schools yet because there was only one primary academy but would start to impact as new schools were built or others converted.

6. Representation at appeals hearings

There had been a huge debate at the PHF meeting about Appeals Committee meetings and the fact that Heads were not able to attend to represent themselves at appeal hearings. It was not clear whether there were national guidelines in place, but the Heads had heard that Heads in Shropshire had been allowed to attend appeals meetings. The Heads were reliant on Telford & Wrekin admissions staff representing the school but it was not clear to the Heads how they did this and they were not given details about what was said at meetings. There was an issue about the clarity of appeals on the grounds of disability. The Appeals Committee can insist that a school admits a child even if the school is over the PAN. The Heads felt very strongly about this issue and wanted greater transparency.

Members explored some of these issues in more detail and asked a number of other questions:

- Members wanted clarification about how the PAN is decided. The Heads said that it is calculated by the local authority based on the size of the building and that number then goes to the Board of Governors to agree but there can be some pressure. There was a discussion about the role of the Local Admissions Forum (LAF). Mr. Rayner thought the process was that the governors agreed a number to recommend to the LAF to decide, but Ms. Ward who sits on the Forum explained that the constitution had changed and the LAF no longer had any decision making powers. In the past, the LAF had been a forum for lengthy debate and had sometime changed the numbers when the local authority might not. Ms. Ward felt it would still be a useful forum for debate and a conduit between schools and the authority even if it had no powers. Mr. Atkinson agreed the LAF could put issues to the authority on behalf of the schools. Ms. Ward said that secondary schools attended meetings and wanted to know whether the primary Heads heard about meetings which they said they did not, and Ms. Ward suggested the LAF should be reporting back to the Primary Heads Forum. The Chair asked the Heads whether in the light of the discussion it would be fair to say that there was a lack of clarity from schools about how the number is calculated, communicated and influenced and the Heads agreed that the process was opaque. Mr. Rayner also reminded members that there is a difference between the PAN and the net capacity used for planning and they do not need to be the same. Cllr. Greenaway said that there were schools where there were not enough local children to fill the PAN and had spare capacity but the school was not designed to be accessible to children from other communities.
- Members had questions about how projected numbers from housing developments are factored into place planning, including when numbers are built in. Cllr. Green said that developers may not build straight away and numbers factored in too soon would affect the overall projections and planning.
- There was a discussion about traffic problems. Although the majority of parents - about 86% - walk children to school, increasing places could still add to traffic problems and traffic safety issues for those who choose to drive. Issues were also raised about the lack or quality of pavements and poor street lighting on some routes.
- The Chair asked more about the challenges for schools as they expand and whether we should be alarmed if schools grow too big, for example over 500. St. Lawrence had thought about the number at which the school would not be big enough. Technically the school was big enough to manage for the next four years although the numbers were not the same every year. This was not necessarily the case for other schools where development growth – for example in Malinslee – could be a problem if the extra capacity is built in schools that parents don't want their children to go to (for example because they can't walk there). The head at Lightmoor had insisted that expansion should happen gradually and the school had grown into the new building and there had been a gradual increase in improvement but it could not happen overnight. The Heads thought HLC had capacity to increase to 4 classes per year group but they were uncertain as to whether a decision had been made in Telford & Wrekin to limit classes per year

group to three. Class size was important and big classes put immense pressure on teachers – how can they teach 37 or 38 children in one class? There were issues with funding for growing schools - there used to be funding if a school grew above 15% over capacity but this was no longer the case.

- The Chair asked about the link between planning capacity and quality. He painted a scenario of a thriving school with high standards and parents on the doorstep but the PAN could not be increased so children had to go to a less good school that had capacity. He wanted to know if this happened, and if so, how the problem could be solved. The Heads said it was possibly an issue in some areas more than others. Schools work closely with the School Improvement Team and Telford & Wrekin has a good team and a good advisory service and standards were on the rise. There could be historic perceptions about standards which were unfair when a school is improving. Mr. Atkinson commented that “popularity” was not necessarily a good criterion for expanding a school because it could change quite quickly.
- The Chair asked whether converting to academy status would hinder or help solve problems. The Heads insisted they wanted to remain maintained by Telford & Wrekin education authority. St. Lawrence felt converting was not in the best interests of the school and that it was not a viable option with all the bureaucracy that goes with being an academy. Old Park could not see how it would benefit the children and that there would be more work for no more money. The church schools had recently got together to debate the issue and had decided they wanted to work with partners but to retain their current status. Academies could decide to admit more children without consulting or communicating and these decisions would impact on other schools. The primaries had not been greatly affected yet because there was only one primary academy in the borough but this would change over time. Cllr. Turley wanted to know if the government could force schools to become academies and the Chair explained that all new schools must be academies or if a school is eligible for intervention the Secretary of State could enforce academy status. Ms. Haywood said Old Park had a “Good” Ofsted rating and the school had looked at this question now while the school had a choice.
- Members asked more about the impact of the “bedroom tax” - how it manifested itself and the evidence that the sudden admissions were due to the bedroom tax. The Heads said there was anecdotal information from forms that the schools receive and from meetings with the families transferring. It had not affected Old Hall as yet but there were parents who had said they were trying to move. One of the knock-on effects was that many of the children had additional needs which the new school had to meet but the transition was so fast there was not always time to put arrangements in place quickly enough. Sudden moves impact on all children but are especially difficult for children with special needs.

When there were no further questions, the Chair asked the Heads which of all the issues raised were the two priorities they would like scrutiny to make recommendations about and the Heads said priorities would be that the PAN and the appeals processes should be consultative processes - decisions were devolved from

the schools but they should be consulted. Ms. Howells emphasised again that a small increase in the PAN would make a huge difference to St. Lawrence.

The Chair thanked the visitors and they left the meeting.

Members then discussed the Terms of Reference for the scrutiny review in the light of the preceding discussion and it was agreed that they would be revised to take account of:

- The impact of increasing capacity on non-statutory services, such as nurseries, which had come to occupy space during years of under-capacity.
- The impact of expansion on the ethos of the school.
- Point 1 should be changed to take account of the process for planning places including how the PAN is set.
- To include the local admissions policy and the involvement of governing bodies.

The revised Terms of Reference would be circulated to members after the meeting.

Members discussed the next steps and the Chair suggested holding working group meetings between formal Committee meetings to gather evidence as there was a lot of work to do in a short space of time and this was agreed.

The next meeting would include:

- Meeting officers from Planning & Delivery to consider the Children & Families Population Profile 2013, circulated as Appendix C1, to look at how data is gathered, the projections and what it tells us.
- A more detailed meeting with the School Organisation Manager to explore how the population data feeds into place planning, statutory requirements and legislation for authorities in place planning and admissions.
- Members to decide who else to meet or what further information is needed.

CYPSC-5 WORK PROGRAMME

The Chair outlined the items for the next Committee meeting as:

1. A report back on the Cabinet response to the Committee's recommendations in the report on the Children in Care Placement Strategy which would be presented to Cabinet on 27th June, and progress on implementing recommendations agreed.
2. An update on the Ofsted action plan, 12 months on.
3. The report of the LGA Peer review of safeguarding.

The meeting ended at 7.25pm.

Chairman:.....

Date:.....

HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

Minutes of a meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on Wednesday 17th July 2013 at 2.00pm at NFU Offices, Agriculture House, Southwater Way, Telford

PRESENT: Cllr R Overton (Chair) (Telford and Wrekin Council), Dr M Innes (Vice-Chair) (Clinical Commissioning Group), Cllr E Clare (Telford and Wrekin Council), P Taylor (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr A England (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr G Green (Telford and Wrekin Council), D Harrison (Clinical Commissioning Group), L Johnston (Telford and Wrekin Council), Cllr J Seymour (Telford and Wrekin Council), S Mahmud (NHS England Shropshire and Staffordshire Area Team), Helen Onions (Telford and Wrekin Council), D Saunders (Healthwatch Telford and Wrekin)

Officers: J Eatough (Assistant Director: Law, Democracy and Public Protection), C Jones (Assistant Director Family & Cohesion Services), J Power (Delivery & Planning Manager), J Rowe (Assistant Director: Neighbourhood and Leisure Services), K Grosvenor (Specialist Commissioner), C Harrison (Service Delivery Manager – Commissioning), C Hall-Salter (Partnership and Planning Manager) and J Clarke (Democratic Services Officer).

HWB-14 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the notes of the meeting of the Health and Wellbeing Board held on 15th May 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

HWB-15 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

D Evans (Clinical Commissioning Group) and Cllr P Watling (Telford and Wrekin Council).

HWB-16 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

HWB-17 TELFORD AND WREKIN CLINICAL COMMISSIONING GROUP UPDATE

Dr M Innes gave a brief update from the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG).

The Comprehensive Spending Review for 2015/16 would have a significant impact on the CCG which would be challenging.

With regard to health and social care the CCG nationally would see a transfer of funds from the NHS in the region of £3.4 billion, which locally would be in the region of £6 million, approximately 3% of the current budget. It was not yet clear if this amount would be new money or whether this had already transferred over to the CCG. The finer details would need further consideration and a **report would be brought back to the Health and Wellbeing Board once this had been finalised.**

The CCG and the Council were working together to set out a plan on how care services could be integrated to provide care around the patient enabling more patients to be cared for at home and promote independent living for as long as possible. **It was hoped that a further report would be brought to the September meeting of the HWB.**

An Urgent Care Network Board (UCNB) had been established with membership from commissioners and providers across the community. The draft Terms of Reference of the

Board were appended to the report. The UCNB would be overseeing the implementation of 5 projects in order to put health and social care community in a good position ready for the winter season:

- Emergency Department Flow
- Admission Avoidance
- SaTH and Community Discharge
- Optimising capacity to support discharge
- Local Health Economy Hub

An update on these projects would be brought to the September meeting of the HWB. Further projects would be based on combined and comprehensive care of the frail, elderly and those with complex needs.

Telford and Wrekin CCG was working together with the Area Team of NHS England with regard to collaborative working in respect of primary care to ensure that service delivery met the needs of the population. There was now a Memorandum of Understanding between NHS England and CCG's in Staffordshire and Shropshire and quarterly meetings were arranged to discuss issues of concern.

Actions had been taken across the area regarding the Francis Report. The CCG had accepted the report and some work had been undertaken on "listening" events. A Board meeting had taken place between Shropshire and Telford NHS Trusts (SaTH) around the ongoing work.

A discussion took place including:

- Integrated Care
- Spending Review
- Integration Pioneers and funding a funding bid
- Community involvement
- Francis Report – listening to views of patients and carers

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

HWB-18 NHS ENGLAND SHROPSHIRE AND STAFFORDSHIRE AREA TEAM UPDATE

S Mahmud gave a presentation on the Area Team and Primary Care Commissioning Overview and NHS England's response to the Francis Report.

The presentation was appended to the Report at Appendix 1.

A discussion took place including:

- NHS England Area Team's reporting procedure
- Delivery of meaningful services
- Setting up of Patient Forums
- Primary Medical Care - GP Practices and the ratio of GPs to Patients
- Geographical hotspots – **Sultan to provide additional information**
- Single Handed Practices
- Age profile of GPs
- Lack of access to female GPs

- Immunisation Rates and Good Practice
- Validity of the Patient Survey Findings
- Dental Services and the lack of access to emergency NHS appointments – **Sultan to bring a report on NHS Dentistry to HWB when ready**
- NHS England Area Team's Complaints procedure
- Patient and community involvement in the LAT

It was agreed that Sultan would bring the Primary Care Strategy back to the HWB as appropriate, and ensure that it was in line with HWB priorities. It was also agreed that representation from the T&W HWB would be sought to develop the Strategy.

It was also agreed that NHS England LAT would bring quarterly reports back to the HWB to include performance and complaints.

RESOLVED – that the report be noted.

HWB-19 ANNUAL REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH FOR TEFORD AND WREKIN 2012/13

Dr C Woodward presented the annual Public Health Report for 2012/13 which highlighted the key messages and recommendations.

Dr Woodward thanked members of the Public Health Team and other officers of the Council who had helped with the production of the Annual Public Health report for their hard work.

The Report had been deliberately ambitious and challenging in its approach in order that it had an impact.

The Public Health Outcomes Framework was published in January 2012 and aimed to promote joint working across the NHS, local government, voluntary sector and communities. The Health and Wellbeing Board were taking the "life course" approach and this would be built on going forward.

If the recommendations were accepted by the Board, this would help to support the HWB rather than adding complexities. It was hoped that the Report would become a useful legacy for the Statutory Director of Public Health which set out the key priorities and framework for action.

Dr Woodward then gave a brief slide presentation. Low Birth Weight was an issue that had been brought to the Board's attention at an early stage. Cardiovascular disease and cancer remain the most significant cause of premature mortality (deaths under 75 years). With regard to Alcohol misuse, a single subject report would be brought to the Board due to the performance metrics drifting. This was a priority of the HWB and it was important not to let this slip. The Board had recently sent a letter to the Government supporting the minimum pricing of alcohol. Due to the announcement on the 17th July that the Bill was not going ahead, **it was agreed that a further letter would be sent to the Government expressing the HWB's regret that this had happened.** An updated policy on the misuse of alcohol should have taken place 2 years ago and it was asked if this policy was due to be updated. It was confirmed that this was to be reviewed through the asset mapping timetable plan. A Lead Commissioner had just been appointed and would take the lead on updating the strategy and a progress report would be brought to a future meeting.

A question was raised regarding electronic cigarettes. **It was suggested that the benefits/harm of smoking electronic cigarettes was looked into and this reported back to the Board at a future meeting.**

A discussion took place surrounding the Children and Young People priorities and recommendations and the increase of incidents of self-harm of young people aged 12-18. Some of the CYP recommendations within the Annual Report would be picked up by the Children and Families Board and some would be the responsibility of the Local Children's Safeguarding Board.

AGREED – that recommendations 1 to 11 contained in the report be endorsed.

HWB-20 JOINT HEALTH AND WELLBEING STRATEGY: DEVELOPING OUR PARTNERSHIP AND OUTCOME FRAMEWORKS

J Power presented a report on the delivery of the Health and Wellbeing Strategy Priorities which included refreshed and refocused partnership arrangements to join-up strategic approaches to service design and commissioning and an emerging outcome framework against each of the Board's priorities.

The Report highlighted issues around commissioning that were needed to take forward the HWB Priorities. A position statement for each priority had been completed against the Health and Wellbeing Strategy underpinning the following principles:

- Equity
- Accessibility
- Integration
- Quality
- Engagement
- Financial sustainability
- Positive Experience of health and social care services
- Early intervention and prevention
- Safeguarding

The key messages from the initial analysis were:

- The need to ensure that delivery plans are in place for each priority
- A sharpened focus on integrated commissioning between services to avoid duplication and ensure an effective care and support pathway for service users
- A need for better joined-up working to address priorities holistically – for example challenges around the time of pregnancy – smoking in pregnancy and breast feeding rates

Also in response to the findings two new partnership groups were proposed:

- Co-operative Commissioning Partnership
- Early Help Partnership

The co-operative commissioning partnership would commence in August and bring together commissioners from the CCG and the Council's adult, children and public health commissioning functions. The initial meeting would focus on agreeing the Terms of Reference. Through its annual review the Children, Young People and Families Board were

developing an Early Help Partnership in order to ensure a joined-up strategic approach to support individuals and families and to address challenges quickly and appropriately. This partnership would also support the delivery of 3 HWB priorities:

- Excess weight in childhood / breast feeding
- Teenage Pregnancy
- Improving emotional health and wellbeing

A series of workshops would be developed over the summer for consultation on asset mapping and the holistic approach.

A progress report would be brought to the September meeting of the HWB.

Appendix 2 to the report set out a simplistic view of priorities and cross working partnerships to address the priorities. The delivery of the strategy relied on working with partners. Two stakeholder events had already taken place and a further engagement event was proposed for the Autumn. This was a way of allowing user groups, parents and service users to be heard. The results of the engagement event would be brought back to the Board.

Performance indicators would be used to get an understanding of where the priorities were being met and services delivered appropriately. The Director of Public Health's report also tied in with the work being undertaken and showed clear consistency and commonality in delivering the priorities. A report would be brought to the HWB 3 times per year.

A discussion took place including:

- The collaborative commissioning approach
- Joined-up working with users/providers/voluntary sector
- Active voluntary sector need to be engaged
- All Age Autism Strategy and links to Early Help Partnership
- Early Help Partnership
- Work of Carers and the Carers Partnership Board
- Local Safeguarding Children's Board and governance links to HWB and CYFB
- Misuse of alcohol/drugs – prevention work / follow up visits

RESOLVED – that

- a) the proposed refocused partnership arrangements taking forward the priorities be endorsed;**
- b) the proposed partnership stakeholder event in Autumn be endorsed; and**
- c) that the emerging priority outcome framework be endorsed.**

HWB-21 FOCUS ON HWB PRIORITIES

Improving Carer's health and wellbeing and Carer's Strategy

C Harrison presented a report on the Improving Carer's Health and Wellbeing and the Carers Strategy.

The Strategy had now been approved together with the Action and Implementation Plan.

There were currently 2 Strategies – Adults Care Strategy and Young Carers Strategy. It was a future aspiration to combine these two strategies into an all age strategy.

There were approximately 18,000 carers within Telford and Wrekin with 4,000 of these caring for over 50 hours per week. At 10.1-10.8 of the report was a jigsaw diagram showing how the Carers Strategy would work for Carers in Telford and Wrekin.

Information advice and support was key to Carers which centred around the Carers Centre Hub

Ongoing work included:

- Planning for the future – ie living wills / crisis planning
- Promotion of wellbeing
- Pampering/recreational sessions for carers
- Nursing Services
- Carers Partnership Board

Carers had identified that the key areas from the jigsaw model were:

- Being financially safe and secure
- Having a life outside of caring
- Taking time for themselves

Three power point presentations were received on the following subjects:

- A life outside Caring
- Healthy Eating Project
- Telford and Wrekin Young Carers Service

A verbal presentation was also received from a full-time carer who was able to talk about her experience of being a carer together with the help and support she had received both in London and in Telford and Wrekin.

A discussion took place including:

- Gap in identifying carers
- Carers Centre to work with GPs to identify carers
- Pop-up surgeries ie pharmacies / schools
- Schools to be more proactive in identifying possible young carers
- Drop-in Sessions within secondary schools
- Promotion of carers
- Cost-effectiveness of a joined-up approach

The Chair thanked the carers for all of their work.

RESOLVED – that

- a) the approval of the Carers Strategy 2013-16 by both the Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group be noted;**
- b) the strategic priorities and associated action plan be supported;**

- c) the progress being made with the Adult Carers Strategy be noted;
- d) the value carers bring to the local health and social care economy be recognised and supported; and
- e) the continued progress against the action plan for young carers be noted.

Supporting People with Dementia

K Grosvenor gave a presentation on Health and Wellbeing Board Priority – Supporting People with Dementia.

Diagnosis of dementia for people of Telford and Wrekin was 44% which was below the national average of 57%. There was a lack of information and quality of end of life care offered to patients.

There were 4 priority work-streams:

- Public and Professional Awareness of Memory Problems
- Information
- Early Identification and Diagnosis
- End of Life

A Commissioning Framework and Action Plan had been drawn up to assure the Board that this was being monitored thoroughly and regularly.

A lot of work had been undertaken on public awareness and AFC Telford Football Club had made a video for youTube and raised awareness at football matches. There had been a lot of support from the press and publicity initiatives.

Two documents had been produced:

- Dementia Services Directory
- Dementia Passport

The Dementia Services Directory was a guide to dementia services within Telford and Wrekin whereas the Passport was a document that could be completed with important information ie medical history, contact details, medicines, allergies. The Passport would be a reference point to support a patients journey through the care settings and would remain with them at all times.

Other public awareness events had taken place during Dementia Awareness Week including a Dementia Awareness Day at Blists Hill Museum on 10th June 2013.

There was now the ability to feed into the West Midlands Dementia Care portal from which support services could be accessed.

A training pathway to meet local priorities had been produced. Worcester University had been invited to develop the programme that led on dementia, with Staffordshire University evaluating the training once it had been undertaken.

Shropshire and Telford NHS Trust had adopted the Pathway to Dementia and were currently embedding this within the Hospitals.

Diagnosis rates for Telford and Wrekin were poor although Telford and Wrekin were the best improving areas. A long term conditions group had been set up.

Other ongoing work included:

- Setting a minimum standard of care
- A review of the Dementia Register
- Improvement of diagnosis rates

An End of Life project had been piloted in Newport which involved identifying people at risk of developing Dementia and producing a virtual wrap-around support network to stop unnecessary admissions to hospitals and care homes.

Case Study

M Sadler from the Alzheimer's Society introduced Mr and Mrs T.

Mrs T had begun worrying about Mr T in 2008. Although Mr T had never really had a good memory, Mrs T noticed little things that were not quite right. Mr T was a sporty, fun loving man who over a few days developed a twitch in his shoulder. Mr T attended an appointment with his GP who referred him on to a Doctor at Princess Royal Hospital. Mr T attended the memory service who undertook a brain scan. It took 2 years for Mr and Mrs T to receive a firm diagnosis that Mr T had Alzheimers. Mr and Mrs T were given no information regarding the diagnosis and Mr T was refused medication at the time as the guidance stated that there was no need to give medication at that stage. Mr and Mrs T wanted Mr T to have the medication the stop the deterioration at an early stage and offered to pay to have the medication, if necessary. After 1 year the guidelines were changed and Mr T was able to receive the medication that he needed.

Mrs T researched the condition on the website. There was too much information contained on the web which gave the worse case scenarios which were quite frightening for Mrs T, so eventually she stopped researching.

Once Mr T was given the medication he was referred to the Alzheimer's Society Dementia Advisor Service. A representative from the Service attended at Mr and Mrs T's home 3 weeks after the referral. This made a huge difference to the lives of Mr and Mrs T. There was lots of information and they were given signposts for dementia and referred on to support groups. Mr and Mrs T stated that this services was "absolutely marvellous".

Mr T was able to access groups such as "Singing for the Brain". This group was highly valued by Mr T as people who would not necessarily talk would join in and sing. Mr T had also learnt to read music. The downside was that there were only 10 sessions 3 times per year, so there was a gap between the sessions and some of the attendees found it hard to understand why the weekly sessions had stopped.

Mr T also attended "Tea for Two" activities which involved both memory and physical activities to stimulate the brain.

Mr T had also received cognitive stimulation – Memory Joggers. This involved Mr T attending at 2 sessions per week for 4 weeks. Unfortunately this was a short burst of intensive sessions, but once this had stopped there was nothing to replace it. It was thought that this may have been better if it was a continuous weekly session.

Mrs T valued the support groups as they were a source of company and someone she could talk to who knew what she was going through and both Mr and Mrs T had made some good friends through the groups. Without the support groups Mr T would have lost a lot of stimulation and the company of other people.

There was now a Dementia Guidebook and Mr and Mrs T expressed that this would have been a big help to them if they had been given this on the initial diagnoses.

A discussion took place including:

- The gap in information whilst waiting for a diagnosis
- Information pack/ contacts for reassurance / someone to talk to
- Possibility of introducing activities for dementia patients in local leisure services

The Chair thanked Mr and Mrs T for attending at the Board.

A further discussion took place regarding:

- The need to support carers
- Breakdown of communication between hospitals and care homes
- Isolation of being cared for at home
- Walk about Wrekin – Walks for Dementia Scheme
- Training
- The length of waiting times

Dr M Innes discussed his role as a “Dementia Friend”. There was a national 1 hour training programme for people to become a dementia friend and it was suggested that the Board received this training.

RESOLVED – that

- a) the significant progress made since the receipt of the last Report in September 2012 be acknowledged;**
- b) Board Members continue to champion Dementia as a priority across the Health and Social Care Economy and contribute to raising public and professional awareness;**
- c) Board Members become Dementia friends to demonstrate the Board’s commitment.**

HWB-22 REVIEW OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

J Eatough presented a report on the Terms of Reference for the Health and Wellbeing Board.

It was asked that the Board consider the changes to the HWB’s Terms of Reference following the Board’s move from shadow to formal committee status and to allow a procedure for public speaking to take place within the Health and Wellbeing Board Meetings. The advantages and disadvantages of public speaking were highlighted at 1.4 of the report.

A discussion took place in which members strongly supported public speaking.

RESOLVED – that

- a) the changes to procedure for Board Meetings as shown at Appendix 1 to the report be agreed; and
- b) the recommendations for amendments of the constitution are taken to full Council as appropriate.

The meeting ended at 4.43p.m.

Chairman:

Date:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 3 July 2013 at 6.00pm in the Telford Suite, The Telford Whitehouse Hotel, Watling Street, Wellington, Telford TF1 2NJ

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, A S Jhavar, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge (as substitute for Councillor K R Guy), A A Meredith (as substitute for Councillor I T W Fletcher), G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds and C R Turley.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors S Bentley (for planning application TWC/2013/0332), A J Eade (for planning application TWC/2013/0312); V A Fletcher (for planning application TWC/2013/0401); A D McClements (for planning application TWC/2013/0207) and C P R Mollett (for planning application TWC/2012/0650).

PC-007 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 12 June 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman

PC-008 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor I T W Fletcher and K R Guy

PC-009 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With respect to planning application TWC/2013/0332, Councillor R T Kiernan commented that he knew the applicant personally and would withdraw from the meeting for that item.

PC-010 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PC-011 SITE VISITS

RESOLVED – that a site visit takes place at 4.15pm on 24 July 2013 at Lee Dingle, 48 Lees Farm Drive, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5SU in respect of planning application TWC/2013/0325.

PC-012 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2012/0650, TWC/2013/0297, TWC/2013/0312, TWC/2013/0332 and TWC/2013/0355.

(a) TWC/2012/0650 - Doseley Works, Doseley, Telford, Shropshire, TF4 3BX

This was an outline planning application, to include access, for the erection of 460 dwellings with associated estate roads, infrastructure and open space following the demolition of the existing industrial/factory buildings and facilities on site. An update report was tabled which detailed additional comments from the Council's Ecology Officer, an additional objection received, commuted sums for SUDs drainage and a revised sum for increased Section 106 education contributions following recalculation.

Councillor C P R Mollett, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. Councillor Mollett spoke on behalf of local residents to oppose the proposals, focussing his comments on the site access but also raising concerns regarding ecology, loss of wildlife and loss of employment land. He asked the Committee to consider undertaking a site visit.

Mr D Gibson, a Local Resident also spoke in opposition to the application on the grounds of site access, traffic issues including flow and volume, loss of employment land, contaminated land in relation to the positioning of the play area and sewerage drainage. He considered that the Committee should defer determination of the application until appropriate environmental health studies had taken place and a new transport study had been completed.

Mr Jon Rowson, from the Applicant company, spoke in support of the application commenting that the site was predominantly Brownfield, noting that an option to purchase had not been exercised by FP McCann (current occupiers), efforts to protect ecology through aspects of the design and the company's timetable for development at the site. He also commented that the development would also provide apprenticeship opportunities for local young people.

The Planning Officer highlighted aspects of the report including affordable housing, green space and landscaping, drainage, contributions for a BMX track, employment land use in the borough, Green Network, National Planning Policy and local policy considerations.

During the following debate, Members raised questions and concerns regarding traffic generation, particularly in terms of the single access point and increased traffic flows relating to the potential nursing home, access, land stability and ground conditions, contamination and methane gas monitoring, archaeology, loss of employment land, lack of consultation with the Parish Council, responsibility for open spaces, planning history, viability and affordable housing.

The Planning Officer responded to questions raised, noting that previous planning applications were significantly different and no direct comparison could be drawn; the adoption of open spaces, including the quarry pool, was subject to negotiation and often management companies were set up for this purpose. She advised that affordable housing was not being reduced but that some of the apartments needed to be open market and that, as the site was in an urban area there was not a policy figure specified for the amount of affordable housing. The Applicant was able to

confirm that consultation with Dawley Hamlets Parish Council had taken place in September 2012.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist also referred Members to the report which noted that there were no technical objections on highways grounds subject to conditions and that a standard contaminated land condition was recommended with long term monitoring and maintenance being undertaken by the Council's Environmental Health Officer. Furthermore, the proposed Section 106 Agreement would provide for either a commuted sum for open space maintenance or the setting up of a management company. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist reminded Members to carefully consider the contents of the report alongside the comments made by public speakers, applying appropriate weight to those comments, to assess the application and decide whether there were sustainable reasons for refusal.

Members remained disappointed at the loss of employment land, and noted significant local opposition to the loss, but some Members also noted that there was sufficient employment land across the borough and that the current occupiers of the land were downsizing in any event. Some Members further considered that with the loss of the current occupier, an industrial site would look somewhat incongruous in the developing residential setting. Members welcomed the proposed condition that a second access point would be required once 75% of the proposed 460 dwellings had been built, with the remaining 25% only released for construction providing that a secondary vehicular access was provided and available for use.

At the end of the debate, and in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 12, a recorded vote on the motion to approve the recommendations contained in the update report tabled at the meeting was taken, the voting being as follows:

For: 6

Councillors A S Jhawar, J Loveridge, J C Minor, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds and C R Turley.

Against: 3

Councillors N A Dugmore, R T Kiernan and A A Meredith.

Abstentions: 0

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0650 the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised to grant outline planning permission subject to the applicants/landowners entering into a Section 106 Agreement to provide £919,941 towards primary school education facilities in the vicinity of the development; £78,000 towards maintenance of Sustainable Drainage features; 25% affordable housing; £50,000 towards an off-site national BMX track; bus subsidy based on £490 per dwelling unit; £25,000 for Public Rights of Way improvements; £5,000 for Travel Plan monitoring; contributions for the western roundabout improvements - A5223/Bridge Road and Jiggers Bank Roundabouts based on a pro-rata development traffic basis (yet to be agreed); clauses to allow for

either open space maintenance commuted sums or a management company and S106 monitoring of £1,000 plus £500 per covenant; and further subject to the conditions set out in the update report tabled at the meeting and addition of an archaeological condition and correction for Level 4 code for sustainable homes (with authority to finalise conditions and add any others officer deem necessary).

(b) TWC/2013/0207 - Garages to rear of 44 & 46 Dawley Road, Arleston, Telford, Shropshire

This application was for the erection of a two storey detached building containing 4no. two-bedroomed flats (two on each floor) with associated car parking and access. The application site was previously owned by the Council which had charged rent for the siting and use of garages. The land had been sold by the Council approximately 2 years previously as it was not considered viable to maintain and, despite there being no legal right of access, some local residents were still using some of the garages. A site visit had taken place that afternoon.

Councillor A D McClements, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. Councillor McClements spoke on behalf of local residents to oppose the proposals on the grounds of the safety of the footpath, noise, overlook, loss of privacy, lack of street lighting, safety of the access, turning for bin lorries and access for emergency services. She also noted that some local residents were still using the garages and had no other form of parking available to them.

The Planning Officer drew Members' attention to aspects of the report including the ownership of the site and highlighting sustainability issues, adequacy of separation distances, highways access, parking and noted that the footpath was unadopted. She recommended that Members consider adding a condition regarding construction access for parking and delivery.

Referring to the site visit which had taken place that afternoon, some Members raised concerns regarding pedestrian safety and vehicular access, bin wagon tracking, the presence of asbestos and demolition, adequacy of parking provision and the possibility to make parking provision for the resident at 24 Festival Gardens, and the lack of street lighting. Conversely, other Members welcomed improvement of the dilapidated site including pedestrian and road safety mitigation measures, and noted that the current users of the garages had no legal right to do so.

Addressing Members' comments, the Planning Officer noted that if Members were minded to add a condition for street lighting, consideration should be given as to whether it would be too onerous for the developer to maintain on an unadopted footpath. She further suggested that the occupation of the proposed units would in itself add ambient lighting to the area and enhance safety. She advised that an informative could be added to remind the developer of their legal obligations in respect of demolition and the presence of asbestos, and advised that there was no legal obligation to provide alternative parking for current users.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0207 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report and further subject to an additional condition for construction access and an informative regarding the applicant’s demolition obligations.

(c) TWC/2013/0297 - Land off Edgmond Road, Newport, Shropshire

This was an outline application with all matters other than the means of access (appearance, landscaping, layout and scale) being “reserved matters” for consideration at a later stage via a separate application(s) for up to 85 houses (of which 35% would be Affordable Homes), highway and associated infrastructure works including pedestrian links, formal and informal Public Open Space including a Locally Equipped Area of Play (LEAP), wildlife corridors and retained hedgerows; and an on site water attenuation feature. A site visit had taken place that afternoon and an update report, detailing the receipt of an updated Flood Risk Assessment, additional objections received from local residents and the figure for Section 106 Agreement contributions for Planning and Financial Monitoring, was tabled.

Councillor S Bentley, representing Edgmond Parish Council (adjoining the site), spoke to oppose the application on the grounds of traffic generation and highway safety in particular relating to the adequacy of the traffic impact study, housing needs, concerns that the recommendation sought delegated authority to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager, and policy conflicts with the Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment.

Cllr R Pitt, representing Newport Town Council, also spoke in opposition to the application on the grounds of access and egress to the development, traffic speed and traffic generation, highway safety, building on Greenfield land, flooding and housing need.

Mr P Barlow, a local resident, also spoke to oppose the application on the grounds of traffic volume and safety, peaceful enjoyment of the nearby caravan park, protection of green space in accordance with the emerging Shaping Places plan, loss of a gateway into Newport, housing delivery, ecology and loss of wildlife. Mr Barlow also expressed concern that there had been some disruption to the receipt of consultation responses.

Mr E Harper, the Applicant’s Agent, addressed the Committee in support of the application pointing to the lack of objection to the application, subject to conditions, from the Council’s officers and relevant bodies.

The Planning Officer directed Members to the sections of the report which comprehensively detailed issues regarding traffic and highways issues, housing numbers and phasing, landscape, flooding and ecology. The Planning Officer also explained the technical error which had resulted in some consultation responses failing to appear on e-Planning and emphatically confirmed that this had been rectified. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist was confident that the range of concerns identified were amply covered in the report and that the significant level of local opposition had also been identified, advising Members that they should

consider the information available and decide what weight they should attach to each element.

During the ensuing debate, Members raised a number of questions and comments. Clarification was sought regarding the provision of affordable housing and the Planning Officer confirmed that the figure of 35% should relate to numbers and not value. Members raised concerns upon the speed and volume of traffic, highway danger, build out rates and housing delivery against planned targets, planning policy in relation to Shaping Places and the National Planning Policy framework, building on Greenfield sites and flooding. Conversely, other Members noted proposed traffic mitigation measures, affordable housing need particularly highlighting lengthy waiting times in Newport and sustainability of the site, concluding that the application was compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist addressed the concerns raised by assuring Members that the Highways Officer had no objection to the application, subject to condition; directed Members to the detailed consideration of affordable housing need set out in the report; assured Members that Shaping Places was on track for completion in accordance with the planned timetable and advised that the Borough was strongly placed in contrast with other authorities with regard to build out rates. He commented upon the use of Greenfield sites and noted that national bodies had been consulted on drainage issues. He further advised Members of their obligations in determining the application based upon material planning considerations and commented upon the appeals process.

At the end of the debate, and in accordance with Committee Procedure Rule 12, a recorded vote on the motion to approve the recommendations contained in the update report tabled at the meeting was taken, the voting being as follows:

For: 6

Councillors A S Jhawar, J Loveridge, J C Minor, G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds and C R Turley.

Against: 3

Councillors N A Dugmore, R T Kiernan and A A Meredith.

Abstentions: 0

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0297 the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to:-

A the applicants/landowners entering into a Section 106 Agreement (with final terms to be agreed by the Development Management Service Delivery Manager) to provide:-

(i) Affordable housing, to include: provisions ensuring that 35% of the dwellings to be built shall be affordable housing

- (ii) **Highways works, to include: Off site highway infrastructure improvements - up to a maximum of £47,755.24; Public transport service enhancements – £10,000 Travel Plan monitoring - £5,000; Implementation of Traffic Regulation Order – £5,000.**
 - (iii) **Education infrastructure funds up to maximum of £120,172 towards Primary School provision and £82,279 towards Secondary School provision within the vicinity of Newport.**
 - (iv) **A formulated commuted sum for the adoption and maintenance of public open space, LEAP facilities and Sustainable Urban Drainage System at the site by Council (if that option is exercised by the applicant); and**
 - (vi) **Provision of a Planning and Financial Monitoring contribution of £4,500**
- B and further subject to the conditions set out in the update report tabled at the meeting (with authority to finalise conditions and reasons for approval to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).**

(d) TWC/2013/0312 - 9 Woodcote, Telford, Shropshire, TF10 9BW

This proposal sought planning permission to change the use of vacant land to a permanent travellers site. The proposals included hardstanding for 4 chalets, spaces for 3 caravans, a permanent amenity/day room block, the erection of a small package sewage treatment plant and provision for parking for 4 cars. A site visit had taken place that afternoon and an update report, detailing additional consultation responses received since the publication of the main report, was tabled.

Councillor A J Eade, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Cllr M Roberts, representing Chetwynd Aston & Woodcote Parish Council, spoke to oppose the proposals on the grounds of highway safety relating to traffic speeds and fears that the site would be expanded in future.

Councillor A J Eade, Ward Member, spoke on behalf of local residents to oppose the proposals on the grounds of highway safety, loss of visual amenity, detrimental affect on local amenity, adequacy of road traffic surveys, detrunking of the road and the number of road traffic accidents in the vicinity. Councillor Eade pointed to traveller site policy which sought to limit their appearance in open countryside land and noted that the acquisition of a similar site at Donnington Wood was due to be considered by Cabinet. Councillor Eade provided some photographs which were displayed to the Committee with the agreement of the Chairman.

The Chairman proposed, seconded by Councillor S A W Reynolds, that determination of the application should be deferred for further assessment by Highways Engineers whose attendance would be welcomed at a future meeting to determine the application. On being put to the vote it was unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that determination of planning application TWC/2013/0312 be deferred to allow a further traffic assessment to take place and to enable the Council's Highways Officers to attend the meeting of the Planning Committee at which the application will be determined.

After the vote had been taken, Mr K Saxon, a Local Resident, who had registered to speak in opposition to the proposals was afforded the opportunity to make comments. Mr Saxon gave a graphic description of a fatality at a recent road traffic accident in the vicinity of the application site.

(e) TWC/2013/0332 - Land adjacent 34 Waters Upton, Telford, Shropshire

In accordance with his declaration of interest Councillor R T Kiernan left the room during determination of this application.

This planning application sought outline consent for the erection of a detached dwelling and garage with access from the highway with all other matters reserved for later approval. Waters Upton Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. An update report, detailing consultation responses received since the publication of the main report, was tabled.

Councillor S Bentley read out a statement from Waters Upton Parish Council which opposed the application on the grounds of visibility and highway safety in terms of the new access in relation to six other nearby access points, existing vehicular movements, impact upon the safety of users of the village hall, key settlement status and the subsequent impact of increasing development on the character of the village and housing need.

Councillor S Bentley, speaking as Borough Ward Member, opposed the application on the grounds of visibility splay and removal of historic hedgerow in conflict with the National Planning Policy Framework, housing growth not being consistent with community need and the impact upon the character of the village.

Mrs S Wall, representing local residents, spoke to oppose the application, drawing attention to inconsistencies in the report and accuracy of the application; she referred to lack of consultation prior to the application being made and the impact upon neighbouring properties including noise, overshadowing, loss of sunlight, loss of privacy and the proximity. She also referred to the removal of an historic hedgerow to create sufficient visibility splay and the arboriculturalist's advice in this respect, she commented upon housing need in the village and alleged that some letters of objection had been lost or reluctantly agreed for inclusion.

Ms J Bleach, the Applicant's Agent, and the applicant, Mr D Morgan addressed the Committee in support of the application. Mr Morgan referred to pre-application consultation with the Local Planning Authority and Highways Engineers, nature of his butcher's business which employed local people and the potential for investment therein. Ms Bleach commented upon the application process, principle of development and access, visibility and recent agreement by the arboriculturalist that the hedgerow could be removed if a replacement was made. Ms Bleach also stated

that the application represented a suitable infill plot of ample size and was compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework and Core Strategy.

The Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the report, highlighting that the village was a suitable and sustainable settlement for residential development, and commented upon the imposition of conditions to ensure replacement hedgerow. She indicated that matters of overlook and privacy would be considered at reserved matters stage. The Planning Officer also gave assurances that the letters of objection which had allegedly been omitted from the report, were, in fact, duplicates which had already been received into the system and that the tabled update reflected late objections received. Members were given further assurances, which were accepted by the Chairman, regarding the resolution of technical issues with the e-Planning system and receipt of objections.

In considering this application, Members noted comments from the speakers regarding community identity, loss of hedgerows and employment and considered these in relation to the principle of development on the site. On being put to the vote it was unanimously:-

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0332 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

(f) TWC/2013/0355 - Telford Ski Centre, Court Street, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5DZ

This was a Council application seeking full planning consent for the erection of a single storey extension at Telford Ski Centre in Madeley to provide new changing room facilities with a link to the existing main building.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0355 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(g) TWC/2013/0401 - 9 Bayswater Close, Priorslee, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 9GY

This application sought consent to remove condition 4 of TWC/2012/0423 which related to an obligation for obscure glazing of part of a first floor window. An update report, detailing additional consultation responses received since the publication of the main report, was tabled.

Councillor V A Fletcher, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. Councillor Fletcher spoke on behalf of neighbouring residents to oppose the proposals on the grounds of loss of privacy and loss of residential amenity. Councillor Fletcher also referred to the site visit which took place prior to the meeting of the Plans Board which originally determined the application on 22 August 2012.

The Planning Officer referred the Committee to photographs which had been taken showing views from the first floor window in question. Members considered that the views were primarily a street scene and did not believe that there were grounds to refuse the application.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0401 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

The meeting ended at 9.01pm

Chairman:

Date:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 24 July 2013 at 6.00pm in the Walker Room, Meeting Point House, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, A S Jhwar, R T Kiernan, J Loveridge, A A Meredith (as substitute for Councillor I T W Fletcher), G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds, C R Turley

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors S Bentley (for planning application TWC/2013/0338), S P Burrell (for planning application TWC/2012/0441), and G M Green (for planning application TWC/2013/0325).

PC-013 MINUTES

Councillor N A Dugmore asked that it be noted that he considered that the minutes did not include sufficient detail regarding comments received from public speakers and did not make specific reference to his request for an investigation into the alleged loss of representations, although that request had not been formally proposed or voted upon. Conversely, other Members were satisfied that the explanations and reassurances given by officers with regard to the alleged loss of representations had been accepted by the Committee and duly minuted.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist advised that he had carefully considered the minutes in light of comments raised by Councillor Dugmore and that he believed the minutes reflected an accurate summary of the events of the meeting since the minutes were not intended to provide a verbatim record.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 3 July 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC-014 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillor I T W Fletcher.

PC-015 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

With regard to planning applications referenced TWC/2011/0769 and TWC/2013/0096, Councillors A S Jhwar and G C W Reynolds both commented that they were local borough ward members but had not taken part in any previous discussions regarding either application.

With regard to planning application TWC/2013/0459, Councillor C R Turley commented that he was a member of Great Dawley Parish Council but that he had not taken part in any previous discussions regarding the application.

PC-016 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

None.

PC-017 SITE VISITS

None.

PC-018 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning application TWC/2013/0096.

- (a) TWC/2011/0769 - The Homelands, Mossey Green, Ketley Bank, Telford, Shropshire, TF2 0DN

This was a part retrospective application for the siting of 28 mobile homes within an existing residential mobile home park for permanent residential occupation. Members had undertaken a site visit prior to the meeting. Oakengates Town Council had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

Referring to the site visit undertaken earlier that afternoon, Members considered that the site was in need of improvement and subject to appropriate conditions regarding ground stability and limiting the number of plots on site, unanimously supported the application.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2011/0769 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report with authority to finalise conditions to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager.

- (b) TWC/2012/0441 - The Finneys Caravan Site, Marsh Road, Edgmond, Newport, Shropshire, TF10 8EP

This application sought to vary condition 2 of planning permission W2006/0126 in order to allow more than 3 mobile homes to be sited on the land for use by gypsies/travellers. The applicant wanted to be able to have more caravans/chalets/mobile homes on site and operate a permanent gypsy/traveller site (not a transit site).

Councillor D Ryan, representing Edgmond Parish Council spoke in opposition to the application. Edgmond Parish Council wished to disassociate itself with racist remarks made by objectors during the course of the consultation process. He referred to the public meeting which had taken place, raised issues regarding the applicant's status in regard to the definition of "gypsy" and use of the site, condition of Marsh Road and impact of additional vehicle movements, alleged abuse of current planning restrictions and the presence of guard dogs preventing access to the site. In the event that the Members were minded to approve the application, Edgmond Parish Council sought a temporary two year permission, subject to robust monitoring.

Councillor S Burrell, Ward Member, spoke in opposition to the application referring to the Council's lack of policy regarding gypsies and travellers, assessment of need

and the recent publication of the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. He went on to comment upon surface drainage, septic provision, waste and foul water, lack of consultation with Severn Trent Water and the absence of an Environmental Impact Assessment. He concluded that the report was incomplete and that determination of the application should be deferred or additional conditions attached to mitigate the concerns raised.

Mr R Marriot, spoke on behalf of local residents who opposed the application. He referred to the change of use of the land, refusal of development for other residents at Marsh Road, disproportionate consideration for the Finney family over other residents, the Planning Inspector's findings in 2008, the Council's obligations to provide traveller sites and this site falling outside the Council's ownership, whether gypsy status is lost after a period of permanent residence, the need for an amenity block and questions over the motives of the family in bringing this application forward.

Mr Finney, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application, explaining the family's Romany heritage and experience of the local community. The applicant was the landowner, and would therefore responsibly operate and manage the site, which he acknowledged would also need a separate site licence. He noted the need for a gypsy site in the vicinity and asserted that no breach of conditions had thus far taken place.

The Planning Officer noted that there was a shortfall of gypsy/traveller pitch provision in the borough and referred to the principle of development, site provision and policy context section of the report in this regard. She further referred to the findings of the Planning Inspector in 2008 regarding the suitability of the site to expand and advised of policy changes following the Planning Inspector's decision in 2008. The Planning Officer also noted that there were no objections from the Council's Highways Engineer or Drainage Engineer. Photographs of the site were displayed and, in response to questioning, an explanation of the layout of a "pitch" was given.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist clarified the policy position with regard to the National Planning Policy Framework and associated Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and reminded Members that although there was potential for pitch provision in the borough to be increased in the future, such applications had not yet materialised and the Committee was obliged to determine the application before them. He also advised that there was no requirement for a traveller site to be Council owned or managed, but that suitable conditions could be imposed upon any planning permission granted to ensure that the site was suitably controlled and managed.

Members considered the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites and the Council's intentions to increase pitch provision in the borough. Consideration was also given to drainage and traffic issues, amenity and considerable local opposition to the proposals.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2012/0441 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the

report with authority to finalise conditions to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager.

- (c) TWC/2013/0096 - Ketley Millennium Village, Holyhead Road, Ketley, Telford, Shropshire

This was a full planning application comprising proposals for the erection of 375 houses and apartments together with associated parking, roadways, landscaping and areas of open space. An update report was tabled at the meeting detailing Highways Authority comments, public rights of way and Section 106 contributions.

Mr B Flippance, on behalf of the applicant, addressed the Committee in support of the application referring to the applicant's desire to build upon existing Millennium Community design whilst maintaining viability, sustainability objectives, public open space, recreational provision and landscaping.

The Planning Officer explained the background to the application as Phase 3 of the site, the original Section 106 Agreement and proposed provision of a new school which subsequently could not be justified due to pupil numbers. He also referred to the slow down in the national economy, design quality, open space provision, managed play facilities, access, rights of way as detailed in the update report tabled at the meeting, sustainability, highways, ecology and the proposed Section 106 Agreement also referred to in the update report.

Members had a mixed view on the design of some elements of the application although leisure facilities were welcomed. Members also discussed affordable housing, parking provision, viability and highways (particularly regarding the mini-roundabout at Trio Furnishings).

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist reminded members that the site was the only Millennium Community approved in the West Midlands. He referred to design quality, regeneration of the site and engagement with the Parish Council and local community. He referred to the enhancement of footpath provision, overall percentage of affordable housing and reiterated that the Council's Highways Engineer was satisfied with the design layout and accessibility.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0096 the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the applicants/landowners entering into a Section 106 Agreement as set out in the report and there being no objections from the Local Highway Authority and further subject to the conditions set out in the update report tabled at the meeting (with authority to finalise conditions and add any further conditions deemed to be necessary particularly following completion of highway and planning assessments on latest submissions to be delegated to the Development Management Service Delivery Manager).

- (d) TWC/2013/0139 - JBS Fibre Recovery, Unit A, Halesfield 22, Halesfield, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 4QX

This full planning application sought retrospective permission for the change of use of Unit A, Halesfield 22 from general industrial and storage use (B1 and B8 use) to waste recycling of beds and mattresses (Sui Generis).

Councillor D R W White, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0139 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(f) TWC/2013/0325 - Lee Dingle, 48 Lees Farm Drive, Madeley, Telford, Shropshire, TF7 5SU

This was a full application for change of use from a dwelling house (Use Class C3) to a residential children's care home (Use Class C2). Members had undertaken a site visit prior to the meeting.

Councillor G M Green, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. Councillor Green spoke in opposition to the application, noting that the application had significantly unsettled the community who had raised concerns regarding the process of consultation, the impact that the business would have upon the character of the estate, policy limitations regarding this particular type of application, a restrictive covenant preventing use of the property as a business and current levels of service provision for children in care.

Local residents, Mr S Starkey, Mr D Atkinson, Mrs C Bunn, Mr S Longbottom and Mrs S Clarence spoke to oppose the application regarding breaches of the Wildlife and Countryside Act, irregularities in the submission of planning documents, lack of car parking, appropriateness of the location, need in the area, National Planning Policy Framework considerations and residents' perception of the process of consultation.

The Planning Officer referred Members to the report, advising that the application was made in accordance with policy, that amenity would not be affected, asserted that vehicle movements would not be abnormal and reminded Members of the adequate car parking space viewed during the site visit. She commented that no evidence existed about anti-social behaviour and the change of use would be mitigated by condition disallowing permitted development rights. In response to questioning, the Planning Officer advised that the planning permission granted in 2004 related to extension works and that no detail was available regarding the restrictive covenant, the enforcement of which was subject to a separate process. She also advised that the proposed conditions would limit parking provision to six vehicles. Further, she informed the Committee that the replacement of documents was common in the application process and Officers were satisfied that all the correct information was available to determine the application.

The Legal Advisor also clarified that if Members were so minded, investigation into the potential breach of the Wildlife and Countryside Act could be investigated but

such investigations did not affect the Committee's ability to determine the application at this meeting. She further clarified the legal position with regard to restrictive covenants.

Members noted local opposition to the application and expressed sympathy for the community's concerns, however, for reasons of planning policy the majority of Members felt that they were not in a position to refuse the application.

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0325 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(f) TWC/2013/0338 - The Quarry, Waters Upton, Telford, Shropshire, TF6 6NP

This application sought full planning permission for one detached, two storey 2-bedroom dwelling, landscaping to the front, a rear garden, parking and turning area. The occupancy of the proposed dwelling was linked to the operation of the neighbouring industrial units (Units 1, 2 and 3 with B2 permission; light engineering works undertaken).

Waters Upton Parish Council had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee. Ms K Baker, on behalf of Waters Upton Parish Council, spoke to oppose the proposals, highlighting the planning history at the site, impact on the character of the village, the role of employment in key settlement status and sustainability. Ms Baker asked that, if Members were minded to approve the application, additional conditions regarding removal of permitted development rights, no further residential property on site and the retention of the site's commercial classification.

Councillor S Bentley, Ward Member, spoke in opposition to the application, echoing the comments of the Parish Council, he also commented on the planning history at the site, the village's key settlement status, retention of employment opportunities, viability, the site's suitability for this type of development and the current accommodation available in the village.

The Planning Officer referred to the planning history of the site and the comments detailed in the report regarding the national change in policy since the previous applications were refused. She also referred to the sections of the report dealing with access and visibility splays. She further asserted that through appropriate conditioning, the visual amenities and character of the site would not be harmed.

During the course of the following debate, Members considered the previous planning history of the site and subsequent implementation of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Planning Officer provided clarification of the previous application which had been refused and the reasons for refusal. Members also considered security at the site, employment use and carbon emissions.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0338 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report.

(g) TWC/2013/0459 - Dawley Park, Doseley Road, Dawley, Shropshire, TF4 3AL

This was a full planning application seeking consent for the installation of a “Health Trek” facility (consisting of low level hurdles, vaults, step-ups and sit-up beams made from wood) to be installed on part of Dawley Park recreational ground.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0459 planning permission be granted subject to the conditions as set out in the report

PC-019 INVEST IN TELFORD – PLANNING UPDATE

The Committee considered the report of the Development Management Service Delivery Manager which provided an update on the Planning team’s performance over the previous 12 months, including recent changes to the service area structure. The report also set out proposed national changes to performance indicators and the need to provide both timely and quality decisions. The report considered the refocus of the Council’s priorities towards being a “Business Winning Council” and suggested methods to achieve this when determining planning applications.

Members welcomed information regarding viability appraisals and encouraged more viability detail to be included in future reports. Regarding applications dealt with under delegated approval, Members reflected upon introducing a criteria in relation to the volume of public objections required to trigger determination by Planning Committee but concluded that the opinion of the Development Management Service Delivery Manager was sufficient in this regard. Also regarding applications dealt with under delegated approval, Members requested that the Committee receive a regular summary of Council applications granted planning permission under delegated powers.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist congratulated the Development Management Service Delivery Manager and the Planning Team on their performance to date and for putting together an excellent report, improving relations with Parish and Town Councils in the process.

On being put to the vote it was unanimously

RESOLVED –

(a) that the officer/Planning Committee determination arrangements set out in paragraph 4.24 of the report be approved; and

- (b) that the Development Management Service Delivery Manager be authorised, in consultation with the Chair of Planning Committee, to develop and implement a formal 'Call In' procedure to determine applications at Planning Committee; and
- (c) that the Development Management Guidance Note be approved; and
- (d) that the introduction of the early notification of site visits as proposed in paragraph 4.25 of the report be approved; and
- (e) to **RECOMMEND** to **COUNCIL** that the Scheme for Public Speaking at Planning Committee be amended to reduce the time allocated to each category of speaker to a maximum of three minutes.

The meeting ended at 8.34pm

Chairman:

Date:

PLANNING COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Planning Committee held on Wednesday, 14 August 2013 at 6.00pm in the Walker Room, Meeting Point House, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors J C Minor (Chairman), N A Dugmore, J Loveridge, A A Meredith (as substitute for Councillor I T W Fletcher), C P R Mollett (as substitute for Councillor R T Kiernan), G C W Reynolds, S A W Reynolds and B J Thompson (as substitute for Councillor A S Jhawar) and C R Turley.

ALSO PRESENT: Councillors A J Eade (for planning application TWC/2013/0312) and V A Fletcher (for planning applications TWC/2013/0154 and TWC/2013/0448).

PC-020 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Planning Committee held on 24 July 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

PC-021 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors I T W Fletcher, A S Jhawar and R T Kiernan.

PC-022 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor N A Dugmore declared an interest in planning application TWC/2013/0154 as he was Chair of the Granville Management Committee, however, as he had not been involved in any discussions regarding this application, he indicated that he would not be withdrawing from the meeting for that item.

With reference to planning application TWC/2013/0448, Councillors S A W Reynolds and B J Thompson advised that they were members of Wrockwardine Wood and Trench Parish Council but stated that, in the circumstances, they would not be withdrawing from the meeting for that item.

Councillor C R Turley indicated that as a member of the Granville Management Committee and Chair of the Council's Housing, Economy & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee which was scrutinising waste procurement in the borough, he would withdraw from the meeting for the determination of planning application TWC/2013/0154.

PC-023 DEFERRED/WITHDRAWN APPLICATIONS

Councillor S A W Reynolds expressed disappointment that the design for planning application TWC/2013/0448 sought to demolish historic buildings rather than seek to preserve them. She proposed that the application be deferred for further discussion between Planning Officers and the Applicant with regard to restoration and conversion. The proposal was seconded by Councillor B J Thompson and it was unanimously

RESOLVED - that determination of planning application TWC/2013/0448 be deferred to a future meeting of the Planning Committee to enable Planning Officers to discuss the scheme with the Applicant with the aim of preserving the current buildings and achieving a design more sympathetic to the character of the area.

PC-024 SITE VISITS

None.

PC-025 PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DETERMINATION

Members had received a schedule of planning applications to be determined by the Committee and fully considered each report and the supplementary information tabled at the meeting regarding planning applications TWC/2013/0154, TWC/2013/0312 and TWC/2013/0448.

- (a) TWC/2013/0154 - Granville Landfill, Grange Lane, Redhill, Shropshire, TF2 9PB

In accordance with his declaration of interest Councillor C R Turley left the room during determination of this application.

This was an application for the development of a waste transfer station with the erection of a refuse vehicle depot, office building and ancillary works. The application was originally submitted when the applicant was one of the three bidders for the Council's municipal waste contract. However, the applicant had since withdrawn from that process but had decided to continue with the planning application from a commercial perspective. The proposals were comprehensively detailed in the report. An update report was tabled, setting out additional information regarding the planning history of the site, further planning policy considerations, need for the facility in the borough, and providing clarification of the concluding paragraphs of the main report. A site visit had also been undertaken in the afternoon prior to the meeting taking place.

Cllr V A Fletcher, adjoining Ward Member, addressed the Board to support the recommendation to refuse the application on the grounds that the volume of heavy goods vehicles accessing the site along Castle Farm Way to the M54 junction 4 would have a detrimental effect on residents in that area of Priorslee ward and could cause road safety hazards. She also expressed concern that the proposals would significantly delay the restoration of the Country Park and would have a detrimental impact on the environment and landscape. Councillor Fletcher also considered that more appropriate locations were available for the development and that the application was contrary to local and national planning policy.

Mr A Collinge, the Applicant's Agent, spoke in support of the application, commenting upon the time-limited nature of the application, lack of objection from Council departments or the Environment Agency, rejection of alternative sites, lack of waste policy, ecological value and restoration of the Country Park, design and enhancement of access and nearby larger developments.

The Planning Officer referred Members to the main report, particularly highlighting the planning policy context, which emphasised locational factors, and consultation responses from the Environment Agency, Highways Engineer and Parks and Open Spaces Officer. He suggested that Members consider whether there was a proven need for a waste transfer station in the area and, if so, whether this site was an appropriate location. In this regard, he contended that the alternative site analysis could be more comprehensive and pointed out that the location of a waste transfer station at this location would not only have a significant adverse impact on the local landscape, but would also frustrate and delay the Council's ambitions for the expansion of the Country Park. It was also the Planning Officer's view that co-locational benefits had not been sufficiently demonstrated and, although the visual impact would be modest, the presence of a waste transfer station at this location would conflict with Green Network policies. Furthermore, whilst the compensation measures proposed were welcomed, on balance it was the Planning Officer's view that the Green Network and future expectations for increased recreational amenity in the area outweighed the proposals.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist drew Members' attention to the update report tabled at the meeting, particularly regarding the planning policy background. He noted:-

- the revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy
- that PPS10 was currently being consulted upon by the Government and advised Members that until the revised draft statement was finalised their decision should be based upon the current document;
- the potential for an intensification of waste related activity alongside the Borough's only Country Park and whether future waste management facilities should be located in a more urban setting;
- the subtle difference between the Council's Highways Engineer not objecting to the proposal and the Applicant's Agent's verbal assertion that it was supported;
- whether the physical enhancements offered by the applicant outweighed the protection of the Green Network and restoration of the Country Park; and
- traffic movements would undoubtedly impact upon the tranquillity and peaceful enjoyment of the Local Nature Reserve.

During the course of the debate, Members voiced their collective concerns regarding traffic movements, whether the need for the facility at this site had been proven, the adequacy of the analysis of alternative sites and the opinion that waste facilities should be located in an urban area, protection of the Green Network, noise impact upon the tranquillity of the Local Nature Reserve, frustration to the restoration of the Country Park and public rights of way.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

RESOLVED – that planning application TWC/2013/0154 be refused for the following reasons:-

1. **The proposed development would have a negative impact upon the character, appearance and amenity of the Green Network, the wider**

local area and Granville Country Park. The presence of the proposed WTS/workshop buildings and waste transfer operations at Granville for some 14-15 years after landfill tipping has ceased would delay the overall completion of the landfill reclamation proposals and the Council's wider plans to extend the Granville Country Park and green space designation and bring it into beneficial use. Despite some localised environmental benefits immediately at the site, there would be no significant community and environmental benefits arising from the development and no exceptional circumstances that would outweigh the protection and aims of Green Network/green space and as such the proposals is contrary to WLP policies OL3, OL4 and OL5, Core Strategy policy CS11, Joint Structure Plan policy P67, the NPPF and PPS10 as well as Telford & Wrekin Council's aspirations of restoring this area to landscape and recreational uses.

- 2. The applicant has failed to fully demonstrate that there are no preferable alternative sites and hence the proposed development would be contrary to PPS10.**

(b) TWC/2013/0312 - 9 Woodcote, Telford, Shropshire, TF10 9BW

The Council's Highways Development Team Leader was present for this item of business.

This proposal sought planning permission to change the use of vacant land to a permanent travellers site. The proposals included hardstanding for 4 chalets, spaces for 3 caravans, a permanent amenity/day room block, the erection of a small package sewage treatment plant and provision for parking for 4 cars.

Councillor A J Eade, Ward Member, had requested that the application be determined by the Planning Committee; the application had subsequently been deferred at the meeting of the Committee on 3 July 2013 to enable officers to assess highways issues raised at that meeting and to enable the Highways Engineer to attend.

Councillor M Roberts, representing Chetwynd Aston and Woodcote Parish Council, spoke to oppose the application on the grounds of traffic generation, traffic speeds, appropriateness of the site, future development at the site, perceived loss of value of neighbouring property, sustainability and referred to the content of objections posted on the Council's e-Planning website.

Cllr A J Eade addressed the Committee to oppose the application on the grounds of planning and sustainability. He referred to the Government's Planning Policy for Traveller Sites guidance, particularly paragraphs relating to sustainability (11), green belt (14 and 15) and development in open countryside (23). Councillor Eade also referred to the planning history at the site, highways issues, recent acquisitions by the Council for traveller sites, and procedural issues.

Mr K Saxon, a local resident, also spoke in opposition to the application. He referred to the Council's Co-Operative values in terms of the volume of objections received.

Mr Saxon urged the Committee to consider traffic speed and the number and severity of road traffic accidents in the vicinity, many of which had not been recorded by the Police.

The Planning Officer drew Members' attention to the update report tabled at the meeting which summarised additional neighbour objections and comments from the Local Highway Authority and Planning Officer upon the contents of a letter received from a firm of solicitors on behalf of a neighbour (also tabled). He particularly drew attention to assertions that the applicable visibility calculations exceeded those advocated by current design guidance and commented upon the inability to verify accident data not recorded by the Police. The Planning Officer noted that the application was supported by the Council's Gypsy and Traveller Officer and advised that there was a demonstrable need for traveller pitches in the borough, which would not be met by recent land acquisitions for transit sites; no site allocations had been identified as part of the Local Development Framework or "Shaping Places" plan. It was acknowledged that the application site was located in open countryside and sustainability concerns in this regard were noted, however, he considered that the application generally conformed with the National Planning Policy Framework and Planning Policy for Traveller Sites. The Planning Officer also considered that if Members were minded to approve planning permission at this site, Officers sought authorisation to seek an additional planning condition or Section 106 Agreement to restrict the occupancy of the residential units to the applicant and named family members and their dependents.

A Member of the Committee sought to table an independent traffic survey. The Chairman noted that this was received after the deadline for submission and was of the opinion that the documentation should have been submitted as part of the consultation process. Accordingly he advised that the document should not weight Members' views during their deliberations.

During the debate Members expressed conflicting opinions, with some Members expressing concerns regarding anecdotal accident data, the accuracy and timeliness of the traffic management survey, the impact of detrunking the A41, history of refusals at the site, demonstration of need, and parking issues. Conversely, other Members considered that a demonstrable need for the site existed and felt that the application accorded with guidance in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites; in addition the proposals would widen the site access and enhance safety for towing vehicles by setting entrance gates 14m back from the road, accidents were noted to be largely due to human error or poor driving and it was further noted that fears for future development at the site could not be considered as part of this application.

The Chairman invited the Highways Development Team Leader to respond to the highways concerns raised by Members. The Highways Development Team Leader advised that:-

- The location points of the 2009 speed surveys were not critical to the Highway Authority's recommendation to approve subject to conditions because the proposed visibility splays were achievable in terms of meeting current guidance (Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2).
- Speeding issues were matters for Police enforcement.

- All reported accidents which had taken place within a 300m radius of the site during the preceding five years had been taken into account. The Department for Transport acknowledge that some under-reporting of accidents appears to take place and this should be borne in mind when analysing data, however, the current STATS19 reporting system remained the most detailed, complete and reliable single source of information on road casualties. Any assertions regarding accident data needed to be verifiable or the data could not be taken into account.
- Some consideration could be given to white-lining or other road markings if deemed necessary.
- Previous highway refusals on the site were acknowledged, but these were all made prior to the Department for Transport's decision to detrunk the road in 2002. As the road had been detrunked, a different set of rules applied regarding the visibility requirement at the site access and, therefore, the current application fell within guidelines.
- He did not have in-depth knowledge regarding changes to construction vehicle weight and length in recent years and whilst he acknowledged that traffic volumes may have increased over time, these were not critical issues in determination of the application.

The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist also addressed Member comments and queries by reiterating to Members that the prevalence of bad driving and speeding in the area were not reasons to refuse the application, but were a matter for Police enforcement. With regard to guidance regarding development in the Planning Policy for Traveller Sites, he pointed out that there was no green belt land in the Borough and, whilst it was acknowledged the site was in open countryside, the proposals were deemed to be an acceptable use. With regard to sustainability issues, it could be argued that the applicant and his family would have the same access to services as other residents in very nearby locations. The Assistant Director: Planning Specialist also indicated to Members that despite plans to increase pitches in the Borough, there would still be a shortfall. He further commented that whilst government advice was for Local Authorities to deal with unauthorised traveller sites, there remained an expectation for adequate pitch provision to be made.

On being put to the vote it was, by a majority:

RESOLVED – that with respect to planning application TWC/2013/0312 0448 the Development Management Manager be authorised to grant planning permission subject to the applicant/landowner entering into a Section 106 Agreement (if deemed appropriate) to limit occupation to named family members and their dependents and further subject to the conditions set out in the update report tabled at the meeting.

The meeting ended at 7.23pm

Chairman:

Date:

SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT BOARD

Minutes of the meeting of the Scrutiny Management Board held on Friday, 12th July 2013 at 10.30am in Meeting Room 3, Darby House, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors D. White (Chair), V. Fletcher, A. McClements, S. Reynolds, C. Turley.

IN ATTENDANCE: Cllr. H. Rhodes, Cabinet Member Customer Services, Libraries & Transport; Steve Watkins, KIP; Alan Olver, Maninplace; F. Bottrill, Scrutiny Group Specialist; S. Jones, Scrutiny Officer.

SMB-1 MINUTES OF THE LAST MEETING

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meetings of the Scrutiny Management Board held on the 17th May 2013 be confirmed and signed by the Chairman.

SMB-2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Cllrs. S. Bentley, M. Ion

SMB-3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None

SMB-4 HOLDING THE EXECUTIVE TO ACCOUNT

Before starting this item, the Chair said he was pleased to welcome three work placement students as observers to the meeting. He then welcomed Cllr. Hilda Rhodes, Cabinet Member for Customer Services, Libraries & Transport and invited her to set out some of her key challenges as Cabinet member.

Cllr. Rhodes reminded members that she had taken on some new Cabinet responsibilities in May. The key issues that she had worked on and continued to work on were taxis and the Community Safety Partnership which involved working with different agencies to make Telford and Wrekin a safe place to live and work. She also had responsibility for flood and water management. The first issue she had had to deal with when she became Cabinet member was taxi licensing and enforcement. Her approach had been to get the taxi drivers around the table, without any officers, so she could listen to their views and to collect evidence for herself about what was happening so issues could be addressed. She had worked with the Chair of the Taxi Forum and other drivers and had visited depots and had a good relationship with the taxi companies who remained licensed in Telford. Many companies had moved to

register in Shropshire because the fees were lower and Cllr. Rhodes said another area of work was to try to get them to move back to Telford.

Members then asked a number of questions.

Questions about taxi licensing and enforcement:

- Cllr. White said there were issues with the safety of taxis and wanted to know what powers of enforcement the Council has. Cllr. Rhodes said there were night time safety issues and they had applied to the Community Safety Partnership who had funded Marshalls to work on Friday and Saturday nights and they were working well. She had met Cabinet members and officers from Shropshire to discuss the issues and they had wanted to work together with Telford & Wrekin but she has said we would negotiate but not work together.
- Cllr. Fletcher asked whether and how often vehicle safety inspections were carried out on taxis and private hire cars. Cllr. Rhodes explained that for the companies licensed in Shropshire, Telford & Wrekin had no powers of inspection even though the taxis were working in Telford and Wrekin. This was one of the issues discussed with Shropshire and a team from Shropshire now came to Telford to do vehicle inspections. Cllr. McClements wanted to know how we get feedback from these inspections and Cllr. Rhodes said that teams from both Councils do the inspections together. Cllr. Rhodes said it was a concern if our residents were at risk and although Telford & Wrekin's licensing conditions were very rigorous, we had to rely on Shropshire to do the inspections on taxis licensed in Shropshire.
- Cllr. Fletcher asked what could be done about inappropriate taxi waiting and whether Shropshire could help with this. Cllr. Rhodes said it was beyond Telford & Wrekin's control. Many taxi companies had registered in Shropshire because of lower fees, but Telford & Wrekin's conditions were much more rigorous. This is why she had met members and officers in Shropshire to discuss control over the taxis in Telford and they had agreed to do spot inspections.

Questions about policing and the Community Safety Partnership:

- Cllr. McClements wanted to know more about the Police & Crime Commissioner. She said that he controls the purse strings and she was concerned to make sure that Telford & Wrekin has its fair share of funding. Bill Longmore, the PCC, had attended a meeting at Wellington Town Council and had discussed issues with cut-backs to the police and Cllr. McClements said that some residents related this to a Council issue. Cllr. Rhodes agreed it was very important issue. The Community Safety Partnership (CSP) had started to put the priorities together for Telford and Wrekin in 2012 in advance of the election of the PCC and had held several meetings with Bill Longmore after he was elected to put the issues in front of him with a timetable for work. Mr. Longmore had attended a CSP meeting and said that the partnership was going in the right direction. Cllr. Rhodes

had attended a presentation which Mr. Longmore had given at The Place in Oakengates which was good although there would be cuts to the police.

- Cllr. McClements asked for more detail about this. Cllr. Rhodes did not have exact figures with her but said that all the budget that the CSP had asked for had been granted so the work that had been planned for the next 12 months could be done. She said the CSP did fantastic work including the way they had handled operation chalice. She was very pleased with this side of her portfolio which was working very well.
- Cllr. White asked what the main challenges for the future were and Cllr. Rhodes said obviously resources were an issue and the partnership would need to continue to work together and keep up the good work with the PCC to keep resources coming in.
- Cllr. Fletcher asked about the increase in the number of night clubs and how the CSP were involved in the night time economy and large events to keep young people safe and protected. Cllr. Rhodes said the partnership was trying to get teams in these areas. Patterns of activity and incidents were analysed so that teams could be distributed in the right way and could target hot spots. The Street Pastors were also doing a good job. Cllr. Fletcher declared an interest as a trustee of the Board for the Street Pastors but said that they did not provide coverage in Wellington. Cllr. Rhodes said this had been brought to her attention.
- Mr. Olver who was present at the meeting for the next agenda item said that Maninplace had received a one-off grant from the CSP for provision for rough sleepers, homeless people and people who had been released from prison. The need for more emergency accommodation for young people had been identified by the "Bleak Mid-Winter" project and the CSP had funded a pilot for 5 emergency beds for young people presenting as emergencies between 8.30pm and 2.30am with the option to increase by a further 3 beds. Cllr. Rhodes said this was a good example of how the partnership was working.

Questions about the welfare benefit reforms:

- Cllr. McClements asked Cllr. Rhodes about her approach to the welfare benefit reforms, but the Chair reminded members that this was a new area of responsibility for Cllr. Rhodes and she was not expected to answer questions when she had not had time to get up to speed. Cllr. White explained that scrutiny had done some work on the welfare benefit reforms and he suggested the Cabinet member could sit down with the scrutiny chairs to be briefed. Mr. Olver said that the welfare benefit changes were new and people had shied away from them but people affected were now starting to show themselves and it was important to be ready for the impact and to find resources for it. Cllr. McClements explained that one of the areas the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee was interested in was how the Council is working with partners to support people through the changes. Mr. Olver said there needed to be a net in place – he and Maninplace were willing and prepared to do what they could, but when it

came down to resources they seemed to be treated as a “Cinderella” service because they provided services for the non-statutory homeless. He said that KIP had been inaugurated in 2005 and since then homelessness for the over 25s had proved to be a bigger problem than anticipated. The true scale of the problem was unknown because the number of rough sleepers was still not known. The Chair said that there were pockets of deprivation in the borough and the cuts in welfare benefits were likely to impact more.

Questions about car parking charges and enforcement:

- Cllr. White asked whether the Council would ever consider charging for car parking in the town centre and if not how parking enforcement services could be maintained. Cllr. Rhodes replied there were no plans to introduce parking charges in the borough towns and she hoped there never would be because of the likely impact on local economies and she would do her best to keep this promise. The service was managing to cope at present.
- Cllr. White said that a previous scrutiny review had looked at on-street parking and had found a lot of issues with the lines and signs on roads which made enforcement impossible. He wanted to know how much it would cost to rectify this and whether it would be done. Cllr. Rhodes said they had been trying to get the lines and signs right so that enforcement was possible and a suggestion had been made to refer this as an issue for scrutiny. Cllr. Rhodes had asked the PCC to increase the Community Safety Officers’ (CSOs) powers of enforcement and this was being considered and she was awaiting a response from the PCC.
- Cllr. Fletcher said there was an issue for residents living around schools with parents parking on the road outside their houses and said that a strict enforcement policy was needed. It had been reported to the police. She thought there was a lot of inappropriate parking around the borough. Cllr. Rhodes replied that parents need to be educated about this. She was hoping that powers would be given to the CSOs so if parked cars were causing an obstruction they could enforce the rules.
- Cllr. Fletcher wanted to know what was being done about drivers who break speeding restrictions and are a danger. Cllr. Rhodes said they could apply to the CSP for funding for traffic calming measures but this was limited and there was a need to address this with drivers by educating them, especially getting young people ready to be behind the wheel. Cllr. Fletcher said it was not only young people and that older people were speeding.
- Cllr. Turley asked whether, if the CSOs were given enforcement powers, they would enforce restrictions in “residents only” parking zones where people working in the town centre parked during the day. Cllr. Rhodes said she would hope so and would take this comment back but there could be a time issue. Cllr. Turley said one school had applied for a 20mph speed restriction outside the school but it had not been agreed because it could not be policed. Cllr. Rhodes said the big issue with CSO enforcement would be having enough resources and time to enforce everywhere and the CSOs

may focus on enforcement on yellow lines. The presentation she had attended by the PCC had said that the number of CSOs would be increased.

- Cllr. McClements asked about the policy to increase CSOs and Cllr. Rhodes said the plan was to increase CSO capacity in targeted areas. Cllr. Turley asked whether there were any Special Constables (“specials”) in the area as they have the same powers as the police, and if not, was it because there was a funding issue because they cost more than CSOs and he asked if Cllr. Rhodes could talk to the PCC about giving the CSOs more power. Cllr. Rhodes said she had already asked the PCC to give enforcement powers to the CSOs. Cllr. Reynolds said she had heard from a local special that there had been a reorganisation in West Mercia and the specials had been given reduced duties so they could only foot patrol in designated areas and would not be allowed to do response work. Cllr. Rhodes said this had been covered in the PCC’s presentation and she would provide a copy to circulate to members, and this was something the CSP would keep an eye on. The Chair asked Cllr. Reynolds if she could report back and she replied she could invite one of the active specials to a future meeting if the Board wished.

Questions about ICT:

- Cllr. Turley asked whether there were any plans to bring ICT for members into the 21st century. Cllr. Rhodes said it was hoped there would be a move from Blackberries to a more user-friendly ICT. The Chair said that electronic notepads would save money and paper and that it was wasteful to continue as we were. He had been told that there was an issue with security on notepads, but other authorities were using them. Cllr. Reynolds said members could not access social media on their Blackberries and when so many young people use Twitter, Facebook and other social media, members risked being out of touch. Cllr. Fletcher said Cllr. Ian Fletcher had bought his own notepad but had been told by ICT that security was an issue and she said it was vital to consider this. Cllr. Rhodes agreed it was important to keep in touch with younger people and assured members that ICT was on the agenda to look at.

Questions about transport and blue badges:

- Cllr. White said he had heard about inconsistencies with the allocation of blue badges - there were people with disabilities or mobility problems who had not been able to get a blue badge and people who were not disabled who had been given one. He wanted to know whether the criteria needed to be reviewed. Cllr. Rhodes said she had not heard about any complaints, but she would take this back to look at. Cllr. Turley asked whether people apply by filling out a form or if they were visited and Cllr. Fletcher explained that people are assessed at hospital against certain criteria and a report is sent to the Council and Council officers did not make judgements on eligibility.
- Cllr. White raised an issue with public transport. There were major changes happening to hospital services and there would need to be good

transport links to/from and between the hospital sites. The Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (Joint HOSC) had reviewed the hospital Trust's Travel & Transport Plan but had rejected it because the Trust had not spoken to Council transport officers. The Trust was now talking to Council officers and the Joint HOSC would continue to monitor this but the Chair said the Cabinet member should be aware of this and to take any necessary action. Cllr. Rhodes said she had a meeting coming up and would take this up.

- Cllr. Turley said he had noticed integrated transport buses used by Age Concern waiting around between dropping off and picking up and he thought this was not a good use of time and money when the vehicles could be redeployed during these times. Cllr. Rhodes said there had been teething problems with the service when it was introduced but the wrinkles had been ironed out and the service was now working smoothly. The main concern was that elderly people were picked up and dropped off and she had not heard about buses waiting around.
- Cllr. Rhodes informed Members about the new Marches Local Transport Body which had been set up to oversee the allocation of funding flowing through the LEP for major transport schemes. Cllr. Turley informed Members that scrutiny of the Transport Body by the Housing, Economy & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee and other LEP authority scrutiny committees had been built into the Assurance Framework and would be built into the Committee's work programme.
- Cllr. White asked about a direct rail link to London and Cllr. Rhodes said that lobbying would continue.

Other questions and remarks:

- The Chair remarked that Cllr. Rhodes had a very wide-ranging portfolio and asked what she had changed since becoming Cabinet member and what she wanted to change in the future and whether there were any issues with staff. Cllr. Rhodes there were no problems with staff and that she respected officers and worked well with them – this was how she worked, by listening to people so that issues could be thrashed out.
- Cllr. White asked if there was anything particularly challenging and Cllr. Rhodes said nothing was too difficult if you worked hard and worked together and she dealt with things as they came up. She said she was here to serve and work for the people of Telford and Wrekin and she wanted to make sure that she gave them value for money.
- Cllr. Turley said he was aware that Cllr. Rhodes was due to re-open Jiggers Bank which was good news for the borough and Cllr. Rhodes agreed. It had been a challenge re-routing buses but it had been managed and the Park & Ride service was good. Cllr. Turley said he was concerned about the risk of accidents at Jiggers Bank. Cllr. Rhodes said that the issue of land instability in the Gorge was in the Deputy Leader's portfolio.

There were no further questions. The Chair thanked Cllr. Rhodes for attending and she left the meeting.

SMB-5 HOMELESSNESS PROVIDERS

The Chair reminded members that the Scrutiny Management Board had been due to have an update on the Homelessness Strategy and previous scrutiny recommendations at this meeting, but the item had been deferred until September when the Strategy would be out for consultation. However, Alan Olver from Maninplace and Steve Watkins from KIP had been invited to attend this meeting to discuss issues with the Board prior to scrutiny of the Homelessness Strategy in September. The Chair welcomed the visitors to the meeting and invited them to give a short overview of their organisations.

Mr. Olver started by giving some history and context to the organisations. During the 1980/90s the need for provision for homeless young people led to the development of the STAY project to provide supported accommodation for young people aged 18-25 including at Wesley House. This left a gap in provision for the 26-65 age group and KIP had been set up in 2005 as a pilot to measure the scale of the homeless problem for older people – the number of rough/street/car sleepers, sofa surfers etc. In that first year, 2005, KIP's annual target for supporting people was exceeded within 3 months and the need for emergency or temporary accommodation for the non-statutory homeless (i.e. aged 26-65) was clearly identified. There were no providers who could develop this kind of provision – the Salvation Army (which supports KIP) could not take it on - so Mr. Olver had handed over the running of KIP to Steve Watkins and set up Maninplace Estates as a community enterprise to fill the gap, providing emergency accommodation for the 25-65s. From 2003, Wesley House (STAY) had been funded by Supporting People money and the provision became supported housing, helping people to move into and maintain permanent tenancies. Supporting People became unable to continue to fund Wesley House and it had closed. This created a sudden gap in emergency accommodation for the 18-25s. KIP had extended its client group age range (26-65) to offer help to younger people aged 18-25 and at the start of 2013, Mainplace had been awarded grant funding for 5 emergency beds for 18-25s presenting as homeless emergencies. Capacity had already been exceeded and the option of adding another 3 beds was being looked at.

Mr. Watkins said he had taken over the KIP project three years ago and he had seen a steady growing need. KIP's original remit was to help people aged 25-65 although a number of under-25s turned up looking for help who were referred back to the Council and the STAY project. As the number of younger people presenting increased - they were seeing an enormous problem with the under 18-25s especially as word got around - KIP felt they were discriminating on age and the client group age range had been extended. The number of 18-25 referrals had gone up from about 2 to about 20 per quarter. Mr. Watkins tabled a report on referral statistics for April-June 2013 and trend data showing monthly registrations for 2011-2013. From April-June 2013 there were 70 referrals – people registered, and needing help. The trend data showed a massive increase year-on-year. There were seasonal fluctuations depending

on the weather – there were lower numbers in the warm months - and a huge spike in autumn 2012. In terms of resources, all the non-statutory homeless people in Telford and Wrekin come to, or are referred to, KIP. Mr. Watkins was the only full time member of staff. There was also a floating support worker who worked between KIP and Maninplace and a volunteer support worker for 1-2 mornings per week. They had managed to work successfully and worked very closely with Maninplace.

Mr. Watkins gave the members a flavour of what KIP does. When someone arrives, the first thing they do is listen to them. Sometimes problems are straightforward and can be sorted out quite quickly, but others have complex needs and can take several days. They go out onto the streets to find rough sleepers to connect with them and try to get them to engage which can be difficult. There can be alcohol or other complicating factors and it can take a long time to engage some people. People are referred to Maninplace and Alan Olver will then work with them. For example there were 2 or 3 people at Maninplace now, but it had taken a sustained effort over a long period to engage them. Some people have periods when they lapse back to rough sleeping. They had helped to keep some people out of prison.

There is a drop-in centre at KIP where people can have a wash or bath and get food or bedding. People can be referred to Maninplace or signposted to other support agencies. The relationship with the Council was getting better. There was a feeling that KIP had been “dumped on” in the past but things were now improving. If KIP was made into a “business model” it would not work. Referrals come in from all kinds of places – doctors, hospitals, the Council etc. – and KIP has to deal with them all. Maninplace had expanded from 32 beds to 78. The floating support worker continued to be funded by Supporting People but with 78 people in temporary accommodation, they do not get all the support they need.

There had been an increase in the number of under-age people (under 18s) looking for help and a shift in the number of referrals of young women – the number had doubled in the last year from 10% to 15 out of 70 (21%) in the last quarter. Women on the street face different problems to men on the street. There are also different issues with housing women – landlords don't want to keep houses open for women. Mr Watkins said they feel the weight of responsibility for women and will not let them sleep on the street but the problem was, where do they go?

Members then asked a number of questions.

- Cllr. White said scrutiny had made a recommendation in the Housing & Homelessness report about continued support for KIP and that there should be a service level agreement because there had been problems with lags in funding. He asked if they could elaborate on the relationship with the Council. Mr. Watkins said the biggest problem was the lack of resources. Things were improving. In the past, Mr. Watkins had had people turning up at 4 o'clock, when he was preparing to finish work, who had been sent by the Council without any notice and this put a massive strain on resources and was difficult to plan for. Now things were much better, possibly

because they were building a better relationship with the officers in post and there was a better understanding and rapport. Previously, people had been referred in a constant stream. They were talking to the Housing Options team and there were now on-going discussions about how the Council could work with KIP to support people presenting at the Council offices. Mr. Olver said as part of this process a Rough Sleepers protocol had been developed which set out how the Council would engage with KIP and Maninplace. A draft protocol had been written and he hoped this would be signed-off this month and he could provide a copy for the members. He could also show members information about the difficulties of people turning up at 4 o'clock or after when Mr. Watkins was finishing work. He said they were working with the Community Safety Partnership (CSP) which had part-funded emergency accommodation for people presenting after 2.30pm or into the evening who needed temporary accommodation from a one-night stop to a maximum of 10 days so there was somewhere for them to go if there was nowhere else. Mr. Olver and Mr. Watkins had worked together to achieve this. People presenting are risk assessed so that appropriate staffing can be arranged at night for people to talk to.

- Cllr. McClements said she was pleased to hear the relationship with the Council was improving and this needed to continue as this was an issue which had been flagged up by the scrutiny review. She said there seemed to more joined-up working and wanted to know if the welfare benefit reforms had been a catalyst for this. Mr. Olver said there had been a shift in the way the Council thinks about homelessness. There had been limited understanding and interpretation of homelessness both locally and nationally, and part of the change was that Council officers were now looking at the issue in a wider sense and beyond the statutory duties so that the non-statutory homeless were referred to local support organisations. He was pleased to see this shift in acknowledging the extent of the problem and the wider issues around homelessness.

Mr. Olver continued that the difficulty was only having 2 workers at KIP, only one of whom provided a first response which was totally inadequate. KIP/Maninplace had wanted to re-bid for Supporting People funding, but the tenders had been issued in a way they had not expected – the Council was looking at contractual arrangements with 2 organisations who would then sub-contract out. Maninplace was too small to bid so they could only hope that the contractor appointed would sub-contract to KIP and Maninplace. They had been approached by 2 of the bidders about potential collaboration, but there were other organisation bidding who had not been in touch with them and this was a concern because Maninplace could not bid for funding in its own right and they would just have to wait for the outcome of the procurement. It did not bode well if they could not access resources with the increased pressure.

Maninplace provided various types of accommodation including emergency, temporary and supported accommodation for people who could not live elsewhere because their chaotic lifestyles meant they were unable to maintain a tenancy. These people had day-to-day support to move them

towards being able to maintain a tenancy independently so they could move on to permanent accommodation. Mr. Olver said there was a growing need for more longer term accommodation to help people affected by the “bedroom tax”. In the last six weeks, Maininplace had set up a subsidiary called “Live In Rooms” as a social lettings service to provide subsidised rooms let out on a longer-term basis. This was really important because people need a sense of belonging and community and they can not get this unless they are in a secure home.

- Cllr. White asked how they help people overcome problems with affording deposits and rent in advance. Maininplace was not a registered social landlord and was therefore exempt under Universal Credit rules whereby housing benefit is paid directly to the tenant, so rent could be paid directly to them as a provider. There was a risk that if housing benefit is paid directly to tenants under Universal Credit that the tenants would not pay their rent and this would threaten the future of the provision. They were liaising with the Benefits Manager to look at this. Maininplace had moved to charitable trust status and the trust underwrites deposits and up-front rent and does not use the same degree of checks that other lettings agencies go through. They charge one week rent up-front which is around £90 and if the person does not have the money they work with them to help them save it.
- Cllr. McClements asked why there had been an increase in the number of women referrals. Mr. Watkins said they look for the reasons for homelessness and they have to delve down deep. For example, the reason for being homeless could be attributed to “family breakdown” or “relationship breakdown” but this doesn’t get to the contributory causes and can skew the figures. For example there could be alcohol, drug or mental health problems or a combination of problems and they then need to understand the reasons for the problems, so they take the person back to the last default position. Mr. Watkins is trained in counselling skills but is not a qualified counsellor so people who wish to go into their problems are signposted to other services – but not all people want to go into their problems.
- Cllr. McClements asked what support their clients get from social services. Mr. Olver said it was poor. Relationship breakdown was still the primary reason given for homelessness but over time they start to find out the real reasons which could be quite different. In the last quarter 4 people had accessed alcohol support, but when you delve into the reasons for homelessness the number of people with alcohol problems is much higher but only a very small proportion access services because the others don’t fit the criteria for help. As money reduces, the criteria for help tightens and people are left wanting.
- Cllr. White asked whether they had links with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) which commissions health services including mental health provision. Mr. Olver said they didn’t have any links and Cllr. White suggested this needed to be developed. Mr. Olver said their bread and butter business is homelessness and they are an intensive housing organisation. To offer support, they need people to help them and the 10

hours of the floating support worker doesn't touch what they need. For people to be able to access services, the support organisations need to understand the connection with homelessness. They had started talking to Portico House in Wellington about setting up a dry house. They linked into the CSP because there were a high number of homeless people with convictions or engaged in criminal activity. They need to piece together what is there and link in. Cllr. White said this was why it was important to link in with the CCG. Mr Watkins said alcohol misuse had reached epidemic proportions and support often breaks down because of alcohol – people miss meetings and the floating support worker does a very good job but it is a challenge. Mr. Olver said talking to people with alcohol problems can be like talking to two different people – one day they seem rational and responsive but drink changes them and takes over their thinking process and how they behave. Mr. Watkins said their behaviour can change before they drink, then they get drunk, then they become depressed, so there can be a three day period when they just can't engage with the person.

- Cllr. Fletcher asked whether alcohol issues were worse than drug issues. Mr. Watkins said the risk reduction strategy is better for drugs – people can function when they are on drug therapy like methodone, but there is nothing equivalent for alcohol.
- Cllr. Fletcher asked whether people with alcohol or drug problems can also have mental health issues like depression and Mr. Watkins said often they do. He said they speak to mental health services, but if alcohol or drugs are involved, there is a dual diagnosis and mental health services will not engage. Mr. Olver said it was a revolving problem - at least at Maninplace people have a roof over their heads and they can start to work with them. There were examples of people they had helped who were now living back in the community, but it had taken five years or more of working alongside them and it was a long, hard slog.
- Cllr. White wanted to know what else they thought the Council needed to be doing. Mr. Olver said that the main issues were resourcing, and being able to access services because they felt they were coming up against a brick wall sometimes. They work tirelessly to give people a better quality of life – when no one else does. Their success is built around this mantra - they put themselves where no one else does and they make a difference.
- The Scrutiny Group Specialist picked up the point about the Supporting People procurement and asked Members whether the Board would like to consider making a recommendation about the process including an evaluation of how the primary providers will work with local providers. Mr. Olver said there had been an 18 month consultation and they had taken an active part all the way through, so they had been surprised and disappointed with the way the tender had come out. He said things may have happened at the last minute that he was not aware of that had changed things, but if they ended up being disadvantaged they would want to challenge and he would like to see included in the contract documentation that local providers have to be involved. The Chair said he would write on behalf of the Board to recommend that this happens and that he would not abandon KIP and

Maninplace. Mr. Olver said that he had helped to get the Supporting People money into the Council at the start, but he had started to feel that the funding was not being used as it was intended and was being used to help make sure a “good” tenant was in a property and Supporting People was about so much more. For this reason he felt it was good timing to go back out to tender but he wanted to see clients benefit.

- Cllr. Fletcher said she had been appalled when Wesley House had closed and wanted to know how they worked with STAY. Mr. Olver said there was an extremely good long-standing relationship with STAY. STAY gets referrals through the Single Allocation Panel (SAP) process. People fill in an application form and the Panel meets fortnightly to allocate single units to people from the list. However, if young people present as an emergency, they cannot wait for the panel to meet and there was nowhere for them to go and this was a gap in provision. Cllr. Fletcher said she was horrified that this had not been resolved. Mr. Olver said the 8 bed places had become 16 bed places when Wesley House closed because the cost of overhead at Wesley House had been saved, but it did not enable them to pick up young people in emergencies so Maninplace now picks up them up with the 5 bed places mentioned.
- The Chair asked how they had been involved in the development of the Homelessness Strategy. Mr. Olver said they had had a lot of involvement and had made a contribution. He felt it was very positive that the intention was for the strategy to be a live document so that it could keep pace with what is happening and the priorities could be changed as we go along. There was no point writing a 3 or 5 year strategy that then sat on a shelf. Cllr. McClements said it had been evident from the scrutiny review and that things moved on quickly which was why the review had taken so long. Mr. Olver said that things were also moving on with the choice based lettings system Choose Your Home – there were about 20,000 people on the waiting list but only about 20 properties advertised. Mr. Watkins said there had been serious consultation on the Homelessness Strategy and the picture that KIP had provided had been taken on board so the figures were accurate - KIP did a lot of work on the annual count. Mr. Olver applauded the Council for not adopting the nationally prescribed method of calculation but for using its own local calculation.
- Cllr. Fletcher thanked Mr. Olver and Mr. Watkins for the help they provide. Mr. Olver said they help a lot of people who need short-term help but they also help people with longer term problems including end of life support. Mr. Watkins said the Telford people were good volunteers.

When there were no further comments or questions, the Chair thanked Mr. Watkins and Mr. Olver for attending and for their work, and invited them to contact him with any further issues. The visitors then left the meeting.

RESOLVED:

That the Chair send a letter on behalf of the Scrutiny Management Board to the relevant officers recommending that the Supporting People tender evaluation takes account of arrangements with local providers.

SMB-6 CHAIR'S UPDATE ON SCRUTINY WORK PROGRAMME

The Scrutiny Chairs provided an update on the work of their Committees as follows:

- Cllr. Reynolds reported that the Budget & Finance Scrutiny Committee had scrutinised progress on the Safeguarding and Early Help Cost Improvement Plan in June, and a further update would be brought later in the year. The Managing Director had attended the last meeting to present his response to the Committee's comments on the budget with a focus on financial planning, commercial income generation and shared services/outsourcing. A briefing note on Single Status had been provided. The Chair wanted to know when this would come back to the Committee and Cllr. Reynolds said this was still to be decided but possibly at the next meeting. The next meeting would be joint with the Co-operative & Communities committee to monitor the impact of the welfare benefit reform policies.
- Cllr. McClements reported that the Co-operative & Communities Scrutiny Committee's review of the Co-operative Values/Employee Commission had almost finished. Members had spoken to staff from across the Council and the only remaining interviews were with staff without computers. It had been interesting and the employees seemed to value the face-to-face contact with members. The feedback had been mainly positive. The Scrutiny Officer was starting to draft the report. Cllr. McClements and Cllr. Reynolds had attended the Good Scrutiny Awards ceremony in London for the work on the welfare benefit reforms. The Committee would be moving onto look at other welfare related issues and there were suggestions about the Crisis Network, debt advice and the impact of the reforms on partners which needed to be scoped.
- Cllr. Turley reported that the Housing, Economy & Infrastructure Scrutiny Committee continued to monitor the waste procurement process and the next briefing was in July. The Committee was moving onto reviewing empty properties and private landlords and would start this in August. The next item in the work programme was the Business Improvement Districts, but there were new suggestions to look at Car Parking Enforcement and the Marches Local Transport Body which had been mentioned earlier on in the meeting.
- Cllr. White reported that the Health & Adult Care Scrutiny Committee had finished the report on Continuing Healthcare. The Clinical Commissioning Group had not wholeheartedly accepted the recommendations but he hoped that changes would be made to the process as a result of the recommendations. A key issue were hospital services, and Cllr. White and the co-chair of the Joint Health Overview & Scrutiny Committee (JHOSC) had met the Chief Executive of the Hospital Trust to express their concern about the uncertainty about services and the need for an open consultation without delay. The Chief Executive, Peter Herring, had welcomed the interest of the JHOSC. Cllr. White said it was very important to have a discussion in public, for example there was pressure from Shrewsbury about the location of the hot and cold stroke services. Telford & Wrekin

had hosted the regional scrutiny network meeting on 11th July. Around 40 people had attended and it had been very well received. The network had agreed to work cohesively and to look at ways of feeding into national policy through the Select Committees.

Cllr. Ion was not in attendance but had provided a written report on the work of the Children & Young People Scrutiny Committee which had been circulated to members in advance of the meeting and was noted.

The Scrutiny Group Specialist informed members that a report on the voting rights of the co-optees on the JHOSC would go to the Council Constitution Committee in July.

The meeting ended at 1.00pm.

Chairman:

Date:

STANDARDS COMMITTEE

Minutes of a meeting of the Standards Committee held on Wednesday, 10 July, 2013 at 6.00 pm at Darby House, Telford

PRESENT: Councillors N A M England (Chair), S Davies, T J Hope and A D McClements

ST-01 MINUTES

RESOLVED – that the minutes of the meeting of the Standards Committee held on 13 December 2012 be confirmed and signed by the Chair.

ST-02 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Councillors R C Evans, M B Hosken and R T Kiernan

ST-03 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

ST-04 STANDARDS UPDATE

The Legal Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer presented a report which provided the Committee with an update on matters relating to the ethical framework.

Since the report had been written, a further complaint had been received, bringing the total number of new code of conduct complaints made since January 2013 to five. The Independent Person had been consulted on the first four complaints received so far, none had been referred for investigation.

The short training session for elected Members on current Code of Conduct issues which was being scheduled for the autumn would also include training on bias and the rules on predetermination as set out in the Localism Act 2012.

In order to support their new roles, the Committee's two Independent Persons had been provided with a subscription to guidance and support services from Hoey Ainscough. The Council was due to host Hoey Ainscough's regional training session and places for both Independent Persons had been secured.

The Committee was also asked to consider and review its Terms of Reference, which suggested reducing the number of updates received from the Monitoring Officer to mirror the number of meetings per year and Members asked in what format they would prefer to receive future updates. In addition, the Code of Conduct was presented for consideration but the Legal Services Manager and Deputy Monitoring Officer advised that there had been no major issues to imply that changes were warranted.

Members were keen to ensure accountability in the Monitoring Officer's review of complaints but recognised that it was important not to receive information that would prejudice the Committee in the event that a hearing was required. However, it was

felt important that the Members needed to understand the type of complaints being received, the decisions made in conjunction with the Independent Person, and any patterns identified.

RESOLVED -

- (a) that the report be noted; and**
- (b) that the Standards Committee's Terms of Reference be amended to refer to the receipt of twice yearly reports from the Monitoring Officer.**

The meeting ended at 6.23pm

Chairman:

Date: